perspective is based on admitting that nature as a whole, together with everything having an internal value, is valuable in itself and not in relation to the valuating entity (the human being). Thus it is not a utilitarian or instrumental value as followers of the anthropocentric model think.

In this new point of view this responsibility includes not only living entities as elements of different ecosystems. It also includes natural resources as fundamental goods of the Earth, which are a condition for the existence of many species. The argumentation presented by prof. Piątek seems to be correct. The only things that is left is the question whether this extended version of the responsibility for nature, professed by Z. Piątek, does not blur the ontic difference between human beings and the world? While reading work by prof. Piątek one often has the impression that it is so. In my opinion, this issue should be elaborated in a more detailed way.

The book *Ecophilosophy* is an innovative and original attempt at building a concept of ecophilosophy, based on the results of the natural sciences and philosophy. This concept is a theory which recovers the balance between the human being and the environment from which he came. *Ecophilosophy* is written using clear and precise language. The author wanted to be as precise as possible while expressing her thoughts. She also avoids repetition, which is really difficult for every writer. Reading this work by prof. Piątek is a real education in clear, expressive and communicative ways of describing the difficult problems of modern ecology. The work can be characterized as coherent and logically consequent. The author justifies her theses in a critical way, with high methodological consciousness in showing how to interpret scientific facts in a philosophical way. Nowadays, one cannot build philosophical-ethical theories without taking into account scientific data. A significant advantage of the work is the ability of the author to connect philosophical arguments with the natural sciences.

AGNIESZKA THEIR

Cracow University of Economics


Undoubtedly, Ludwig Wittgenstein is one of the greatest and most influential philosophers of the 20th century. He belongs to that group of philosophers who are currently at the focus of attention. This attention is focused not only on Wittgenstein’s thought itself but also on his personality and the interesting lifestyle which gives his thought an even more amazing dimension. Also his style of writing philosophy, vague, sometimes metaphorical, hard to decipher unequivocally, is so attractive for some that their main goal is to solve his thought like a „Rubik’s Cube”, a task
which quite often takes a whole lifetime. A clear proof of the attention paid to Wittgenstein’s thought are the symposiums (also international), published scientific works, monographs, articles and many kinds of scientific associations under his name which aim to investigate and propagate his thought as well as continuing it in a creative way. In Poland the philosophy of Ludwig Wittgenstein has also become more and more recognisable.

Ludwig Wittgenstein deeply influenced the creation of twentieth-century analytic philosophy. Researchers of his thought divide his philosophy into early and late periods. In the early period of his philosophy, Wittgenstein wrote the *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*, in which he supports the creation of a concept of perfect language and uses Bertrand Russell-style logical analysis. The second period of his philosophy is characterized by an abandonment of the ideas described in the *Tractatus Philosophical Investigations*, which opens the later period of his philosophy contains both a different concept of language, which is here considered as a set of games, and a different research method (linguistic analysis). The arguments which Wittgenstein presented in this latter period influenced the Oxford school of ordinary language philosophy, to which, among others, Ryle, Austin and Grice belonged. In August 1914, Wittgenstein started to write *Notebooks*, in which he notes a very interesting fact about his life. The First World War started in August 1914 and Ludwig Wittgenstein was assigned to the 2nd Regiment of the Fortress Artillery in Kraków. He served in Kraków and Lviv for about two years. At first, he served as a soldier on the warship „Goplana”, later he worked in military repair facilities in Kraków and Lviv from which he was sent to the front, to the regiment of „howitzers” (as was his wish).

This very important part of Wittgenstein’s life became a reason for the Institute of Philosophy at the Jesuit University of Philosophy and Education „Ignatianum” in Kraków to organise an international conference on Ludwig Wittgenstein’s philosophy. The conference titled „Ludwig Wittgenstein – assigned to Kraków” took place on April 14-15, 2008, in Kraków. It gathered many well-known researchers of the philosopher’s thought from different sides of the globe. Besides Polish experts on Wittgenstein’s philosophy, the conference included specialists from Austria, Germany, Norway and Portugal. The papers, presented both in Polish and German, were published in the monograph „Ludwig Wittgenstein – assigned to Kraków”.

The articles included in the work pick up different subjects related to the philosophy of the early and later Wittgenstein and deal with logical, epistemological, metaphysical and ethical issues, mostly connected with the sense of life. Some of the articles describe the relations between Wittgenstein and other philosophers i.e. Leibniz, Nietzsche, Russell and writers: Tolstoy, Trakl, Emerson. Taking these relations with writers into account makes it possible to show Wittgenstein’s thought in a perspective wider than only a philosophical one. Other articles show the influence of Wittgenstein’s personality and lifestyle on his philosophy because in his case it is difficult to radically separate his life and philosophy.
The whole monograph starts with an article by Józef Bremer from the Institute of Philosophy at the Jesuit University of Philosophy and Education about the relationship between Wittgenstein and Michał Drzewicki. Then Katarzyna Gurczyńska-Sady from Maria Curie-Skłodowska University in Lublin describes the issue of solipsism in the early Wittgenstein’s philosophy of psychology. Walter Methlagl from Innsbruck University discusses articles by Wittgenstein and others related to the First World War. Jerzy Perzanowski (a Polish researcher of Wittgenstein’s thought from the Jesuit University of Philosophy and Education in Kraków) describes Wittgenstein’s place in contemporary metaphysics and, in a second article, places his philosophy in the context of the great tradition of western metaphysics, which has evolved from Thales of Miletus. Alois Pichler (head of the Wittgenstein archive in Bergen) and Christian Erbaher (doctoral student and scholar in the Wittgenstein archive in Bergen and the Institute of Philosophy at Bergen University) present the project „Wittgenstein MS 101 form September 1914”. Background and meaning. Josef G. F. Rothhaupt (lecturer at the Faculty of Philosophy at Ludwig-Maximilians-Universitat in Munchen) interprets Wittgenstein’s remarks as a kind of „philosophic acupuncture”. Wojciech Sady (a Polish researcher of Wittgenstein’s thought from Maria Curie-Skłodowska University in Lublin) discusses the issue of knowledge with regard to Wittgenstein’s treatise on certainty. Maciej Soin (from the Polish Academy of Sciences in Warsaw) discusses the issue of the classic, correspondence theory of truth in Wittgenstein’s thought. Ilse Somavilla (Innsbruck University) presents in an interesting way the relations between Wittgenstein’s philosophy and writers like Trakl, Emerson and Leo Tolstoy, revealing new aspects of his thought. Dorota Szczęśniak from the Pedagogical University of Kraków gives a critical account of the language in the times of Viennese modernism showing relations between Wittgenstein and Karl Kraus. Nuno Venturinha presents Wittgenstein’s attitude towards Nietzsche and solipsism. Heinrich Watzka, lecturer at the Philosophisch-Theologische Hochschule Sankt Georgen in Frankfurt on the Main, presents the problem of the difference between „telling” and „showing” in the later Wittgenstein’s philosophy. Jan Woletiski (Jagiellonian University in Kraków), an expert on the Polish tradition of analytic philosophy, the Lviv-Warsaw school, presents an account of the relations between Wittgenstein’s philosophy and Russell’s philosophy. The last article included in the monograph, by Ireneusz Ziemieński from Szczecin University, presents the concept of a joyful life according to Wittgenstein’s thought.

Obviously, the articles placed in the monograph do not cover every aspect of Wittgenstein’s philosophy. Every such monograph has to be selective and tries to discuss already known issues or to discover new, untouched ones. Such a presentation is necessary for a better and more appropriate acknowledgement of Wittgenstein’s philosophy. Every article mentioned is written in a professional manner, and in clear language. Undoubtedly, the monograph was prepared in the spirit of Wittgenstein. One can describe it as professional work, addressed mainly to researchers dealing with Wittgenstein’s philosophy. The particular advantage of the monograph is in revealing new aspects of Wittgenstein’s thought, which can undoubtedly allow
a deeper and more exhaustive understanding of it. The book expands not only the Polish, but also the international, literature about Wittgenstein.

PIOTR DUCHLIŃSKI

Jesuit University School of Philosophy and Education Ignatianum


The permanent regularity of the development of science must be acknowledged as a fact, namely that scientific theories universally accepted by the researchers of a given branch of natural science penetrate the consciousness of the average person with great delay. Moreover, the greater the specialization in a science, the more difficult it is to be up to date with its achievements. The most difficult barrier in this respect is undoubtedly the language barrier. The language of science has become, at present, so „technical”, and in the case of physics alone also so formal, that many years of study, in a particular specialization, are necessary in order to understand it fully and master its use. A researcher willing to translate scientific results into a language understandable for a recipient coming from outside the academic group, must undertake an effort no less difficult than that of the contemporary translators of the works of classical literature.

Father Michał Heller is not only an example of a scientist able to link harmoniously quite distant fields of knowledge, but also of an experienced researcher, who has become known as a popularizer of science and philosophy. Following the literary achievements of Fr. Heller, it can be noticed, that titles popularizing diverse philosophical and theological ideas and contemporary findings of natural science constitute a great part of his scientific achievements. In his publications, appearing one after the other, he also demonstrates his point of view on the world and science, in which there is no discrepancy between the natural sciences and theology. At the same time he always remains objective and does not allow himself to impose on the recipient his own view. First of all he presents the facts, clarifies and interprets them appropriately, draws conclusions from them, and then allows the reader to take a stance by themselves. The person of Fr. Professor Michał Heller has become well known lately due mainly to his being awarded the Templeton Prize in 2008. Although, on the one hand it is a sad fact, that such a significant event was necessary for the media to notice this outstanding figure, on the other hand it is a great joy, that thanks to this, the attention of many people has been directed to various matters of a philosophical and scientific nature undertaken by the researcher from Tarnów. The latter of these areas seems to be especially difficult to translate into a language understandable for the average recipient, who does not possess education in natural science. Hence, no doubt, the indefatigable desire of the laureate of the aforementioned prize, to bring closer to a wider range of recipients the current