

Editorial

A human being is the central category in the field of pedagogical sciences. If we seek answers to the fundamental questions of education: who is a human being and who can he become exploiting his potential? we enter the area of basic knowledge, which is pedagogical anthropology. Anthropology is the area of human thought which views a human being in holistic terms, and, which thereby tries to provide universal answers about his essence, existence and development. Taking into account the anthropological perspective is the only opportunity to formulate significant answers to ontological, axiological and epistemological questions of general pedagogy.

In a time of digital revolution, COVID-19, Big Pharma, Big Tech; in a time of fascination with Eastern civilisations, trans- and post-humanism, we offer a reflection on pedagogy and pedagogy of the person, both rooted in Eastern civilisations and based on the Areopagus, Golgotha and Acropolis (classical Greek philosophy, Christianity and Roman law), and theistic personalism. The return to personalism and to the concept of a person with his dignity and subjectivity, to a personal God—the source and the aim of a human being—may be therefore the best remedy for the threats posed by the modern world for man and education.

In the following thematic issue we would like to debate the personalist paradigm and to consider, above all, one of the aspects of pedagogical personalism, which is the reference of a human being to a personal God. It is the result of an international scientific seminar on pedagogical anthropology implemented as part of cooperation between many scientific centres (the Jan Kochanowski University in Kielce, Catholic University of the Sacred Heart

in Milan, the Abat Oliba CEU University in Barcelona, the John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, the Nicolaus Copernicus University in Toruń) on the 19th of April 2021 on Zoom.

In the section entitled “Pedagogical Personalism and God” we can find reflections of some pedagogues–personalists from the countries traditionally associated with the Catholic anthropology: Italy, Spain and Poland. The aim of the article of Marisa Musaio is to outline the specificity of pedagogy and its inherent link with the idea of a person. To achieve this, the author uses theoretical references of anthropological pedagogy inspired by personalism and its turn towards the hermeneutic perspective. In Sławomir Chrost’s article, we can find a thesis about the need to develop transcendent, transcendental and teleological pedagogy in relation to the anthropological basis, which is the theory of a person and causality. Marian Nowak focuses our attention on personalistic pedagogy, and on its connection (in the studies of selected personalists) with transcendence, as defined by Karol Wojtyła, as ‘another name for the person’. Mariano Bartoli indicates that education of a person presupposes the formation of his freedom. Monica Crotti, referring to the traditional concept of a person, proves that by virtue of his *pedagogical presence* and respect for *a promise*, a pedagogue appears to be *a person of hope*. Federico Rovea presents an original idea of a person present in de Certeau’s writings as innovative and enriching for the current debate on education, based not on ‘identity’ but on the ‘change’ movement.

Urszula Ostrowska’s text places anthropology and pedagogy in the field of human sciences, referring to new challenges/problems facing science and education. Bożena Matyjas presents a vision of a child and childhood in terms of personalistic pedagogy. Julita Orzelska considers despair and death as pedagogical challenges for the sake of the quality of human existence. On the other hand, the aim of Marzena Chrost’s article is to present and analyse the meaning and role of awareness and self-awareness in psychosocial functioning and activity of a human being in the perspective of reflectivity.

In the following issue we will also find some texts referring to contemporary religious education. Agnieszka Salamucha comments on the concept of subjectivity, distinguishing the three meanings of the notion of subjectivity: as a specifically human, permanent and irretrievable ability/disposition/potential; as a variable and dynamic update of the potential; as a privilege resulting from the fact of being a human being. Mariusz Chrostowski, however, pays attention to a better and more effective operationalisation of theological assumptions with reference to sociocultural and religious pluralism;

he also points out new ways of implementing inter-religious education as a part of formal religious education in Poland.

We hope that the articles in the current issue may shed light on the theoretically analysed and practically solved notions of education of a human being – a person from a theistic perspective; that it may serve as an inspiration for a discussion, dialogue and exchange of views, not only in Polish realities, but also in European and global ones too, and finally, that it may serve as an incentive to join in or organise the next editions of a scientific seminar in the field of pedagogical anthropology.

Sławomir Chrost
Kielce 2021

