

# "The Nature of God. Ontological and Epistemological Issues" Instytut Filozofii, Socjologii i Dziennikarstwa, Uniwersytet Gdański

24-25.05.2018

Thursday 24.05.2018

Room s.336 WNS

**10:35 The opening of the conference**

**Session 1 - 10:45-14:00**

**1. 10:45-12:00 Aquinas and the Two Theisms**

Prof. Roger Pouivet, Distinguished Professor, University of Lorraine (France); Senior Member, Institut Universitaire de France (Paris)

**2. 12:00-13:05 William Hasker on the Doctrine of the Trinity**

Prof. Dr hab., Dariusz Łukasiewicz, Instytut Filozofii i Socjologii, Uniwersytet Kazimierza Wielkiego.

**3. 13:05-14:00 Our World is the Best of All Possible Ones**

Dr Tomasz Kąkol, Instytut Filozofii, Socjologii i Dziennikarstwa, Uniwersytet Gdański.

**Lunch 14:00-15:00**

**Session 2 - 14:30-17:00**

**4. 15:05-15:55 Belief in God and Affective States. A Thomistic Refutation of the Hiddenness Argument**

Ks. Dr Marek Dobrzeniecki, Collegium Joanneum, Papieski Wydział Teologiczny w Warszawie.

5. 15:55-16:50 **On Some Vices Opposed to Epistemic Simplicity**

Dr Piotr Lichacz, Instytut Filozofii i Socjologii PAN,  
Warszawa.

**Dinner (around 18:00)**

**Friday 25.05.2018**

Room s.336 WNS

6. 10:00-10:50 **The Image of God in Panentheism: A Critical Evaluation**

Dr Mariusz Tabaczek OP, Instytut Tomistyczny,  
Warszawa.

7. 10:50-11:40 **Salvation and Damnation as The Action of God's Will. John Duns Scotus' Position**

Dr Martyna Koszkało, Instytut Filozofii, Socjologii i  
Dziennikarstwa, Uniwersytet Gdański.

8. 11:40-12:30 **Eternally Hidden God. Karl Rahner's Possible Contribution to Contemporary Discussion on Divine Hiddenness,**

Ks. Dr Miłosz Hołda, Wydział Filozofii, Uniwersytet  
Papieski Jana Pawła 2, Kraków.

9. 12:30-13:20 **Some Methodological Remarks about How to Do the Committed Philosophy of Religion in the Universe of Philosophical Disagreements,**

Dr Marek Pepliński, Instytut Filozofii, Socjologii i  
Dziennikarstwa, Uniwersytet Gdański.

**The closing of the conference.**

# "The Nature of God. Ontological and Epistemological Issues" Instytut Filozofii, Socjologii i Dziennikarstwa, Uniwersytet Gdański

24-25.05.2018

## Abstracts and short notes

**Prof. Roger Pouivet,**  
**Distinguished Professor, University of Lorraine (France) Senior Member, Institut Universitaire de France (Paris)**

### **Aquinas and the Two Theisms.**

Classical theism - that of Augustine, Anselm and Aquinas - is today challenged by another theism. This new theism appears in the works of the analytic philosophers of religion (R. Swinburne, A. Plantinga, W. Hasker, the « Open theists»). God, for them, is a person; and the conception of the person they use is that inherited from Cartesian substantialist dualism. We then can speak of an anthropomorphic turning point in analytic theology: God would be a person, like you and me, but with zero defects, unlike me and maybe you! But, for Aquinas, and Classical theism, God is *ipsum esse subsistens*, existence itself, and this is a constitutive assertion of classical theism. God is not a person with certain properties a human person does not have! We may therefore think that the new theism of analytic philosophers, at least some of them, is certainly not worth the old one!

### **Note on Roger Pouivet**

Roger Pouivet is Distinguished Professor of Philosophy at the Université de Lorraine (Nancy) and Senior Member of the Institut Universitaire de France (Paris). He was the director of the Archives Henri Poincaré (Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique). He has taught or lectured at several universities around the world including the University of Iceland, Nicolas Copernic University (Torun), St. Louis University (USA), Saint John's University (New York), University of Saint Andrews (Scotland), Lingnan University (Hong Kong), Catholic University of Louvain (Belgium), etc. Roger Pouivet writes in the field of philosophy of art and aesthetics (*Esthétique et logique*, 1996; *Le réalisme esthétique*, 2006; *Qu'est-ce qu'une oeuvre d'art ?*, 2007; *Philosophie du rock, une ontologie des artefacts et des enregistrements*, 2010) and *philosophy of religion* (*Philosophie de la religion: approches contemporaines* (ed.), 2010; *Épistémologie des croyances religieuses*, 2013). He adopts a metaphysical and analytical approach to problems, including a Thomistic perspective. His book *L'Art et le désir de Dieu* has been published last year and the

second edition of his *Philosophie contemporaine* (2000), a discussion of what philosophy is today, will be published in August 2018. His best-known and most translated book is *Après Wittgenstein, saint Thomas* (2nd ed., 2014; *After Wittgenstein St. Thomas* is the title of the English version) Some of his books has been translated in English, Italian, Spanish, Bulgarian, Romanian, Chinese, Arabic). Roger Pouivet also has an important editorial activity, as head of two series: one, "Chemins Philosophiques", is published by the leading publisher of philosophy books in France, Vrin; and the other, "Aesthetica", published by Presses Universitaires de Rennes,, is the main collection of philosophy of art in France. Finally, Roger Pouivet is interested in Polish philosophy (he edited *La philosophie en Pologne 1918-1939*), especially at the Krakow Circle (he wrote papers on Kotarbiński, Salamucha, Bocheński, etc.)

**Prof. Dr hab. Dariusz Łukasiewicz,**  
**Instytut Filozofii i Socjologii, Uniwersytet Kazimierza Wielkiego w Bydgoszcy**

### **William Hasker on the Doctrine of the Trinity**

There are at least six problems related to the doctrine of the Trinity, i.e. the logical, metaphysical, moral, historical, existential and ecumenical problem. The logical problem is that the doctrine of the Trinity seems to be logically inconsistent (the Father is identical with the Son). The metaphysical problem concerns the controversy about the nature of God: is the Christian God a single *person* or a *society* of three distinct divine persons? The moral problem (Samuel Clarke's "forgotten" argument from divine deception) consists in the incompatibility of the Trinitarian doctrine with the divine moral perfection. The core of Clarke's argument rests on the fact that God revealed himself in the Bible (in the Old Testament) as the only *one* single person (the Father) and after the revelation of the Old Testament came the revelation of the New Testament that there are *three* distinct divine persons. The historical problem of the Trinity consists in the claim that there is not a sufficient biblical evidence supporting the doctrine of the Trinity and that the first Christian theologians (Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Tertullian, Origen) were not trinitarians but unitarians. There is also the question what type of the Trinitarian doctrine had in mind the pro-Nicene's Greek Fathers (Cappadocian Fathers: Basil of Caesarea, Gregory of Nazianzen, Gregory of Nyssa) and the Latin Fathers (Augustine): were they social trinitarians or not? The existential problem is dealing with the question what is the importance of the Trinitarian doctrine for Christian believers today: is this doctrine a logical puzzle only or a crucial existential truth which the Christians believe in, or, perhaps, it is a completely irrelevant matter to their individual existence? The ecumenical problem concerns the question whether and to which extent the doctrine of the Trinity is an obstacle to the progress of a religious dialog between Christians (trinitarians) and Jews or Muslims (anti-trinitarians). In my presentation I will focus mainly on the logical, metaphysical and moral problems of the Trinitarian doctrine by resorting to social trinitarianism (ST) of William Hasker. Hasker is one of the leading analytic theologians of our days and his Trinitarian doctrine (presented in the book published in 2013 *Metaphysics and the Tri-personal God*) is a dialectical synthesis of the recent debates among the contemporary analytic philosophers of religion.

### **Note on Dariusz Łukasiewicz**

Professor Ordinarius at Kazimierz Wielki University, Bydgoszcz. Director of the Institute of Philosophy. Chairman of the Department of Logic and Ontology. Member of the Committee of Philosophical Sciences of the Polish Academy of Sciences. President of the Central European Society for Philosophy of Religion. The author of over 100 scientific publications including 15

authored or edited books. He edited (with Arkadiusz Chridzimski) *Actions, products and things. Brentano and Polish Philosophy*, (Frankfurt: Ontos Verlag 2006), (with Roger Pouivet) *Scientific Knowledge and Common Knowledge*, (Epigram Publishing House/Kazimierz Wielki University Press, 2009), (with Roger Pouivet) *The Right to believe*, (Frankfurt: Ontos Verlag 2012), *Ontological Proofs Today, Special Issue of European Journal For Philosophy of Religion*, 2012, (with Ryszard Mordarski) "Józef Maria Bocheński - The Heritage of Ideas: from Logic to Wisdom", *Studies in East European Thought*, 2013 Springer, (with Roger Pouivet) *Epistemology of Atheism. Special Issue of European Journal for Philosophy of Religion* 2016, (with Ryszard Mordarski) *Philosophy of Kazimierz Ajdukiewicz. Studies in East European Thought* 2016, Springer. Current research: Polish Brentanism and philosophy of religion.

**Dr Tomasz Kąkol,  
Instytut Filozofii, Socjologii i Dziennikarstwa, Uniwersytet Gdański**

### **Our World is the Best of All Possible Ones**

Leibniz's theodicy (understood both as the title of the book and the theory outlined in it) is often thought of as the eccentric result of the purported unhealthy hyperoptimism of its author and too many philosophers dismissed it out of hand (from Voltaire to Kołakowski, Lenzen and Priest, to mention only a few). The purpose of my talk is to show that, contrary to critics, theodicy proves the falsity of the famous Epicurus's dilemma (in one of its versions: "If there is evil, then either there is no God, or He is not omnipotent or He is not omniscient or He is not omnibenevolent") and in this way it fulfills its function, i.e. the defense of the consistency of the doctrine of the three religious monotheisms. In particular, I point out how to respond successfully to the three strongest charges leveled at Leibniz's account: 1) that if God knows peoples' future actions, then those actions are not free, whereas if God is atemporal, then he cannot be "the living God" - both options will be considered without recourse to Jan Łukasiewicz's solution (in accordance with Leibniz); 2) that our world is "obviously" not the best of all possible worlds; 3) that if God creates the world with evil in it (no matter whether we accord evil the status of a "positive" being or not), then God is by doing this an utilitarianist, which is incompatible with His dignity.

### **Note on Tomasz Kąkol**

Dr Tomasz Kąkol, Institute of Philosophy, Sociology and Journalism, University of Gdańsk, Poland, [tomasz.kakol@ug.edu.pl](mailto:tomasz.kakol@ug.edu.pl). Areas of interest: ontology (R. Ingarden, B. Spinoza, T. Aquinas, I. Kant, time, material constitution, identity), philosophical logic, philosophy of mind, also: bioethics, sexual ethics, Biblical studies, Quranic studies. Publications: 35 articles, 9 detailed reviews, 1 translation with a commentary. Among others noteworthy are: "The SameP-Relation as a Response to Critics of Baker's Theory of Constitution", *The Journal of Philosophical Logic*, vol. 34 (2005), 5-6, 561-579; "A Formal Analysis of Selected Proofs by Aquinas for the Uniqueness of God", w: Christian Kanzian, Muhammad Legenhausen, *Substance and Attribute. Western and Islamic Traditions in Dialogue*, Ontos Verlag 2007, 79-105; "Is God His essence? The logical structure of Aquinas' proofs for this claim", *Philosophia*, vol. 41 (2013), nr 2, 649-660; "So pleasant, so addictive. Several remarks on A. Pruss' work *One Body*", *Roczniki Filozoficzne*, t. 53 (2015), 3, 119-128; "Aquinas and the ontological argument", w: M. Szatkowski (ed.), *Analytically Oriented Thomism*, editiones scholasticae 2016, 79-91; "In defense of presentism and extratemporal God", w: M. Szatkowski (ed.), *God, Time and Infinity*, Walter de Gruyter 2018, 53-60; "Towards a (risky) synthesis" w: M. Szatkowski, B. Skowron (eds.), *Contemporary Polish ontology*, Berlin/Boston: de Gruyter 2018, 149-159 (corrected proof). In Polish: „Przeciw substancjalizmowi”, *Filozofia Nauki*, 4(72)/2010, 121-134; „W kwestii

dowodów Spinozy na istnienie Boga i dowodu na jedyność Spinozjańskiej substancji", *Filo-Sofija*, Nr 17 (2012/2), 83-100; „O kilku argumentach za zniesieniem różnicy kategoryjnej między przedmiotami trwającymi w czasie i procesami”, w: D. Leszczyński, M. Rosiak (red.), *Świadomość, świat, wartości. Profesorowi Andrzejowi Póttawskiemu z okazji 90. jubileuszu w darze*, Wrocław: Oficyna Naukowa Polskiego Forum Filozoficznego 2013, 324-338; „Ingardenowska ontologia czasu i procesu a prezentyzm”, *Filozofia Nauki*, 2(82)/2013, 117-129; „Idealizm transcendentálny dziś? Od Kantowskiej metafizyki substancji i czasu w *Krytyce czystego rozumu* do sporu o istnienie świata”, *Studia Philosophica Wratislaviensia*, 4/2013, 7-18; „Realizm epistemologiczny. Dyskusja z dwoma wybranymi <<manifestami antyrealistycznymi>> (Goodman, Putnam)”, *Filo-Sofija*, Nr 27 (4/II/2014), 29-39; „Śmierć ludzkiej zygoty i jej starszych koleżanek. O wybranych przesądzeniach we współczesnej bioetyce prenatalnej”, w: Leszek Kopciuch (red.), *Filozofia a praktyka*, Lublin: UMCS 2015, 103-120; „O rzekomym kryzysie chrześcijaństwa. Odpowiedź prof. I. Ziemińskiemu”, *Filo-Sofija*, Vol. 16, nr 34/2, 93-113; „Doświadczenie religijne Muhammada a chrześcijaństwo”, *Sensus Historiae*, Vol 28(2017/3), 151-162.

**Ks. Dr Marek Dobrzeniecki,**  
**Collegium Joanneum, Papieski Wydział Teologiczny w Warszawie.**

### **Belief in God and Affective States. A Thomistic Refutation of the Hiddenness Argument.**

J. L. Schellenberg famously championed the hiddenness argument, according to which the occurrence of reasonable nonbelief in God among people is incompatible with His existence. His line of reasoning assumes that the omnipotent and loving Deity would want to participate in reciprocal relationships with human beings and that the necessary condition for such relationships is belief in His existence. According to Schellenberg, the main challenge theism has to face reads as follows: why God does not intervene in people's lives in such a way that it would exclude reasonable doubts with respect to His existence? In my talk I shall address the problem by invoking the free-will response. It will not however follow the footsteps of Richard Swinburne who argued that the knowledge that God exists entails the knowledge of the existence of Heaven and Hell and in this way it can distort human freedom, but rather I shall re-interpret Aquinas' doctrine of natural and supernatural knowledge of God that claims that the supernatural knowledge of God necessarily causes affective states described, generally speaking, as *delectatio* – finding pleasure in the object of knowledge resulting in attachment to it. A person gifted by God with the theological virtue of faith cannot therefore preserve a neutral distance to the object of her knowledge, so in order to protect her freedom of choice in a relationship with God it is not given to her at the beginning of the relationship. At the point of departure, so to speak, a person has to count only on her natural cognitive powers which can fail when it comes to attaining the truth about God. This is the explanation for the fact that reasonable non-belief occurs in the world created and governed by the omnipotent and loving God. In my talk I shall also point out at the roots of Aquinas' theory that is at his conception of God's presence in the world. According to it, God is present in the world as the prime cause of all things (and hence the possibility of natural knowledge of God through natural things) and through His grace (and hence the possibility of supernatural knowledge of God thanks to His grace). I will argue that Schellenberg's formulation of the hiddenness problem indicates that he asks about the absence of God in some people's lives in the latter sense. I shall also explore the question if the necessary connection between the cognitive and affective states is characteristic only to God or to any other person? The question

is of a great importance because although Schellenberg uses the concept of person with respect to God in an analogical way, he is not consequent enough. If he was, he would be more sensitive to the role of the affective states in the knowledge of persons.

### **Nota o Marku Dobrzenieckim**

Ks. Marek Dobrzeniecki – dr filozofii, od 2014 adiunkt na Papieskim Wydziale Teologicznym w Warszawie, studiował na Uniwersytecie Kardynała Stefana Wyszyńskiego w Warszawie oraz na Uniwersytecie we Fryburgu Szwajcarskim. Obszar zainteresowań to analityczna filozofia religii, problem relacji między wiarą a rozumem, filozofia Ludwika Wittgensteina. Aktualnie pracuje nad argumentem z ukrycia J. L. Schellenberga oraz teorią analogii bytu Ericha Przywary SJ. Autor pracy: *The Conflicts of Modernity in in Ludwig Wittgenstein's „Tractatus logico-philosophicus”* (Frankfurt am Main 2016) oraz artykułów, m. in: *Problem zła w teologii współczesnej*, „Teologia w Polsce” (11/2017), *Lindy Trinkaus Zagzebski teoria autorytetu poznawczego. O potrzebie ufania innym*, „Studia Philosophiae Christianae” (52/2016).

**Dr Piotr Lichacz,**  
**Instytut Filozofii i Socjologii PAN, Warszawa.**

### **On Some Vices Opposed to Epistemic Simplicity.**

As it is the case with all human debates, the debates about the divine nature depend on the debating people's cognitive, moral and linguistic abilities. I would like to focus on one epistemic virtue, simplicity, and underline its role in conditioning the way the topic of God's existence is treated as well as the topic of the divine simplicity. More specifically, I shall consider some vices opposed to epistemic simplicity since it seems that the nature and functioning of epistemic simplicity can be thus better recognized.

### **Note on Piotr Lichacz**

Piotr Lichacz, assistant professor in the Institute of Philosophy and Sociology of the Polish Academy of Sciences (Department of the History of Ancient and Medieval Philosophy). He is interested in the thought of Thomas Aquinas and particularly in its contemporary interpretations and applications. E-mail: [piotr.lichacz@ifispan.waw.pl](mailto:piotr.lichacz@ifispan.waw.pl)

**Dr Mariusz Tabaczek OP,**  
**Instytut Tomistyczny, Warszawa.**

### **The Image of God in Panentheism: A Critical Evaluation.**

A considerable group of contemporary philosophers and theologians (especially those engaged in the science/theology dialogue, such as Barbour, Peacocke and Clayton) support panentheism - a theistic position which assumes that the world is in God, who is yet greater than everything he created. They see it as a ballanced middle ground between the positions of classical theism and pantheism. In my talk I will offer a presentation and a critical evaluation of the most fundamental principles of panentheism from the point of view of the classical theism. First, I will list six main species (or aspects) of panentheism and the motivations of

those who support it. In the second part I will analyse the three main difficulties concerning its ontological and theological principles, i.e., (1) the meaning of the preposition "in" (*en*) in "panentheism"; (2) the accuracy of panentheistic definition of divine immanence, and (3) the question whether panentheism is successful in protecting God's transcendence. I will conclude with some remarks concerning the value and role of the panentheistic movement within the contemporary philosophical and theological debate.

### **Note on Mariusz Tabaczek**

Mariusz Tabaczek, OP, graduated in 2016 from the Graduate Theological Union with a PhD in systematic and philosophical theology. He also holds an STL degree from the University of Poznan, Poland. A member of the Thomistic Institute in Warsaw, Poland, he teaches in the Dominican School of Philosophy and Theology in Cracow, Poland. He specializes in science/theology dialogue, with a special emphasis on the role of philosophy. Areas of expertise include systematic theology, theology of divine action, philosophy of science, philosophy of biology, philosophy of causation, contemporary metaphysics in analytical tradition, Classical and new Aristotelianism. Dr. Tabaczek has published articles in *Theology and Science*, *Zygon*, *Scientia et Fides*, and the proceedings of the virtual conference on science and religion organized by the University of Constanta, Romania. He co-authored two chapters for the new edition of *Science and Religion: A Historical Introduction* (ed. by Gary B. Ferngren; 2017). His first book entitled *Metaphysics of Emergence: Causes, Absences, and Dispositions* is in the process of publication by the University of Notre Dame Press. Dr. Tabaczek was awarded the GTU Newhall Teaching and Research Fellowship (2013), and the CTNS Charles T. Townes Graduate Student Fellowship in Theology and Science in 2014.

**Dr Martyna Koszkało,  
Instytut Filozofii, Socjologii i Dziennikarstwa, Uniwersytet Gdański.**

### **Salvation and Damnation as The Action of God's Will. John Duns Scotus' Position**

According to John Duns Scotus the election to the select group of the saved persons is a result of grace, and thus of God's will and His choice, it is not, in any case, a result of meritorious deeds performed by an elect person. In contrast to election, damnation of a created person is related to a cause present in that person: in condemning a human being God takes into account sin and bad use of free will on the part of a condemned subject. Scotus's nuanced and carefully worked out conception seeks to reconcile in theory God's justice and His mercy. Against the background of conceptions discussed and rejected by Scotus (St. Augustine's, Peter Lombard's, Aquinas's, Henry of Ghent's) his own theory appears as moderate and comes in the middle between those which hold that there is no reason on the part of creatures either for election or damnation and those which attribute some reason for either election or damnation to created persons. The most difficult problem involved in the discussion, the problem of relation obtaining between grace and freedom in procuring the act of election/damnation, Scotus solves through the introduction of categories *velle, non velle, nolle* applicable to analysis of actions by God's will. God's act of *non velle* (as distinct from *nolle*), that is His withdrawing grace from a person does not determine that person's will to commit sinful acts, and, in particular, does not have for an effect making a man a reprobate. Thus, the non-willing does not determine man to sin and ultimate damnation.



## **Note on Martyna Koszkało**

MARTYNA KOSZKAŁO, PhD, Division of History of Classical, Medieval and Modern Philosophy at the Institute of Philosophy, Sociology and Journalism at the Faculty of Social Sciences of the University of Gdańsk; Work in Progress: The Nature of Will. Freedom and Necessity. The Analysis of John Duns Scotus' Theory in Comparison to St. Augustine, St. Anselm of Canterbury and St. Thomas Aquinas. Areas of Specialization: Medieval Christian Thought, History of Free Will, Philosophy of Religion, John Duns Scotus, Theories of Individuation.

**Ks. Dr Miłosz Hołda,**

**Wydział Filozofii, Uniwersytet Papieski Jana Pawła 2, Kraków.**

## **Eternally Hidden God. Karl Rahner's Possible Contribution to Contemporary Discussion on Divine Hiddenness.**

Despite new elements, the contemporary debate on the problem of divine hiddenness can be seen as part of a discussion that is as old as religion itself. In the 20th century, this debate took several stages. Various philosophers and theologians have tried to deal with this problem. Of particular interest is the proposal of Karl Rahner - one of the most important and influential theologians of the 20th century. Discussing with the so-called "Schultheologie" Rahner reminded, that in the Christian tradition "hiddenness" was understood as a feature of God's character or as a key element of God's nature. According to Rahner, even in eternal life, God will not be fully open to people, but will remain hidden. "Hiddenness" is another name for the mystery of God. This is the reason why people should not expect epistemic access to God's plans and motives. Rahner's proposal casts a very interesting light on the contemporary version of this debate and helps in some way deal with the problem of hiddenness. I intend to present Rahner's theology of divine hiddenness and to indicate those elements of his proposals which may be the most promising for the contemporary version of this debate.

## **Note on Miłosz Hołda**

Rev. Miłosz Hołda, philosopher and theologian, presbyter of the Kielce diocese. Affiliation: The Faculty of Philosophy, The Pontifical University of John Paul II in Krakow. Scientific interests: natural theology, philosophical anthropology, epistemology. Important publications: *Czy nauka zakłada Boga?*, [w:] J. Golbiak, M. Hereć (ed.), *Relacja nauka-wiara. Nowe ujęcie dawnego problemu*, Lublin: RW KUL, 2014: 231-250 (co-author: Jacek Wojtysiak); *Epistemologia a argumentacja za istnieniem Boga*, [w:] S. Janeczek, A. Starościc (ed.), *Epistemologia*, Lublin: RW KUL, 2015: 441-456; *Sceptyczny humanizm naszych czasów*, [w:] J. Jagiełło (ed.), *Spory o naturę człowieka*, Kielce: Jedność, 2015: 282-300; *Argumenty epistemologiczne w kontekście nauki*, [w:] J. Salamon (ed.), *Przewodnik po filozofii religii. Nurt analityczny*, Kraków: WAM, 2016: 353-366; *Dlaczego zła modlitwa nie jest możliwa?*, „Roczniki Filozoficzne” 64 (2016): 27-36; *The Embodied Mind of God*, „European Journal for Philosophy of Religion” 10 (2018): 81-96. E-mail: milosz.holda@upjp2.edu.pl

**Dr Marek Pepliński,**  
**Instytut Filozofii, Socjologii i Dziennikarstwa, Uniwersytet Gdański.**

**Some Methodological Remarks about how to do the Committed Philosophy of Religion in the Universe of Philosophical Disagreements.**

In this lecture, I address the issues of practicing the philosophy of religion, which is both engaged and objective. Such a metaphilosophical reflection must take into account not only the semiotic and epistemological dimension of process of a gaining the knowledge, but also the subjective one, including the influence of philosophers' attitudes to experiential evidences and propositional evidences. In reference to the position of Kathreen Dormandy, who analyzes various strategies regarding the weighing of arguments and dealing with a bias of philosophers, I present what are the conditions for practicing such an objective philosophy of religion, which at the same time is significant for someone's worldview.

**Note on Marek Pepliński**

Marek Pepliński, PhD, Institute of Philosophy, Sociology and Journalism at the Faculty of Social Sciences of the University of Gdańsk; He specializes in the philosophy of religion, normative epistemology, and the methodology of philosophy. Author of over fifty publications, articles, encyclopedia and dictionary articles and notes. Editor and co-editor of four special issues of the "Filo-Sofija" devoted to metaphysics, philosophy of religion and epistemology. [http://ug.edu.pl/pracownik/2288/marek\\_peplinski](http://ug.edu.pl/pracownik/2288/marek_peplinski). Email: marek.peplinski [at]ug.edu.pl