

THE STUDENTS OF HUMANITAS UNIVERSITY AS THE AUTHORS OF A REVIEW

*Only useful work makes
the soul happy.*
Nikolaj Gogol

INTRODUCTION

The Principles of Jurisprudence, the Theory and Philosophy of Law, a book of my authorship, has been provided a positive review by Professor Adam Jamróz, a prominent theoretician and practitioner of law.

Also, the text has been edited by Danuta Dziewięcka, the Editor of “Humanitas” Publishing House, which she did, in close cooperation with myself, with outstanding devotion and in a very conscientious and professional way. My gratitude to her for her effort has been expressed to the authorities of Humanitas University.

Mrs Dziewięcka, the Editor, Professor Jamróz, and of course me as the author of the book, did our best to achieve an important social goal together and to convey content significant to the readers, especially the students, in a right and proper way. The visual aspect of the book was taken care of by Mr Bartłomiej Dudek, who designed its cover. All of the aforementioned, somehow co-authors of the book, made all reasonable efforts to provide the highest quality through communicative language, valuable content, a cohesive structure and a pleasing to the eye design. In the end, however, it is the author who takes the ultimate responsibility for the work, and expects, as every author does, splendor rather than criticism. Our cooperation has been crowned, in a short time, by the printers from “Humanitas” Publishing House. While working on my book, I had relatively clear intentions which resulted from my building relations with the Students. Invariably, in my academic teaching I try to follow the rule, which I do believe to true, that the value of a professor, which decides about the quality of their teaching, is their academic achievements available to the students. A typical form of this type of academic output is a handbook available to the students, not restricting them, by any means, from obtaining knowledge from other academic sources on the subject belonging to the curriculum. That was my purpose as far as the book here discussed is concerned – a handbook entitled *The Principles of Jurisprudence, the Theory and Philosophy of Law. A critical reinterpretation*.

My next purpose resulted from my certainty that, nolens volens, the students who use a handbook evaluate and make an opinion on it in a variety of different ways. It

is entirely natural that each and every author, including the authors of handbooks, improves their self-esteem if the opinions are favorable. It is usually the case that students, from obvious reasons, speak high of the book while contacting directly a professor, who is the author, even though the opinions might not always be frank and honest. In a request to my students, which I posted on my website, I asked them to write a review of my handbook, almost begging them for honest opinions. I emphasized the mutual benefit coming from compiling the textbook reviews: "An in-depth cognizance of the content of the textbook might both ensure your exam success and provide me with some valuable information." The information, which indeed turned out to be useful, will be used to prepare a new edition of my handbook.

Undoubtedly, the author of the handbook, as well as the authors of its reviews dream of their works being perfect. If, according to my self-assessment, the handbook is far from perfect, one of my top Student-Reviewers, **Jarosław Łukasz Ferdyn**, got to it closer than ever. The review he submitted to me was so good that I recommended it to be printed in a periodical. Coming back to the question of perfection, I will quote Alfred de Musset, who tempers excessive optimism: "Perfection is beyond our reach as much as infinity is," he wrote. Arthur Schopenhauer, on the other hand, not excluding the possibility of achieving perfection, claimed that "The nobler and more perfect a thing is, the later and more slowly does it mature." I had both the quotations in mind while assessing the reviews I received from my Students from Humanitas University. Not expecting them to be perfect, I graded the best ones the highest, and the scarce poorest ones – the lowest. The reviews were read by my academic co-workers first so that the most objective assessment was possible.

As a person devoted to the academic life for over half a century, I have never overestimated the significance of either my publications or my teaching. For it is not about how long you gain the experience, but how much it is worth. However, I did not fall into the Radical pessimism of Solon, who used to claim that "experience is a sum of mistakes we have made." Nevertheless, the opinion that in our experience mistakes intermingle with successes is probably closer to the truth. In my publications I tried to search for original and significant issues that has not been elaborated on yet, which I emphasized, compiling the handbook I am mentioning, in its subtitle *A critical reinterpretation*. A great reward for my teaching activities, on the other hand, constituted the honorary title of Homo Didacticus, which I was awarded by my Students at Maria Curie Skłodowska University in Lublin. I highly appreciated the originality of the content and form of the reviews written by my students at Humanitas University, as originality is an indication of independent thinking. Walter Lippmann, in turn, wrote about unoriginal thinking: "Where all think alike, no one thinks very much." If you want to be great, you must think in an original way. I do try to think originally, but I do not crave for being great. However, let's agree with what Voltaire said "It is wonderful to be humble when you are already great."

STUDENTS' REACTIONS

*Each and every STUDENT
is UNIQUE to me.*

Roman Andrzej Tokarczyk

Only a few Students accepted my request to write a review of my handbook as completely obvious. All of them, however, 127 students of law and administration altogether, declared that they would not make a commitment to write such a review on their own initiative, which they explained in many different ways. It was **Jarosław Łukasz Ferdyn** who maturely pointed out main difficulties of so doing. He said, exceedingly accurately, that "making a reliable, insightful and correct review of a scholarly monograph is not an easy task, since the reviewer should possess extensive knowledge in the field of the publication they are to review, as well as be aware of how to create a work of this type."

Karolina Kentnowska appreciated the courage of the professor who, on his own initiative, asked his own students assess a handbook of his authorship with no limitations. I am in favor of her opinion that "Not many authors would dare to expose their works to the critique of their students." **Elżbieta Justyna Kubica-Węgrzyn**, on the other hand, spotted threats for the Students resulting from their professor's bold request. In her excellent review she put it in the following way: ordering your students to write a review of a scientific work on the philosophy of law, written by a prominent author, is a truly diabolic idea, taking into account that the review will influence the student's position before the exam – it might well work as either a catapult or »a nail in the student's coffin«. Even students of administration are not suicides, therefore they must find a comfortable area in which they feel competent. The idea of the review should then be: Whether and to what extent is the book readable? In other words, my review will focus on the aspects of perception of the scientific work. In this very field, every student appears to be highly competent and able to commit a professional review... A strategic goal of students' reading is one – to obtain the magical credit in the index book."

Two Students regarded the professor's request to write a review of his own handbook as unrealistic.

According to **Elżbieta Małgorzata Wieczorek**, the request was "awkward." Approaching the awkward request, she said, "making an effort to review a publication so rich in content and representing such broad knowledge seems unfeasible to me. I am a novice student of administration and everything I come across, learn and experience is new and often obscure... Reading the outstanding publication forces the readers to open their minds to the vastness of knowledge which the authors has to pass on... The reader has the impression that the author of the book has exceedingly wide knowledge

and through sharing it he realizes a very important objective – a mission.” Elżbieta, despite of her scruples, prepared a review which I graded as very good.

The reaction of **Monika Krukowska**, on the other hand, was rather unusual and quite hasty. First, while my presenting the request during a lecture, she ostentatiously announced that “making the review” is “absolutely impossible.” Moreover, the “order” was, according to her, to humiliate the Students’ dignity. After this public enunciation, she ignored my further conversation with other Students. As she wrote reportingly in her review, “I [the author] did not ask as a single question because it seemed unnecessary to me.” However, when she calmed down at home she perceived that her behavior was inappropriate and driven by hasty and impulsive emotions. In her review, she apologized to the professor many times. As if she wanted to neutralize her faux pas, she praised me, as the author, whether I deserved it or not. It was not the praise, however, but the content that made me grade her review as good. For I belong to the people who do not take a dislike to someone because of their inappropriate behavior, therefore I have respect and only friendly feeling for Monika. People whose reactions are different are just alike those who they disapprove of.

Many authors of reviews bridled at writing them because of the lack of competence, as if they had forgotten that the whole course of university education is based on striving, with more or less success, for particular competences. Asking my Students to write the review I wanted them to gain the competences of a reviewer. The lack of their competence as far as “assessing the content of professor’s monograph” was openly claimed by **Małgorzata Kuberska**, **Dagmara Patrycja Czałoń**, **Joanna Katarzyna Gidek** and **Monika Anna Urbanik**. According to **Katarzyna Borowiec**, such reviews “should be written by people who have expertise in the field.” Why, Kasia, one would say, after all they must have learned everything, just like you! According to a few of the Students, among others **Angelika Katarzyna Baryła**, **Beata Stanisława Grzelec**, **Roksana Paulina Pogoń** and **Sonia Irena Szymańska**, the difficulties of writing a review resulted mainly from significant difficulties in understanding philosophy in general, and especially the philosophy of law. **Irena Przybylska-Kołodziejczyk** did not have to deal with the aforementioned problems, however, she found the review difficult because of the author himself, as it was difficult for her to distance herself from the content of the handbook, which is crucial in the process of evaluation. She had “the feeling that the author guided her »by hand«.” **Aleksandra Natalia Polis** would not decide to compile a review on her own initiative because she would feel embarrassed by the hierarchic nature of the professor-student, superior-subordinate, authority-layman relation.

„To me, as a student,” **Małgorzata Alicja Król** confessed, „it is very difficult to evaluate in detail particular chapters of the handbook, written by such a titled professor... But trying to review the book I want to focus on these chapters which I have particular interest in.” Motivated in this way, yet emphasizing politely that the whole “content of the book is really impressive,” she paid the most attention to the chapters devoted to legal profes-

sions, the idea of social contract, and, as many other Reviewers also did, biojurisprudence. Driven by similar or different reasons, **Dominika Nadzieja Horoszko** would rather refer to her text not as a review but “reflections of the book.” **Karolina Kentnowska**, who I have already mentioned, admitted that “The proposal to write a review of Professor Roman Andrzej Tokarczyk’s book... was surprising to me. It appeared so original and extraordinary to me that I decided to take a closer look at the very Author. I was glad to learn that the Author’s Wife turned out to be a graduate of my Alma Mater Jagiellonica, which, out of purely feminine sentimentality and recollection of warm reminiscences, made an impression of intimacy and closeness with the Publication.” **Katarzyna Justyna Szczęśna** wrote her review in the form of a personal confession. Having expected another dull book, she was pleasantly surprised after reading the handbook. She managed to understand the meaning of a number of difficult words that were used in the book. “I am really glad,” she says with amazement, “that I am a human and I have the right to make mistakes. The book has a great scholarly and educational value and it may well be referred to as an exemplary handbook, which will appear useful in the education process (as well as self-study) of every person interested in the principles of jurisprudence.”

When I decided to risk and ask my Students to write a free and independent review of a handbook of my authorship, I could have expected the worst, only negative reactions. However, similarly to **Katarzyna Justyna Szczęśna** after reading the handbook, when I read the reviews I was truly pleasantly surprised. Having expected even only the worst, I played safe in case the worst really happened. I followed Peter Westholm who once said, “Always expect the worst and you will never get disappointed.” I did not get disappointed, however, but I became pleasantly surprised by the fact that my handbook generated mostly positive, and even very positive reactions. If the situation had been different, I would have done everything so that no one believed that only the negative opinions on my book were true.

THE LANGUAGE OF THE BOOK

*The measure of literature is not the one
who writes, but the one who reads.*
Roman Andrzej Tokarczyk

The author of a scholarly publication, like *The Principles of Jurisprudence, the Theory and Philosophy of Law. A critical reinterpretation*, must use different languages as means of expression. The main language for the aforementioned publication is the legal language and the language of law, which constitute languages for specific purposes for those who deal with the law. To be able to communicate meaning by means of these languages to the reader so that it is clear and comprehensible, the author of a scientific publication

makes use of the literary language. The literary layer constitutes a kind of connective tissue of a scientific work, uniting its languages for specific purposes. A scholarly publication, especially a handbook, does not have to be dull and boring. Using the literary language, in justified situations, it is possible to make the book more attractive and interesting. I try to make use of the possibilities in my scientific work.

Those review authors who either do not know, or do not respect the relations of professional languages and the literary language, had a very one-sided, critical opinion. For those who support the rule that a scientific work should only use scientific and professional language (here legal language and legal jargon) using the literary language seemed to be either unnecessary, or even wrong, deteriorating the linguistic quality of the book. They accused the author, though shyly, of "too flowery a style." On the other hand, those who admire the beauty of the literary language, especially the Old Polish, expressed their being bored with the majority of legal language and jargon. In case of such discrepant opinions and expectations of the reviewers, only one saying comes to mind: "You can't please everyone."

Obviously, the author of a handbook, as well as authors of any other scientific publication must obey the general principles and specific rules as far as syntax, grammar and logic of the Polish language are concerned. The aforementioned linguistic correctness is not the same as the author's style. Each and every author of every single work can be characterized by their own, individual, unique style of expressing their thoughts. Respecting the style is an obligation for both editors and reviewers of the work. The authors of the reviews of the handbook, in the vast majority, approved of the style of the author which resulted in many warm words. Only a few of them expressed some unclear doubts as far as the language of the book is concerned. The latter, however, made me think more than the former.

Regarding the language of the reviewed book, the intentions of its author were quite accurately interpreted by **Beata Stanisława Grzelec**, who says "Writing about law is a real art, which is not obvious to everyone. However, nothing improves the quality of a text better than its beautiful style and correct (in terms of grammar and spelling) language. Personally, I do believe that legal writing does not have to amount to dry and indifferent sentences made of the same phrases used a thousandfold. Therefore, I got charmed and encouraged to further reading by the language of the handbook from the very beginning. Relatively clear, if I might say so, readable, vivid and graphic, emphasizes excellent knowledge of the issues which the author elaborates on." The author of the aforementioned thoughts also noticed a great achievement of the author in his underscoring distinctive parts of the content of the book and the possibility of comparing them thanks to the logical order and methodologically uniform and cohesive division into chapters. However, "I will not pretend to have understood everything," she adds.

Other authors of the reviews showed off their great frankness, too. "The language of the book is very scientific and demanding," said **Angelika Katarzyna Baryła**. However

the language is referred to as “clear and fluent” by Sonia Irena Szymańska, and “careful and considered, but requiring maximum concentration of the reader” by **Aleksandra Natalia Polis**. Neither of them labels the language as legal, nevertheless. According to the refined impression of **Monika Ewelina Maj**, the language of the book is “exceedingly sophisticated... lacking all the contemporary colloquialisms, and giving the impression of reading belles-lettres... The author takes us back to the Old Polish times and helps us re-discover the beauty of the Old Polish language.” **Roksana Paulina Pogoń** shares the opinion and says: “The language is extremely sophisticated, some words bring poems to mind... like the clothes of piety or aspiring ideas, they take the reader back to another era, which is a very interesting idea, I realize, however, that not everyone might be fond of it.” This potential and actual diversity in the reception of the author’s style and vocabulary was noticed by **Aleksandra Tomczak**: “The author is excellent at selecting words, and although some of them did not appeal to me, they might appear really valuable to other readers.” **Olimpia Nowak**, similarly to **Jarosław Łukasz Ferdyn**, remarked that “The Author uses a number of complicated notions... but he is great at explaining and defining all the unclear expressions... I did not feel bored with the pompous descriptions of the super-difficult legal phrases. On the contrary, while reading I had the feeling that it was an idyllic belles-lettres piece of writing, telling and incredible story about the law. “Mr Tokarczyk’s book,” Olimpia continues, “definitely does not fit the canon of obligatory dull reading list, which leave you with nothing but confusion.” **Klaudia Bereziuk**, in turn, did not perceive the values of literary language of some parts of the book, as to her “The book is very demanding and using professional language.” **Magdalena Zofia Brzezińska** refers to the professionalism of language explicitly: “I think that the book is written in the language of law which makes it incomprehensible for most readers. Those who do not possess the knowledge of philosophy as Professor does will find it very difficult to understand the principles elaborated on in the book.” Magdalena’s statement raises doubts as far as her knowledge of the extent of understanding the book by other readers is concerned. When it comes to her knowledge of the philosophy of law, if it is insufficient, she has the possibility to acquire it on the level of the Professor’s or even higher, which is possible thanks to the high quality of teaching at Humanitas University. It is the nature of studying that sometimes some texts must be read more than once, so as to understand what the author wanted to say,” which **Ewa Adelajda Jachimowska** refers to. **Anna Kantor** discovered special features of the author’s original language in the book. “As far as the language is concerned, the readers can admire impeccable Polish and extraordinarily florid style... Nevertheless, the language is very demanding and it might cause difficulties in understanding some issues, requiring the reader to reread and analyze some parts of the text.” Ms Dziewięcka’s opinion, who edited the book in the Humanitas Publishing House, was shared by **Kacper Jaromir Jaromirski**, who agreed that its erudition is pervaded by impeccable Polish. **Marta Teresa Sendobry**, however, saw educational benefits coming from the necessity of checking up new and unfamiliar words. “I am glad,” she said, “that the book made me go deeper and broaden my

knowledge... Undoubtedly, the biggest advantage of the language and style is their precision and clarity." Marta encouraged me even to compile a dictionary of the philosophy of law as a separate publication. I reply immediately that it is a very serious and extremely big task for a number of co-authors, and therefore beyond a single author's capacities. **Anna Maria Jedlińska's** words sound as if they were a motto to the whole book; the reviewer claims that "Perfectly selected words do not need improvements." For **Dominik Maciej Błoniarczyk**, on the other hand, it is superfluous to add, next to the words in Polish, their synonyms in English. I promise to reconsider the idea, I do generally believe, however, that it happens to be necessary. I would like to remind **Paweł Marek Mańczykowski** about the indispensability of referring to the Latin language in the Polish legal discourse, as Latin still constitutes an established element of both the tradition and culture of Polish and EU law, and sometimes even the culture of the case law. **Urszula Ewa Dydak** does not see any shortcomings of the language of the book. "The language is very simple and accessible even for a person who has never been in contact with studying law, which is not very common, unfortunately." **Paweł Marek Mańczykowski** shares a similar opinion: The Professor... writes in such a way that it is comprehensible for a potential reader. Whether you are a lay person or an expert in law, you will find something for yourself in the publication. Particular issues are explained in a clear and legible way. "A knack for the written word is clearly visible," emphasizes **Agnieszka Stachańczyk**... Some sentences are contrived and exaggeratedly long, in a broader context, however, they seem to be necessary... the book is directed at a slightly different target group, therefore it can be written in this way." I assure Agnieszka of the fact that I addressed the book to Her, as well as to all my Students at Humanitas University, not to an indefinite target group. I do not know, however, what **Kacper Borysik** had in mind suggesting that the language of the book is "simple and easy" only "thanks to cunning (sic!) literary tricks."

What will appear useful in improving the second edition of my book is small typos, spelling mistakes and usually debatable stylistic faults. Such mistakes and defects only confirm what is true for both authors and editors, that proofreading is almost a never ending process. I have already become convinced that it is the case, and I hope that Mrs Danuta Dziewięcka, the Editor, will agree with me.

THE STRUCTURE OF THE BOOK

*A reissued book has a structure
of old and new content.*

Roman Andrzej Tokarczyk

At first glance only a book constitutes a uniform whole. Once we look inside, however, it reveals its structure, which happens to be the most multifarious in case of art books, children's books and occasional publications. The architecture of scholarly and

scientific publications usually seems to be much more meager, even there, however, there is space for diversity. The cover is the first thing we see while reaching a book, once we open it there are title pages, a table of contents, an introduction or any other type of introductory content. All the aforementioned components altogether are referred to as introductory materials. Obviously, the most important part of each and every book, especially a scientific work, is the main text, with its own more or less complex structure. The main text might be divided into volumes, parts, chapters, subchapters, sections and subsections. It might also contain extra materials, such as tables, diagrams, illustrations, prints of reproductions. What closes a scientific publication is a bibliography, an index, and sometimes a foreign language summary.

The structure of the handbook in question needs diversification and enrichment, which I declare that the second edition of the book will contain the essential improvements. I must admit, however, that it was "Humanitas" Publishing House that limited the possibilities of publishing the book in a richer form because of its binding standards. If the new version of the handbook, compiled taking into account both the Reviewers' and the author's postulates, gets rejected, I will need to look for another publisher. As for the details concerning the diversification and enrichment of the architecture of the handbook, they are mentioned further in the paper in the opinions of the Reviewers and my opinions of the ones they wrote.

One of the main objectives of the critical reinterpretation, which guided the author of the reviewed book, was the concept of three in one: including the bases of three disciplines, which are usually treated separately in academic publications and teaching – jurisprudence, the theory of law and the philosophy of law. None of the Reviewers called the reasonableness of the solution into question. **Angelika Katarzyna Baryła** wrote that it was a manifestation of the author's courage: "The author should be regarded with admiration as he found courage to combine knowledge of jurisprudence, philosophy and theory of law in one literary work." According to **Aleksandra Natalia Polis** "the very concept of a publication combining jurisprudence, the theory and philosophy of law is very ambitious and demanding." "From a student's perspective it can be pointed out," **Jarosław Łukasz Ferdyn** validates the idea, "that the issues related to the principles of jurisprudence are of particular interest to the students of the 1st year, whereas the problems of the theory and philosophy of law belong to the range of interest of 5th year students. Combining these issues in one handbook might constitute a good solution for those students of law who, being in their 5th year and struggling with the questions of the theory and philosophy of law, need to go back to the basic issues related to the law in general." According to **Aleksandra Natalia Dylewska**, "the Author superbly managed to combine three disciplines of knowledge in a structural whole, which constituted a precarious task. The authors of the reviews regarded the structure of the book as successful. "I am enchanted by the fact that everything has its own place in the book. There is no accidental information, everything is perfectly planned and harmonious," noticed **Paweł Marek**

Mańczykowski. According to **Marzena Grażyna Libera**, “The book is written with flair, everything is coherent and accurate.” A few Reviewers, among others **Magdalena Zofia Brzezińska** and **Marzena Grażyna Libera**, shared Professor Adam Jamroz’s opinion that in both the first and the second part of the book a chapter on the application of law should precede the chapter on the validity of law. In my opinion, however, the order is not as obvious as it might seem, since if the chronology of the phenomena are taken into consideration, primarily it was the law that must have existed so that it could be applied. Later, however, the validity of law is a result of its application, therefore the chronological precedence of the application of law in the processes of creating it can be acknowledged as opposed to the validity of law. In the second edition of the book I will standardize the chronology in both first parts of the book, however. I will put first the chapter on the validity of law, however, further there will be the chapter devoted to law application. In my opinion, however, only such law can be applied, which is already valid. And this is my justification and response to the supporters of the other opinion who wanted me to change the order of chapters in the book. **Marta Teresa Sendobry** expressed an opinion similar to other Reviewers’ that the structure “is very coherent... The gradation of the complexity of issues is applicable here. The author as if leads the reader up the stairs, from the easiest basic issues to the more detailed ones.” At this point, I must admit again that the first edition of the book was influenced by some restrictions imposed upon me by the “Humanitas” Publishing House. In the second edition I will do my best to somehow overcome the limitations. As I did in my other books published by Zakamycze, Wolters Kluwer and LexisNexis, I am going to place key words and references to them on the margins of particular paragraphs, which are sometimes referred to as “side headings” in the editorial jargon. Therefore, I will meet **Rafał Czesław Rygielski**’s expectations, as he wrote: “I suggest placing key words, or *definiendum*, on the margins, which will help find *definiens* quickly. It is worth mentioning, not being too overconfident, I believe, that it was me, with reference to Tomasz Hobbes, who gave a new second life to the useful “side headings” in the Polish scholarly literature. It is clearly visible in many publications of mine. I am also going to follow **Monika Jadwiga Olkusa**’s advice to introduce the so called “running title,” as it was applied in a memorial Book dedicated to me. She expressed it in the following way: “Perhaps it would be better for the general legibility to place the title of a given chapter at the top of the page, instead of the title of the book.” I will also take into consideration a few Reviewers’ suggestions to correct and enrich the content of the book in its second edition by introducing listings, tables, diagrams, prints and bold-face of key words. **Natalia Karolina Rozwadowska** along with a few other fellow Reviewers are right while suggesting that horizontal listings are much less legible than listing horizontally, one above the other (e.g. in case of pages 20, 21, 38, 66, 74, 109, 348). I will also consent to **Dagmara Ewa Pukowiec**’s suggestion to diversify the content of the book by introducing tables, especially while classifying law types on pages: 27, 43, 45, and maybe also in other places in the book. I am only at the stage of

considering the form and the possibility of introducing graphs, charts and diagrams. What I am already certain of, however, is that I will include a number of humorous illustrations by Józef Tarłowski, which will show the seriousness of law “in a distorting mirror”. I am also going to add some anecdotes. Perhaps I will also satisfy **Natalia Teresa Goik**, who wrote: “Those who are the so called visual learners would appreciate some illustrations or prints, which would make it easier to understand some issues.” It seems that contrasting phenomena, i.e. the seriousness of law and its weaknesses might help comprehend it easier and deeper. On the other hand, **Aleksandra Judyta Motylewska** supported the idea of maintaining the form of the book as it is, which I found extremely interesting, I will not comply with the suggestion, nevertheless. She somehow defends me, which I am really grateful for: “The author refrained from using tables and other graphic forms which seems reasonable as it forces the readers, mostly students used to acquiring knowledge in a simplified way, to think. Such attitude is primarily fair, as the student-reader must put effort if he or she wants to understand the content of the book, which is, or should be, one of the requirements of higher education.” Ola saw a value of studying in dealing with difficulties, whereas I, declaring the will to remove them, take the position of an author who aims to maximize the clearness of the contents he passes on to the readers. I will also do my best to enlarge and diversify the fonts in the book, as **Angelika Katarzyna Baryła**, **Dorota Aleksandra Kowalczyk**, **Mateusz Nowakowski** and **Natalia Karolina Rozwadowska** requested. I am going to include a list of chosen literature concerning the issues elaborated on in the handbook, as well.

THE CONTENT OF THE BOOK

*If knowledge can create problems,
it is not through ignorance that we can solve them.*

Isaak Asimov

Referring to the content of the book, I am not going to summarize it, which would be completely unnecessary as my Students are already familiar with it and know it even better than the author himself. I focus exclusively on the issues which the Reviewers criticized or elaborated on, suggesting its various improvements.

The book is of neutral character as far as the worldview is concerned, which is the author's intention. Therefore, it does not encourage the readers to accept one particular outlook. In his brilliant, comprehensive and inquisitive review, however, Fr. **Krzysztof Antoni Myjak** somehow tries to convince the author to be in favor of the Christian, mainly Catholic interpretation of the natural law, which would manifest itself in including in the book a description of Clive Staples Lewis's, a British professor, contribution to the theological comprehension of the natural law. However interest-

ing the contribution is, it will be included in the second edition of the handbook only in the form of a passing reference, as its place among the most prominent Christian interpretations of the natural law is not yet established, and the book itself has limited edition size; also, the distribution of space devoted to particular problems elaborated on in the book must be proportional. To avoid a conviction that **Fr. Myjak** limited his review only to the aforementioned issue, I will quote his very mature evaluation of the book: "At the very beginning it must be stated that the comprehensiveness, erudition and eloquence of the discourse make it possible to say that the publication, in case of its form and content, constitutes an excellent introduction into areas undiscovered by either the students of law or common readers, law amateurs. Not only is it an introduction, but also a well-thought lecture, not devoid of erudite references to the practice and the theory of law, the most significant example of which are not only the introductory terminological issues, but also, and most of all, the extensive reflection on biojurisprudence. As far as the didactic and linguistic side of the work are concerned, big experience and particular freedom of communication are clearly visible, along with the floridity of language, which does not disturb, however, the process of absorbing the content; it builds the atmosphere of agreement with the reader, which makes reading the book an adventure of cognition rather than an unpleasant necessity... Summing up, professor Tokarczyk's publication is an invaluable source of information when it comes to the field of jurisprudence and the theory and philosophy of law, which should be found on the reading list of each and every student or even professor of law, and the style with its clearness makes it possible for an amateur or a lay person to acquire the content of the book easily, too."

As **Fr. Krzysztof Antoni Myjak** already introduced us to the sphere of religious issues, let us look into **Monika Anna Urbanik's** reflections. She questioned convincingly a statement from the reviewed book that "miraculous recoveries are spotted only by religious bigots." "There are numerous examples," she says, "of different recoveries which cannot be explained by contemporary medicine. Obviously, a number of them constitute the result of believing in the recovery, but it seems that it has nothing to do with bigotry or fanaticism...it is very difficult to say whether the reason for it is deep faith or deep conviction that thanks to internal strength and confidence it is possible to overcome all the menace." It would be difficult to add anything to this wise reasoning of Monika's, therefore I will reconsider and transform the sentence in question.

If there was a ranking of the most original, controversial, intriguing, innovative, interesting, attractive, appealing, cognitively and practically significant issues of the handbook, the predominance would go to the chapter devoted to biojurisprudence. It is "a truly hypnotizing" chapter for **Anna Kantor**, and "closest to **Andżela Jurga's** heart." **Ewa Adelajda Jachimowska** was encouraged by the chapter to get acquainted with some "other publications of the author." **Patrycja Magdalena Wytrwał** predicts, giving probably too much hope to the author, that "the suggestion might bring

about the renaissance of humanities, philosophy and the general knowledge of law.” “I find the chapter exceedingly fascinating, as it stimulates the reflection about birth, life, existence and death,” wrote **Marlena Barbara Noworyta**. **Katarzyna Barbara Boruta** confessed, in turn, „I stand in awe for the Professor, who created a new concept called biojurisprudence, combining philosophical and scientific contents, which proved his refinement and broad knowledge, as well as the creative power of his mind as an author... It is somehow the piece-de-resistance.” This is how **Beata Stanisława Grzelec** referred to the concept of biojurisprudence: “The Author created biojurisprudence, which fits perfectly the contemporary subject matter... the chapter entitled PRO FUTURO made the biggest impression on me. It was once said that if you do not feel like reading a book again, there was no point in reading it at all. I think that I will study and analyze its contents more than once.” **Joanna Puchyrska** adds, “I believe that the innovative concept indicated what is really important in life, as it encompasses human in a holistic, not fragmentary way, and it keeps pace with the fast changes of the contemporary world.”

Before I quote a suggestion to change the situation of quotations and maxims as mottos preceding each chapter of the book, I will present the Reviewers’ opinions on the them, the majority of which are in favor, even very enthusiastic. It was only **Sylwia Uścimiak** whose opinion was completely opposite to the aforementioned, which will be elaborated on in the next paragraph. **Patrycja Magdalena Wytrwał** stated that, “The maxims are a brilliant solution, as they appear before every chapter of the book, and their main idea refers to and emphasizes (as well as the titles of subchapters) the subject matter and its topics presented one by one... the choice of quotes is excellent since they precisely refer to the questions elaborated on in the successive sections of the book.” **Marzena Grażyna Libera** added: “Professor begins every chapter with a maxim, which makes the reader stop for a while and reflect on the subject matter.” **Roksana Pogoń** has no doubts as for the suitability of the mottos: “Maxims are useful, not only in case of law and philosophy, but also in many other areas of science and life situations. Moreover, they are valid in the antiquity and in the 21st century alike.” **Renata Elżbieta Domagała** noticed that “It makes us feel intellectually stimulated to further discovering something new.” **Mateusz Nowakowski** “takes a fancy” to the quotes and maxims, as “they refer to the content of the chapters in a very accurate, encouraging and interesting way.” **Dominik Maciej Błoniarczyk** and **Małgorzata Alicja Król** also like the idea, and **Olimpia Anna Nowak** and **Dorota Pośpiech** find it “interesting.”

The only Reviewer who suggested a different location of the quotes was the aforementioned **Sylwia Uścimiak**. Although I do not share her opinion, I quote her review as a whole: “In my opinion a quotation or a maxim is an embellishment at the most and I personally think that they are redundant. Of course, if the Author really wants to include quotes and legal maxims in the book, I would suggest creating another page at the very end of the book, devoted exclusively to such mottos, which

could be entitled »Chosen quotes, legal tips and Latin maxims which every lawyer should be familiar with«. Also, the examples of legal tips given on page 139 could be moved to the section of the handbook.” I will not follow Sylwia’s advice because of both my personal convictions and the opinions of the reviewers in favor of the present distribution of the quotations and maxims in the book. She did not notice, most of all, the closest relation of the chosen quotations and legal maxims with the successive chapters. The relation would be entirely broken if the quotes were move to the very end of the book. While choosing the maxims I did not attempt to create a selection, as literature is full of such publications, e.g. a book of mine *Legal Ethics Commandments. A book of thoughts, maxims and prints*, which includes a detailed Index of entries that makes it easier to look up a suitable quotation or a maxim, which might appear relevant to people professionally engaged in various legal norms and standards.

I will take into consideration **Jarosław Łukasz Ferdyn’s** remarks on the improvements of the content of the book. I will think over his point on “whether indicating all the criteria for division of the provisions of law would improve the values of the work.” Whether to devote separate chapters to legal subjects and the interpretation of the law. Taking into account **Jarosław** and **Agata Danuta Koziarska’s** remarks on discussing the sources of law in the book. I will incline to doubt the irrefutability of cognitive values of the definition of life gathered from Wikipedia. I will clearly separate social and human studies, in accordance with the relevant legislation, which I was made aware of by **Natalia Ewa Przybylska**. Because of my liking for learning English, in turn, I will not translate into Polish the letter by Aleksey Vlasov, a Russian researcher into biojurisprudence, included on page 396 of the book in English. I will probably follow **Katarzyna Renata Looze-Grzesik’s** advice to add some quick-tests or questions after every chapter. Kasia says, that she would “become convinced that she understood a given chapter correctly.” Her suggestion that “the course of this subject should last at least one year” is addressed to the authorities of the “Humanitas” University. As far as my opinion is concerned, I can work with “Humanitas” Students 24 hours a day, all year round.

Finally, to close the casual remarks on the reviews I want to point out that many of them (in this way I become a reviewer of the Reviewers) contain a number of slip-ups and funny parts. I will quote, however, only a couple of them. As I consider myself to be a tactful person, I will not reveal the names of their authors. They are available in the reviews, but only with the agreement of the authors and available only for some. One of the Authors confessed that the author of the book, which is me – Roman Andrzej Tokarczyk, is her “so called hobbyhorse.” Another Lady must have fought “continuous perplexities.” Yet another Author liked “undoubtedly braiding (sic!) well-known quotations to support some philosophical theses.” For another Author a monograph is synonymous to a monogram. A Reviewer, while complementing on the Author’s

knowledge, put it in the following way: “The Professor, despite of his knowledge (sic!), writes very clearly so a single recipient understands.” The next author, undoubtedly an expert in medicine and confectionery, introduced the disciplines into her review; she wrote: “One might say that every sick person would rather have some sweets than to take medicine to recover. »The Principles of Jurisprudence, the Theory and Philosophy of Law« is like the sweets for those who crave for knowledge. It contains everything, which, in comparison with bulky volumes of other scientific works, makes it sweet and tasty, using the confectioner’s nomenclature.” Completely seriously, on the other hand, I will encourage everyone using the very word “interdisciplinary” to replace it with “transdisciplinary,” or similar. (They did not read footnote number 454!) For “interdisciplinary” consists of two Latin words: *inter* – between and *disciplina* – discipline, as a separate discipline of knowledge. Therefore, the word means something in between the disciplines, not the disciplines themselves, or a combination of some of them. In the spaces the disciplines there might be even complete void. I will refer to a true story of a scientist who slipped severely in his career after having used the word “interdisciplinary” in the title of his postdoctoral dissertation. The National Committee for Academic Appointments and Promotions did not accept it because of the very word. They rejected the dissertation because of the lack of a scientific discipline among other disciplines, and “interdisciplinarity” as a discipline simply does not exist. Anyway, I try to carefully avoid the tricky word and kindly recommend others to resign from its unfounded use.

THE DESIGN OF THE BOOK

*How they see you,
that’s how they perceive you. a saying*

The Authors of the reviews also evaluated the layout of the book, in particular its cover. **Izabela Brzeska** noticed that „The cover is the most significant visual aspect of each book.” **Aleksandra Tomczak** developed the thought: “As a Polish proverb says »don’t judge the book by the cover«, a book should not be criticized because of the way it looks, the truth is, however, that many of us choose books by their covers.” **Olimpia Anna Nowak** shares the opinion: “In my opinion, an interesting cover appeals to people. While looking for a book in a shop it is often the cover that we notice first. It might seem banal, but people often pay attention to the packaging first, and then the content.”

The cover of the handbook is one of three designs prepared by Mr Bartłomiej Dudek, leaving the final decision to the author of the book. Obviously, there is no accounting for taste, so that all tastes are respected, but the cover I chose seemed the

most suitable for me. The cover was similarly evaluated by a dozen or so of the Reviewers. **Dagmara Ewa Pukowiec**, for instance, said that the cover „is eye-catching, esthetic, smooth and soft... sturdily glued, with blue as the dominant color, and the figure of Themis – the symbol of justice and eternal order.” However, according to **Natalia Karolina Rozwadowska**, „the book could be thread-stitched, not glued. I think that glued books are less durable, especially when you tent to go back to your favorite publication.” **Ewa Fedowicz** noticed that the laminated cover of the book has a fault: “after a few days of using it starts to foliate.” Unfortunately, I observed the same.

Paulina Katarzyna Wrzosek also formulated a favorable opinion of the cover: „The cover by Bartłomiej Dudek attracts attention. The *ombre* effect is extremely impressive – well known, appeals both to the mature readers and the youth.” **Angelika Katarzyna Baryła** also belongs to the group of supporters of the present design of the cover. She writes: “The colour of the book is really well-matched as blue calms down, but also stimulates imagination, leads to creative and intensive thinking. It is quite significant as far as the handbook is concerned since the subject matter is relatively demanding and sophisticated.”

However, a few Authors of the reviews criticized the cover of the book. **Kaja Maria Pająk** expressed her criticism the most pointedly. She almost shouts out: „It is hard to find a more biased cover, which seems to be completed in a rush. The blue background and Themis on it do not compensate for the impression of pettiness. Do all the covers of books devoted to law must be served by Themis – as innocent as a lamb?... why has the question of esthetics been neglected? Why hasn’t anyone made an effort to create something original, pleasing the eye?... Not to mention the lack of hardcover... I think the layout is the biggest weakness of the book.” **Łukasz Marcin Lisowski** also turns out to be bored with Themis on the covers of legal books. **Marzena Teresa Dudczak** thinks that „The cover is gloomy. It suggests the obscure and heartless side of law and the philosophy of law, whereas it is known that they also have their bright sides. Especially that philosophy, as the love of wisdom, thus (as I suppose) open-mindedness and an enlightened mind, is not compatible with the austerity.”

As the author of the book, I will do my best to make sure that the new project of the cover is less receptive to criticism, or even not receptive to the criticism of the most demanding esthetes at all. Because of the ambitious goals of the book emphasized by the subtitle „A critical reinterpretation,” I have been encouraged many times to highlight the very image of the author, even on the front cover. To be sure, that would be a good starting point, not only for those who disapprove of me, which I do not believe is the case, to reproach the author, i.e. me, for too big stardom and megalomania. Although it has been known since the times of Ignacy Krasicki that “genuine virtue does not fear criticism,” it would be an abuse to judge the author’s lack of virtue only on the basis of his image.

All of the aforementioned constitute some of my hesitations as far as the project of the second edition of my book is concerned. I will try to convince the Publishing House to edit a hardcover, on good quality paper, with diversified fonts, prints, tables and other visual forms. Just like in case of the first edition, I will reject the royalties. The publisher will be requested to make sure that the edition of the paper book is sufficient, as it is appreciated more by a number of readers, who do not approve of e-book versions, which end up in a trash bin after being printed out.

GENERAL OPINIONS ON THE BOOK

*The man who does not read has no
advantage over the man who cannot read*

Mark Twain

I quoted the motto following what a pro-reading review by **Joanna Beata Poźniak** said. The general implication of the motto can be referred to the students of law and administration and their reading. Those students of law and administration who do not read books on law and administration, if there are such students, have no advantage over the ignoramuses within the scope of the literature on law and administration. **Joanna Beata Poźniak** has no liking, however, for forcing to read any books, even handbooks, which definitely would not appeal to professors, especially the authors of handbooks. This time, however, it seems that the obligatory reading did not turn out to be the cause of her bad mood, as she wrote: „After reading the book I am really impressed by the author’s knowledge and the diligence of the publication, which will definitely become an excellent compendium for those who want to broaden their knowledge concerning law and philosophy. The book is both fascinating and tough at the same time, therefore it will certainly divide the readers – some will love it... some will hate it.” The author of the book, craving for improving his work, appreciates more the manifestations of criticism, even if they are closer to hatred, than any expressions of love. I looked up and collected all the manifestations of criticism in my Students’ reviews of the book, which I included in suitable places in the text, and I will make use of them while editing the second edition of my handbook. In her review, **Aleksandra Tomczak** did not omit even the very title of the book. What “riveted her attention was the subtitle »A critical reinterpretation«, which introduces the element of mystery, as if behind the theory and philosophy of law there was a secret to be discovered by the reader.” Not falling under the spell of this adorable literary association I will notice that probably each and every book, before reading it, hides some kind of mystery behind its cover. My intentions contained in the phrase “A critical reinterpretation” were revealed in the second paragraph of the *Introduction* of the a handbook, which is a monograph at

the same time. A number of Students-Reviewers interpreted it correctly. As there are frequently discrepancies between people's thoughts and statements, as well as both of the aforementioned and their actions, the Reviewers of my book put me through their paces. My evaluation of their Reviews ranged from the extreme naive acceptance of all the opinions, especially the favorable ones, to the extreme abnegation of rejecting all of them. Between those two extremes there are more moderate opinions of mine. The real intentions of the reviewers are, however, difficult to recognize, as it is only them – the Reviewers, who know it. According to the *In dubio pro reo* principle (Latin for “[when] in doubt, for the accused”), followed not only by lawyers, while presuming the honesty of the opinions I rejected the extreme intentions. Citing here somebody's opinion I quote it literally, putting it in between quotation marks. I would like to mention that any evaluation might be and happen to be assessed further. Therefore, the layers of assessment stratify like multi-story buildings, reaching the levels of, I guess, skyscrapers. After the author's exposition aiming to provide his security, let us go back to quoting the Reviewers' opinions.

Wiktoria Anna Szczurowska emphasized that “professor Roman Tokarczyk belongs to the authors who can write about difficult issues in an interesting and accessible way. His latest monograph constitutes an incredible intellectual adventure... It seems possible to elaborate on the exceedingly important issues concerning law and philosophy in an accessible way, interesting even to an ordinary reader.” **Iwona Agnieszka Karbowska** noticed a couple of advantages of the monograph: it constitutes the essence of what is the most important from the legal point of view, as for its reception, the book is very accessible... an excellent source of knowledge... it is an excellent way for students to revise; it helps future lawyers tackle the gist of law; instead of three different publications, more or less accessible, I guarantee, this one is enough...; it can be directed at different readers... *Chapeau bas* to the Author.” **Marzena Teresa Dudczak** claimed that *The Principles of Jurisprudence, the Theory and Philosophy of Law. A critical reinterpretation* is “a very rich work, which includes a wide range of information, from the historical data up until now, along with the emerging” biojurisprudence. **Rafał Czesław Rygielski**: “It seems that all the objectives, i.e. the creation of a monograph, the use of a possibly simple language, innovation and reaching a wide group of scholars, have been achieved. What is astounding is the author's erudition, confirmed by smooth movement among different areas of knowledge... The author's easy style also deserves approval.” **Dorota Iwona Młodzianowska** penetratingly described one of the author's assumptions concerning the “critical reinterpretation.” According to her, the book “touches upon extremely timely areas of law, which intermingle with one another and yet each of them, as functioning separately, has a colossal contribution into the development of the legal culture of societies. Reading the publication constitutes an amazing intellectual adventure, broadening one's horizons, enriching cognition and, at the same

time, making the reader realize how fragile we are, despite of the anthropocentric attitude to the world.” **Karolina Aleksandra Radlak** noticed that “Professor Roman Tokarczyk’s publication has a original, pioneering and innovative character... it has big cognitive value... Referring to the book as a great work will not be an exaggeration. It is a work of passion, ease, nimbleness and wisdom.” For **Robert Mariusz Majewski** “reading the book is not an unpleasant necessity, but a fascinating journey for a mong eager for knowledge.” According to **Łukasz Sebastian Stefan**, “the book is a result of detailed research by a lawyer and a philosopher, but most importantly a man aware of his knowledge and sensible to human life.” As an author focused on the value of life, I really appreciate such thought-provoking comments stimulating a contemplation of life. “Personally, I was delighted by the book,” **Gabriela Maria Jachimowska** wrote, “and it made me think about the value of life.” Similarly, **Joanna Wilczek**, confessed: “It is a publication on the highest level... it is in my bestseller list, it is really the only type of book which, after reading it, makes you stop and think for a while. Now I realized the meaning of life.” The perception of the content of the book by my Humanitas University Students confirms how differently they understand what seems to be obvious. While the majority regarded the content of the book as clear, or very clear, there were some who did not, nevertheless. **Agata Anna Mędrygał** confessed that “the book does not belong to the light ones.” **Magdalena Małgorzata Rembek** admitted, in turn, that: “the issues discussed are not easy for a student of administration,” which could imply that the book is easier to understand for students of other majors, especially law. In her casual review, **Anna Weronika Jurasz** turned out to be ruthless in her opinion of most of the content of the book. She wrote bravely, though irritated, which did not influence, however, my opinion of their review, “that most of the content has been compiled in a harsh way, which does not help a contemporary student acquire such a vast amount of knowledge.” Some reviewers, e.g. **Karolina Milena Morawska**, had to “reread some fragments in order to understand them.” They did not suffer a loss, however, as it is known that revision, next to understanding, is crucial to memorize things. While reading such discrepant opinions of a publication targeted at a relatively small group of readers, with a similar level of formal education, there arises a general remark. It should be noticed how big, or even indescribable the difficulties of the legislators must be when it comes to expressing clearly the laws addressed to millions of diverse recipients with different levels of awareness.

Małgorzata Izabela Brzeska classified the reviewed book as of those “which have a big influence on our worldview... Such publications, containing a number of wise thoughts, are unforgettable, as they help us enrich our vocabulary.” **Małgorzata Anna Szcześniak**, after mentioning numerous mistakes in the decision-making process of the Polish government, does not have any doubts that the book should be on the »obligatory reading list« of the members of parliament, senators and politicians, as well as

the members of various commissions, i.e. people who should take care of obeying the law on a regular basis.” I will probably incur the displeasure of my scholar colleagues if I quote **Katarzyna Jadwiga Borowiec**’s suggestion. “In my humble opinion,” she says, “the book should also be read by the university teachers who lecture on the basics of jurisprudence or the theory of law, as they would improve their skills as lecturers. Speaking a language similar to the one the author of the book uses, they would get through to the minds of students-laymen much faster.” Therefore, **Małgorzata Ewelina Stępień** could admit that “the book convinced me of the subject matter of philosophy, it proved that the content can be presented in a simple yet pleasant way.”

So as to recover from the acrid remarks referring to the difficulties in the perception of the book by some of my Humanitas Students, I will quote a completely opposite opinion. **Anna Maria Kurzawa-Dyrcz** claims that “the book is written in such a way that even for the fledgling in the subject it is clear and understood... It is a diversified lecture... an excellent publication that broadened many cognitive horizons... it is not a traditional academic handbook, but a magnificent monograph... on an exceedingly sophisticated subject. Therefore, it passes on the author’s vast knowledge and rich experience.” “Every thought written on the pages of the book,” stated **Andżela Jurga**, “is somehow a discovery for me.” For **Karolina Prażnowska**, the book is “a repository of knowledge when it comes to both legal and philosophical issues.” According to **Ewa Adelajda Jachimowska**, in turn, “the author did not resign from the high level and profoundness of his ruminations, which are numerous in the book.” **Dominik Maciej Błoniarczyk** added that “the book is a remarkable piece of work.” **Karolina Anna Jędrzejak** definitely knows a lot, but this time she stated: “I know one thing for sure, the book is excellent.” It is difficult not to be overwhelmed by the coquetry of the catchy, charming and probably to some extent a bit deceptive words by **Andrzej Janus**. “I will start from saying that my life is not going to be boring anymore. You gave me a work which my mind is not capable of embracing till today. Your book is not just meant to be read, but to keep coming back to it. It is full of humor and contrariness. It is excellent to read. My wife, who is a Doctor of Medicine, frequently pilfers the book from my briefcase and immerses in reading, too. We often talk in the evening, especially about the third part of the handbook. The way in which you describe the philosophy of law is really fascinating to both of us.” For **Milena Karolina Plaza** “What makes the reviewed book extraordinary is: the importance of the subject matter, especially introducing the new trend in legal studies... intelligent division into parts, as well as an interesting part of particular texts... It is beyond all doubt that Professor Tokarczyk’s latest book constitutes significant contribution to contemporary studies of the theory and philosophy of law.” “In my opinion,” says **Natalia Teresa Goik**, “the reviewed work is »a pill« of knowledge on the three disciplines, and it might well serve student as a handbook – a register of cases.”

Wirginia Wróbel wrote: Reading the book gave me a lot of pleasure; “I read the

book with great enthusiasm and »eager for knowledge«.” Since, according to **Martyna Małgorzata Kałat**, “every chapter makes it possible to understand a given question thoroughly.” I am full of admiration for the Professor,” admits **Anna Teresa Kotas** elegantly, “who provides knowledge in a very comprehensible and detailed way in all three parts of the book.” **Ksenia Dela** stated: “I think that professor Roman Andrzej Tokarczyk’s publication might be an excellent inspiration to further discovering and broadening one’s knowledge on the philosophy of law.” **Aleksandra Natalia Polis** says: “I am certain that Roman Tokarczyk’s book will always find interested readers among the students of law, administration, political studies, philosophy etc.” **Marlena Kucza** sums up: “To recap, the book contains above-average values... important contribution into the development of legal and philosophical studies.” Numerous reviewers,” among others **Anna Kantor**, **Karolina Beata Koterwa**, **Mateusz Nowakowski**, acknowledge that they admire and respect the author for taking up such difficult job.” **Izabela Szczesny** emphasizes in a lofty manner: “It is a wonderful publication by a wonderful person, who I fortunately had the pleasure to meet, therefore I am able to say objectively that the dilemmas are fully substantiated.” Summing up his review, **Krzysztof Wojtasiak** highlighted that “the reviewed book constitutes an extremely significant publication on the legal book market and every practicing lawyer’s bookcase should have the book on its shelf. What makes the book different from other publications of this type is the synthetical approach towards the basic issues relating to jurisprudence, the theory and philosophy of law.” Among many thanks addressed to the author, **Ewa Grażyna Strug**’s words stand out: “I would like to express my gratitude for such a publication... which leads the reader »by the hand« from the basics of jurisprudence to the profundity and vastness of the ambiguity of notions and perspectives in order to build up wisdom, for philosophy is the love of wisdom.” **Marzena Grażyna Libera**, on the other hand, while expressing her gratitude for “the possibility to read a book by such prominent author as Professor Roman Andrzej Tokarczyk,” admitted that “it takes pride of place in my bookcase.”

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

*It isn't what they say about you,
it's what they whisper behind your back.*

Eroll Flynn

I was endowed by the authors of the reviews – my Students with so many adjectives that I will introduce myself as Roman Andrzej Tokarczyk. I am currently using my middle name – Andrzej, too, so as not to be confused with a couple of other people also called Roman Tokarczyk, living in Poland and abroad. For instance, next to my profile photographs on the Internet there is a picture of Roman Tokarczyk – a notary public from Warsaw. It is difficult to confuse us, however, as he is definitely richer

than me in the material dimension, but I seem to be the richer one as far as our hair is concerned. There is much more information about the very surname Tokarczyk on the already mentioned Internet. For example, in the United States there is a book titled *The Tokarczyk Name in History*.

My Students from Humanitas University know how to spell my surname. Only three of them, male, because of the lack of proofreading of their reviews, wrote sporadically Tokarczuk instead of Tokarczyk. I forgive them and do not bear a grudge for it, as my surname has been numerously confused with the names of other very honorable People – Ignacy Tokarczuk, the bishop of Przemyśl, and Olga Tokarczuk, a well-known author. Associating my name with such prominent People brings credit to my surname, but I am not sure whether it goes both ways. I will make one more remark upon the times of telephone directories. Then, while travelling the world, whenever I arrive in a new place, I used to start my stay there from looking up my name (or at least the surname) in a telephone book. In Canada, for instance, there was a Roman Tokarczyk from Ontario, an established prosecuting attorney. Because of the coincidence of our names and surnames he had me as his guest. So as not to confuse each other, we spent some time in front of a mirror next to each other.

In the reviews it was clearly visible that the Authors were very diversified when it came to being familiar with and obeying the academic etiquette. Those who the notion of etiquette is foreign to completely or partially will be mentioned. I will also distinguish the names of those Students whose sense of tact and finesse is on a very high level when it comes to writing about others or addressing them directly, especially a professor. These are the praiseworthy names (in an alphabetical order): **Małgorzata Izabela Brzeska, Jarosław Łukasz Ferdyn, Beata Stanisława Grzelec, Karolina Kentnowska, Irena Zofia Kucharek, Marzena Grażyna Libera, Rafał Czesław Rygielski and Sylwia Uścimiak**. As a person teaching legal, moral and even etiquette norms, I will say that in the hierarchy of their subtlety and the quality of cultural level it is not the legal or moral norms that make all the running, but it is the etiquette that leads the way, which is best visible in the normative cultures of the Far East. Thus what I dream about is that the situation is similar concerning the normative cultures of the West, including Poland. Some Students, before they wrote the review, got acquainted with my biography, whether necessarily or not – I do not know. **Anna Maria Kurzawa-Dyrcz** wrote as follows: “While preparing to write my first review, I familiarized myself with the biography of the highly respectable man of vast knowledge, basking in esteem in the academic community and enjoying prestige among students. I am delighted by the knowledge and rich scholarly experience of the author.” In order to group the numerous opinions on myself expressed by my Humanitas Students, I will make use of the modifiers they used, which are as follows: a person, a lawyer, a philosopher, a professor, a scholar, a scientist, a researcher, an author, a writer, a publicist, a specialist, a university

teacher, a speaker, an authority. Nearly all of the opinions tend to use more than one of the aforementioned modifiers at the same time. **Monika Anna Urbanik** wrote a review in the form of a letter addressed to me, in which she used numerous attributes which made me abashed. She wrote: "Dear Professor, I am full of admiration for you. What commands respect is the incredible number of publications, occupying high positions, a number of state distinctions and prizes, as well as cherishing friendship, tradition and your own interests such as dancing or skiing. If being kind, open-minded and serene is added up to the aforementioned qualities, there appears an image of an eminent scholar, a world-class specialist of impeccable manners." According to **Iwona Agnieszka Karbowska's** opinion, "Professor Tokarczyk is an exceedingly interesting person – with his rich personality, impeccable looks, extremely rich experience and great achievements... I am proud to be his student. Such a great person, a big authority in the area of the philosophy of law and other fields, made me – a common student – review his book; I am afraid my knowledge is too scant to evaluate it, but I will try and do my best." Iwona's attempt turned out to be successful, not because of her opinion of me, but considering very good form and content of the review she submitted to me. Although we have not known each other for long, **Aleksandra Monika Trebuniak** managed to notice that "Professor is an extraordinary person... he is a pioneer when it comes to the new trend in jurisprudence – biojurisprudence, as well as... legal proxemics... he has a big influence on shaping the interest of the legal »world« in legal comparative studies and the philosophy of law. It was the energy that he emanates and his *dossier* that encouraged me to get acquainted with the publication." **Marcin Krzysztof Skuza** stated with conviction: "As it can be seen through his achievements, Professor is an open-minded and enlightened person, actively engaged in a number of areas significant for us as a society, while being partial to ordinary or amusing issues at the same time. **Anita Lucyna Cugowska** somehow noticed: "Scholars write about the Professor beautifully." **Irena Zofia Kucharek's** review is full of beauty and coquetry. She says: "I admit that I was pleasantly surprised that such a prominent person in a kind and open way shares the story of his and his family... On the Internet you might see that Professor loves animals, and it is common knowledge that a person who loves animals is a good person. At this point, allow me to refer to my personal reflection on the fact that Professor, in his kindness, will turn out to be understanding, too, as my knowledge is too scarce and I must admit that, in spite of my best intentions, I was not able to comprehend the vastness of knowledge included in the book... Dear Professor, I admire your knowledge included in the book, but, most of all, I do admire your extraordinary personality." After getting familiar with Irena's work I did not have any doubts that it was very good, and the self-assessment of her knowledge was an expression of her charming humbleness.

In the light of the aforementioned opinions, what can I say about myself as I person. I belong to the so called larks, i.e. people who are up at dawn. Taking only this fact into consideration, I cannot consider myself to be great, as some owls who sleep long do and they see their greatness in the length of their shadow by the sunset. I have never been overly rich therefore my idea of wealth includes a smile, a kind gesture, a good word, good will and high expectations towards yourself. Such expenditures are relatively inexpensive for such a person like me, but they constitute the easiest and the most effective ways leading directly to another person. Trying to act this way, I please some people, whereas numerous others are become surprised or even astonished.

Angelika Katarzyna Baryła has no doubts that „Professor Roman Tokarczyk is a prominent lawyer, philosopher and a specialist in the fields of legal ethics, the philosophy of law, as well as political and legal doctrines. It is also worth mentioning that he is the founder of a new trend in the area of jurisprudence, i.e. biojurisprudence... and he aims at its development.” **Justyna Magdalena Osuch** knows that the professor “belongs to the group of the most active and dynamic scholar lawyers in the country. He also enjoys prestige in the international scientific circles on several continents.” In her review, **Aleksandra Tomczak** did not forget to include “a few words about professor Tokarczyk – a great lawyer and philosopher, the author of numerous books and publications which enabled many lawyers and students to perceive law from a new perspective.” Taking into account the reasons mentioned above, in the eyes of **Karolina Anna Jędrzejak** “Professor Roman Andrzej Tokarczyk is a prominent lawyer and philosopher.” A few authors of the reviews referred to me as a “scholar,” a title both honorable and obliging. For **Iwona Jolanta Sobstel** “Professor Roman Tokarczyk is a great scholar, recognized in literature, an expert in politics, law and philosophy, the author of many works in different areas of legal studies.” With no pathos, in turn, **Dominik Maciej Błoniarczyk** wrote: “It is visible that Professor has a good grasp of the whole subject of philosophy” (sic!). **Anna Kantor** stated: “I am full of admiration for professor Roman Tokarczyk, a great scholar... Looking at his biography it can be assumed that he deserves to be referred to as an authority... he commands even greater respect.” **Wiktoria Anna Szczurowska** shared the opinion: “I would like to express my appreciation for professor Roman Andrzej Tokarczyk, a prominent scholar and a great authority in the field of the philosophy of law.” Too modestly, to be sure, **Agnieszka Katarzyna Jańta** writes about herself: “I put a lot of effort into reading the book and writing its review as I am far from being such a prominent scholar. The more so, I am full of admiration for the author... professor Roman Tokarczyk.”

Obviously, I accept all the flattery with both satisfaction and common sense. Following my Great Master and Friend, professor Grzegorz Leopold Seidler, I have an invariable opinion of myself. To be sure, I am not as wise as I sometimes happen

to think, but I am also not as foolish as some of my opponents believe. Since I have suffered from creative anxiety for years, I know that anxiety leads to achievements, whereas too much satisfaction with self leads to nothing but defeat. I think highly of Descartes and his thought that thinking is the essence of being. I think even higher, however, of Pascal's thought about the advantage of doubt over certainty. Hence, I will address Descartes and Pascal *post mortem* to say that even for the most ideal thinking it is not possible to go beyond the boundary of the highest value which is experience. It was Locke who used to say so, but it is life in particular that teaches us about that. It teaches us that it is impossible to climb the ladder of success with your hands in the pockets. In order to avert three great miseries – as Voltaire used to emphasize – boredom, vice and poverty, one must work, work, work.

The Authors of the reviews included opinions on both my all scholarly achievements and the one particular book. **Daria Magdalena Całka** stated: „In my opinion professor Tokarczyk's book is a remarkably creative publication. I congratulate Professor on such considerable scholarly output. I am full of admiration for him, his works and great talent.” **Zofia Słomska** wrote about me, as an author: he is „one of the best known, both in Poland and abroad, philosophers and theoreticians of law, who had significant influence on the development of the European and world-wide philosophy of law... an award-winning scholar, a great authority... he can be proud of impressive scholarly output of fundamental works in different areas of legal sciences, published in a couple of languages at home and abroad.” My achievements “made enormous impression” on **Małgorzata Kuberska**, whereas **Dorota Pośpiech** found it “impressive.” She “bows and scrapes to the AUTHOR for his huge knowledge of so many different fields, extraordinary culture of word, innovation, setting up new frameworks.” I would like to thank **Joanna Anna Feliksik** for her wishes: “I wish you, Professor, a multitude of readers, as well as further interesting scholarly works, as they constitute a source of inspiration, which I do believe will come true.”

In a number of the reviews the author is mentioned only in the context of the aforesaid handbook. According to **Dominika Olga Kozera**: “Professor R. Tokarczyk can write about difficult issues in an interesting and approachable way. Therefore, becoming absorbed in the book, the reader feels like going on to the next chapter... because it touches upon questions which are exceedingly important for people.” **Elżbieta Justyna Kubica-Węgrzyn** expressed her opinion in a similar vein: many thanks to the author who, apart from great erudition, proved to have literary talent, which very few authors of scientific works might boast of... I am full of admiration for his sense of a great scholar in the sphere of the philosophy of law and I am full of praise for professor Roman Tokarczyk.” **Angelika Katarzyna Baryła** stated: “I would like to mention that I am full of admiration for Professor Tokarczyk as he made the effort to describe three such broad problems in the handbook; I also admire his remarkable knowledge.” In **Joanna Katarzyna Gidek**'s opinion “The author's expertise is astonishing,

exceptional and in-depth, which results in the style and vocabulary of the book.” Thus, **Beata Stanisława Grzelec** in a way sums up all the opinions: The author himself is an extraordinary and multidimensional personality.” **Karolina Anna Jędrzejak** makes “my obeisance to Professor for creating the work.”

For a professor to become an author, it is necessary to be a researcher first. He must search for truth as a touchstone of the scientific knowledge so after announcing it others, especially students, could acquire it, too. The position of a researcher who announces the results of his work depends on their originality and cognitive or (and) practical utility. “It is better to suffer defeat – Herman Melville believed – being original than to achieve success thanks to imitation.” Being well-thought of because of its originality, biojurisprudence encourages a contemporary person to consider not only the meaning of their own life but also their relationships with other manifestations of life. Biojurisprudence, in its transdisciplinarity, has the advantage over the specialized narrow-mindedness of those who call themselves experts. As Nicholas Butler ironically summed it up “An expert is someone who knows more and more, until finally they know everything about nothing.” In order to avoid that, my life’s philosophy is different; it can be found on my website.

Olimpia Anna Nowak noticed accurately that an author should, most of all, convince the recipients to his opinions, not forcing the reader to accept them. She says: „By so doing the author proves that he does not treat the reader as a puppet, who must agree with his every word. Not at all. The author, through his monodrama (sic!) teaches us that we must think ourselves and understand.” **Marlena Barbara Noworyta** wrote: “I would like to express my admiration for the author, Professor Roman Tokarczyk, who I had the pleasure to meet during lectures... Professor proved himself as a prominent lawyer and philosopher with vast knowledge and experience, being able to arouse the students’ interest in the field of philosophy; he is, at the same time, an extremely kind and warm person.” In this way, almost imperceptibly, we have reached opinions on the author of the reviewed book as a university teacher.

In his moving review **Andrzej Janus** addressed me as a university teacher. He wrote: “Dear Professor, the way how you run your lectures, how fabulously you play with words, how good you feel in the lecture hall as a speaker talking about such sophisticated questions as the theory of law is completely impossible to understand to me. When I happen to read the book I can see you in front of my eyes as if you were there. This shows how much of yourself you put in that book.” **Dorota Joanna Skuza** wrote: “Tokarczyk, the Scholar, has a very interesting biography, which emanates with incredible experience of a wonderful lawyer and philosopher. The knowledge which Professor passes on to students during lectures is really impressive. Professor transmits knowledge to students in an extremely accessible way – I left the lecture hall delighted by the wisdom and professionalism of the Scholar.” **Marcin Krzysztof Skuza**, in turn, noticed that the professor “During classes he proved to be a man

who gives away a lot of knowledge and is able to pass even the toughest issues in a very easy way.” “He is one of few lecturers who let the students speak and allow to ask questions,” added **Damian Paweł Sęga**.

“I wish we had more classes with Professor,” writes sorrowful **Marzena Grażyna Libera**, “as he can both present the image of the three fields of knowledge and run classes in an absorbing way, full of flair, humor and interesting associations. The very possibility of asking questions on the first lecture proved that Professor Tokarczyk is not a boring teacher but one who is open to cooperation with students and expects remarks and discussion.” **Magdalena Leśniak** suggests: “Professor has great passion for his academic teaching. He is a man of great caliber – a prominent scholar and erudite. His publications constitute an event for those interested in the field of the philosophy and the theory of law. Professor is an unquestionable authority in this field.” **Anna Maria Jedlińska** shared a similar opinion. Again, sensitive and curious **Dorota Joanna Skuza**: “I have never met such a person. I have never met such an authority, who made me think of the sense and meaning of existence. In the review of my book, **Mateusz Nerka**, next to his opinion on me, included beautiful wishes: “I am happy to have the chance to attend your lectures – you sensationally complete the book with yourself. It is one of those Works which splendidly show your personal attitude to the world, your sophisticated sense of humor and extraordinary intelligence... I wish you joy, which sees beauty in small things. Hope, which does not fade away, when dreams seem too far. Peace, which calms when everything else throws you off balance. Faith, which gives support when you feel helpless. And, what is most significant, I wish you to stay Yourself.” Well, I thank Mateusz very much indeed for wise wishes and, from the bottom of my heart, I wish the same to him. I am glad that my Students perceive the great value of good education, even for the sake of the education itself, since it is property which cannot be taken away from an educated person. Those who grumble about the high costs of higher education should realize that the price of ignorance is much higher. As a teacher I know that while teaching others I do learn myself, too. I realize that admonishing others is much easier than yourself. I know that being aware of the fact that our knowledge is limited constitutes the most certain constituent of the knowledge. I realize that a thing well-done is of greater value than a well-said or well-written one. I know that, most of all, it is the deeds that are evaluated and judged, not the offices held. I know that we all crave for perfection, but it could be achieved, however unfeasible, if there was no possibility of subtracting or adding anything. For there must not be any predefined or imposed limits to people’s aspirations. With no grumbling about my fate I will finally mention that teachers, since time immemorial, have been given too big trust and too little remuneration (even at private universities). But it is not an opinion of mine!

As the author of *Academic Anecdote Anthology*, published threefold, I will emphasize that only those who can laugh at themselves do not suffer from the lack of

entertainment. „Nothing reveals the real character of a man more than a joke that touches himself” - noticed Georg Christoph Lichtenberg right on the mark. An indication of a serene soul is the ability to laugh at yourself. In this ability I see joy and strength to respect others. However, I do not mention here any anecdotes about myself, as some of the Reviewers suggested, as they will be found in the already mentioned *Anthology*. Obviously, the reviewed book of mine, just as any other publication, does not exhaust the subject. I hereby share **Mateusza Grot**’s opinion, who, in his very good review, quotes Montesquieu’s words: „When writing, one shall not exhaust the subject so there is nothing left for the reader. Thus, it is not about the people reading only, it is about them thinking.”

Roman Andrzej Tokarczyk