

<http://dx.doi.org/10.16926/sit.2021.04.13>

Andrzej PAWŁUCKI*
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1383-1754>

The importance of metaphysics in the theory of nontrivial physical education – Polish tradition¹

Jak cytować [how to cite]: Pawłucki A. (2021): *The importance of metaphysics in the theory of nontrivial physical education – Polish tradition*. Sport i Turystyka. Środkowoeuropejskie Czasopismo Naukowe, vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 107–123.

O ważności metafizyki w teorii nietrywialnego wychowania fizycznego – tradycja polska

Streszczenie

Poznanie socjologiczne wychowania fizycznego jest samo w sobie kompletne, ale niewystarczające. W socjologicznej teorii znajdujemy wyjaśnienia *funkcji* społecznych i indywidualnych wychowania fizycznego, ale już nie: 1) uzasadnienie *racji* pochodzenia – *skąd się bierze, dlaczego jest* oraz 2) interpretację *znaczenia* – *jaka wartość uzasadnia sens?* Pytanie pierwsze wymaga odwołania się do *filozofii pierwszej* (metafizyki), a drugie do filozofii wartości, filozofii społecznej i filozofii kultury. Poszerzenie zakresu poznania wychowania fizycznego o filozoficzny wątek ukazuje tę dziedzinę wychowania jako osobliwość metafizyczną i kulturowy powszechnik trójstopniowego łańcucha przyczynowości społecznej. W realiach uczelni pedagogicznej przeistoczenie teoretyka wychowania fizycznego w postać filozofa wychowania fizycznego następuje wraz z operacją uzasadnienia sensowności bytu: przejścia od wyjaśnienia istnienia bytu w świetle prawdy o przyczynie do uzasadnienia słuszności istnienia bytu w świetle prawdy o dobru. Intelktualizacja racjonalności filozoficznej studenta jako przyszłego nauczyciela – uwzględniająca w jego kształceniu problem

* prof. dr hab.; University School of Physical Education, Pedagogy of Physical Culture Department; e-mail: andrzej.pawlucki@awf.wroc.pl

¹ In this essay, I refer to the article of Ivo Jirásek, in which the author pleads for including Slavic achievements in the field of philosophy of physical culture in English-language academic publication [11].

pochodzenia i sensu wychowania fizycznego – może wzmacniać dyskretnie efektywność oddziaływań na osobowość ucznia. Celem rozważań jest ukazanie ważności myślenia metafizycznego w poszerzaniu zakresu eksplikacyjnego teorii wychowania fizycznego: od trywialności do nietrywialności.

Słowa kluczowe: filozofia wychowania fizycznego, przyczynowość w wychowaniu fizycznym, sens wychowania fizycznego, cele wychowania fizycznego.

Abstract

The sociological cognition of physical education is, in itself complete but insufficient. Within sociological theory we will find explanations of the social and individual *functions* of physical education. However we find neither 1) justification of the reason for its origins: *where does it come from?*, *why is it here?*, nor 2) interpretation of the *meaning* – *what value justifies the meaning?* The first question requires reference to the basics of metaphysics, and the second to the social philosophy and philosophy of culture. Expanding the scope of cognition of physical education by a philosophical thread shows this field of education to be a metaphysical singularity and a cultural universal with a three-stage chain of social causality. In the realities of a pedagogical university, the transformation of a theoretician of physical education into a philosopher of physical education takes place alongside the operation of justifying the sense of being. This is the transition from an explanation of the existence of being in the light of the truth about the cause, to a justification of the rightness of the existence of being in the light of the truth about the good. The intellectualization of the philosophical rationality of a student as a future teacher can increase discreetly the effectiveness of influencing the personality of the student. The aim of the considerations is to show the importance of metaphysical thinking in expanding the explicative range of physical education theory: from the trivial to the non-trivial.

Keywords: philosophy of physical education, causality in physical education, sense of physical education, aims of physical education.

Introduction

Physical education can be recognised theoretically as a complete being when an assumption is made about its causality in the relationship between pupil subjectification and personality empowerment. However theoretical cognition does not exhaust the signs of scientificity, when the subject, which the scientist “gets into”, is by its very nature a causal and ideal being. That is, one that exists in action, for the good that is the reason for its existence. Good is included in the existence of the social being as an ontological constant: good is “glued” to existence, much as value remains a *link of action* [26]. Physical education is therefore asking for theory and philosophy. One can only obtain a complete knowledge of its **causality in sense** from two sources of cognition.

The aim of these reflections is to show the importance of metaphysical thinking in extending the explicative scope of the theory of physical education: from the trivial to the non-trivial². In teacher education, axiological intellectual-

² M. McNamee stated that: “it is absolutely necessary to think philosophically about the nature and values of activities that are thought to constitute physical education” [15].

ization – which takes into account the justification of sense – increases the effectiveness of physical education.

As with physical education so with healing. Both must be carried out so that an action can be derived from a body that is duly endowed with healthiness, and thus makes existence present. If man did not exist through action, neither medical treatment nor physical education, which mainly aim to maintain the body in good condition, would have a reason to exist.

Thus, both the *mediaries-actors*: the doctor and the teacher, are granted the status of metaphysical singularity, as each of them, in their own way, causally relates to bodily naturalness by acting on health – the doctor by means of biotechnical influence and the teacher by means of social influence.

Just as a doctor takes on the role of a *jatrejon* (infirmary) *activist*, so too does a teacher as a *gymnasion* activist. I use here the Greek names for social roles, because in ancient culture I find the original metaphysical confirmation of sufficient reason for the existence of both *activists-mediaries*. They, both, by their causality make the existence of a *social actor* dependent on their bodily endowment. And, consequently, when it comes to the causality of the *gymnasion* teacher, mediation in the *actor* assumes the free and skilful role of the ascetic of corporeality. The doctor ends the mediation when the premises of epicrisis allow the ex-patient to recover their health, and the teacher of the *gymnasion* ends it when the former student becomes an independent *asketai* for themselves.

A peculiar metaphysical aspect is that every culturally regulated activity changes the natural order of existence. As a result of a person's causal influence on their bodily nature, the culturally "enhanced" accidents of the inner body and the external body – constituting their supernatural *novum* of might – make the performance of the *actor's* destiny more probable. The effective existence of a person who intentionally introduces good into social "circulation" requires *guaranteed* resources of physicality which are always greater than the body *naturally* possesses. It is therefore peculiar that a lower action – aimed deliberately at the *humanisation of bodily nature* – makes the higher performance of a person more likely. The act of bodily formation violates the natural order of corporeality, so that, after it has been given a higher potential, the proper action of a person could already be conditioned by the *humanised*, and not only by the species-related nature of humanness. Nature is nevertheless a prerequisite for action, being the material *condition* of existence. However culturally perfected nature – which is a metaphysically peculiar fact – begins to participate in the subject's higher cultural tasks. The efficiency of the action of the higher subject which is necessary for its existence in culture, therefore depends on the effects of the lower action which are necessary for its existence in bodily culture (so called *physical culture* since *culture depends on bodily culture*). It comes down to this metaphysically peculiar relationship: the lower action for the sake of the higher action, when it is preceded – also causally – by the relationship of educational trust in

the pattern of bodily culture. And this means that physical education, which fulfills the task of transmitting the pattern of bodily formation, also acquires the status of a metaphysical peculiarity, and at the same time, given its inalienable status – acquires the rank of a cultural universal.

Physical education as a three-stage relational being

The result of this cognition leads us to recognise the entire chain of social causality as a metaphysical peculiarity. This – in logical order – is initiated by a healthfulness teacher (the 1st degree causative link), who transfers the pattern of bodily formation onto a student and empowers him or her to assume the role of an ascetic of a healthfulness *gymnasion*. The pattern is then continued through higher actions by a *social actor*, who undertakes these actions to improve their accidents of the body sufficient to the nature of the causative tasks (the 2nd degree causative link).

By complementing the bi-directional nature of subjects particularly participating in the practice of the *actor's* bodily formation we close the causality chain of physical education with the 3rd degree causal link. This allows the subject of theoretical knowledge of upbringing in the culture of the *gymnasion* to extend to a social causality that is not only inter-subjective but also inter-generational, where its goal-value is the culturally-improved bodily structure of the being. It can therefore be concluded that not only does the act of asceticism acquire the status of a cultural universal, but also that the triple complex inter-subject relationship of *gymnasion* culture is contained in the concept of “cultural universality”. What is peculiar is the whole system of physical culture, together with the system of *gymnasion* education that is embedded in it.

How should physical education be “conceptualized”?

To the question “what is physical education?”, usually comes a simplified answer as is the case with the logical truth about a cultural universal. It is devoid of reflection on the reason for the origin of being. Everyone knows *what physical education is*, but they do not know why it occurs everywhere – regardless of the ethnic origin of the language and its name in it. When I write: “**should be conceptualized**”, I bear in mind the indispensability of using the metaphysics of realism and objectivity in learning about social reality, in which physical education – obviously a being in itself – must remain in an inclusive relationship subordinate to all systems of cultural participation. From the perspective of the theory of social systems, this relationship is expressed by the presence of physical education in every system of cultural destiny. This relationship therefore occurs in

every social system, because, regardless of the content of the cultural activity, the agency of each individual act determines the natural bodily endowment of the *actor*. Their readiness to improve their accidents of the body depends on the empowerment obtained from physical education to participate in *gymnasion* asceticism. A person brings themselves to act with their body, and acts through the body. Hence its agency in relation to its intention depends objectively on bodily power – the *actor* first learns that they must *measure the forces of intent*. Hence its agency in relation to its intention objectively depends on bodily power – the *actor* first learns that they must *measure strength against intention*. And they cannot be under any illusions that “somehow” they will achieve the goal. Realism requires this (the *rigid* body structure) to be taken into account which limits deliberate action. However, following the premise of a body self-perfecting, *the actor* – who has a reasonable belief that they have power over themselves – endows themselves with greater physical abilities. This makes the *actor* realise that they can *measure intention against strength* and even extend the scope of the intention – being convinced that upon summoning a new one to a new aspiration, they will unleash the hidden potential of physical structures.

Physical education, being a causal relationship in itself, is “entangled” in external social causation, in which there is a “cultural echo”, evoked by acts of bodily formation by the former student. The patterns of body formation entrusted to the student by the teacher – each for a different *occasion* of cultural participation – are awakened (recalled from memory) by them in adulthood.

This happens only after a person has reached professional maturity and they take measures to improve their physical fitness in all respects. Physical education can be understood scientifically by applying (1) the principle of causality in order to arrive at its results, and (2) the principle of sufficient reason for being – to explain the external cause of its origin. Due to the circular-cyclical causality of physical education, which is characteristic of inter-subject (horizontal) and inter-generational (vertical) relationships, in which the first causal link can be considered as the final link (as in the paradox of egg and hen primacy) – it is logically legitimate to ask where physical education has its causal origin, or exactly what effect the causal relationship of physical education (between teacher and pupil) has on further social causation?

Obviously physical education does not initiate itself, but it is established. The teacher is *appointed* by a socially external institution and *does not appoint themselves*, and the student is *appointed* by the same instance and *does not proclaim themselves* a student. Being “supported” by a greater instance, the teacher obtains from it, the right to exist on the principle of easement: *living for someone, not living for themselves*. Empowered physical education draws out of this *principle of easement* the conviction of its metaphysical importance or even indispensability in the ontological founding of someone’s life according to their aspirations. To be more precise, *empowered* physical education embodies the figure of a *the-*

oretician, not a teacher. It is the theoretician who reveals to the teacher the awareness of their servant destiny, and it is not the teacher, who elevates themselves to the two-sidedness of the teacher-theoretician.

By continuing theorising, therefore, one is led to the opinion that physical education activates its causality by being set in motion by a metaphysically primordial and *fundamental* subject, and in no way acquires the power of self-determination by itself. The question about the beginning of physical education is misleading because it points to its inherent self-repetition, while it is indeed a self-determining being, but not a self-contributing one.

A methodological *note* about the intellectual experiment

The solution to the question of the metaphysically mysterious **origins of physical education** – let us call it the *theory of the birth of being* – is promising **only in a thought experiment** in which the simplest causal system possible on the scale of social life, will be considered – taking into account their life *among people* (horizontal intra-generational order) and participation in the life of an adult, and of a child as a person awaiting their own life among adults (vertical intergenerational order). This condition is met by a natural family, the structure of which includes both relations: adults towards each other (spouses), adults towards children (parents), older adults towards children as grandchildren and, of course, older adults towards themselves and children towards each other. It is impossible to explain the origins of physical education on a scale that currently covers humanity, or even all of society, without prior multilevel analytical preparation, would not necessarily lead to the separation of some elementary being from the whole of reality. This being, viewed from the point of view of its essential features and existence accidents of the body, would not contain the same properties as this whole social reality.

Therefore, by abstracting the whole, that constitutes adult society, we allow the system of the natural social group of the family to be the object of the mental-experimental operation: a being that simultaneously exists both horizontally and vertically, and thus meets the condition of the way of existence of the whole. This system cannot be either a single subject – as the whole of society is not the sum of individual beings – or a two-subject being, because it would not meet the condition of an intergenerational mode of existence, despite the fact that the principle of social causation would be confirmed in it. The only social system in which one could see how the whole works is simply a *family* existence of three generations – which is a causally and ideologically self-regenerating structure. The result of theoretical knowledge of the family is to allow us to understand how the causality of the whole is achieved.

For a thought experiment, I have chosen a family, who I know have included physical education in the circularity of their existence that determines its functionality, and which is best expressed by the sentence formulated by an adult, the head of the family (Śniadecki³) that “human happiness depends on health”. My choice has been determined by the husband and father of the family who has used the conclusions of his own and the scientific theory of physical education in his family activities. He has empirically substantiated these through his own personal experience.

I have chosen a natural, three-generation family, in which the father, as the primary teacher of his three children, has used the rationality of his own theory of physical education. This was a spontaneously created cognitive structure, the logical record of which he improved and perfected many years after the end of the educational cycle, and which he called “health upbringing”. The children became independent, and the father, as a former teacher of healthfulness, was constantly improving his physical education theory. The children died, and the theory is still *alive* today.

I am using as a further example the scientist who took up teaching within family life. This is, obviously, nothing unusual. But for a scientist, who is a natural health teacher to their three children, to use the empirically acquired premises of inductive reasoning with the intention of making a theory out of them, in order to present the theory of physical education to others so they could truly understand health upbringing – this was unprecedented. And master Jędrzej himself – I dare add – did not realise that he put his own theory into the circulation of causality of teaching nor that he “stole” the theory from the same circulation in order to introduce its improved version into pedagogical theory forever.

Theory of the *beginning* of physical education

The thought experiment reveals, firstly, why an adult participant in social life has to appoint himself or herself a teacher – after all, he or she is busy with activities that are appropriate to the content of their life among people and might therefore “have no time” to act as a teacher, and secondly, why the adult has to exclude the child from the natural process of growing up and add to their childhood life the task of the content of his or her own life as an adult. Why does an adult put a child to the test of living according to his or her own pattern of action – making the child a student – and why does he or she in addition undertake the task of passing on that pattern by acting as a teacher?

When we imagine how a teacher of healthfulness might teach their own children, we could naively ask why a child would otherwise become a natural student

³ Śniadecki Jędrzej was a scientist chemist (he is said to be the discoverer of the element Ruten), professor at Vilnius University (1798–1838), physician by profession.

to an adult and an adult become a natural teacher to themselves. And is it not the case that every natural teacher, unable to cope with both tasks at the same time: firstly his or her own proper participation in the culture of adults – the core content of which, after all, has to be a professional activity – and, secondly, a teaching activity would entrust that to an intermediary from the secondary circulation of education. It is known that the Śniadecki family engaged tutors as intermediaries in the secondary circulation of education. When they included paid teachers – who came from other European cultures – in the primary circulation of education they transformed it into the secondary circulation of education. It was as if, by bringing the school into the house, the Śniadecki family's home turned into a home school. This meant that a teacher from the *secondary circulation of education*, entrusted with such a task by the primary teachers, had to prepare for it in advance in a teacher training college. *Secondary circulation* teaching requires didactic skills.

Returning to the theory of the beginning of physical education and closing the list, one can also naively ask: Why does a teacher need a methodics and why does a methodics become a pedagogue?

In order to fill the gaps in the secondary circulation of the education the so-called methodics was established in teacher' training seminars. A reflective practitioner of the type who would become a methodics had to be provided with a philosophical understanding of the meaning of their cultural trust. The methodics needed a pedagogue, just like the teacher needed a methodics, and the student needed a teacher. Thus, in the final version, the theory of the beginning of empowered physical education took into account at the very end the causality of the educator in guiding the student through the culture of the *gymnasion*. The theory of the beginning revealed the logical necessity of the educator in the chain of the causality of physical education, but at the same time led to the recognition of the necessity for academies in the educational circulation of *gymnasion* culture and its ontological importance in leading the student to responsible participation in the culture of adults.

The pupil does not know the methodics, let alone the pedagogue, and, just as the theory of the **beginning** explains the causality of physical education so, to both of them, the human way of dealing with oneself may owe – in terms of both the humanisation of one's structure of being, and indirectly – the empowered way of existence in the culture of their aspirations.

The theory of *trivial* physical education

The theory of the beginning reveals the external reason which leads to the metaphysical birth of a being. It shows the final relationships of the internally self-organizing being, pointing to the relational co-presence of the pedagogue to the methodics, but it does not shed light quite clearly enough on the subject from

which “everything” begins inside being itself. After all, it is not the pedagogue who initiates physical education, but they join the circulation, being initiated by “someone”, and it is not the pupil who comes to the teacher wanting to be educated physically, but “someone” calls on the pupil to give them the social term for a candidate for adulthood.

It is an adult who undertakes teaching in a primary social group and initiates the causality of physical education when, guided by their own experience of everyday cognition, they begin to recognize the properties of their child’s bodily structure. An adult will have experienced many situations in life, from which they will have been convinced that they cannot exceed their abilities. Nevertheless, by exercising physically in the areas where nature submits to their actions the adult would ensure for themselves the effectiveness of the assumed goal. Did they not discover before their cognition, the simplicity of this significance: that by acting in a simple way, they can significantly perfect the natural corporeality for the purpose of their existence? And could the adult call this act “nursing”, “body shaping”, and even “physical education”?

If adults could use this name for a being that was conceived and realized by themselves, in which they themselves were the causative agent, and the child was the objectified *end*, then – along with the transition from the potential of the decision to the actuality of the act – the adult would become the *alpha* of objectified physical education, its causal beginning. The *alpha*, but not the *omega* of a circular course. They were not the adult who was content with trivial bodily education – all that constitutes the causality of physical education. This was not in the sense that they acted trivially, i.e. pre-methodically and pre-pedagogically, but that the consequences of their agency were located in the student’s *physicality*, and not in their personality as it related to corporeality. The adult did not even think that they could broaden the scope of their causality, but above all, place their vector in relation to the student so as to induce in them the pursuit of bodily self-education. The adult did not think that it was possible to move from objective to subjective physical education, and thus did not recognize that they were only an *alpha*, initiating the being on the level of the metaphysically trivial, teaching reality. Nursing, and educating the child’s physicality within the circularity of primary education is both trivial, and real, as a relational being, and as such constitutes the causal beginning of bodily education. Its continuation has always – ever since there have been *gymnasiums* in European culture – been the re-humanization of the bodily nature of the pupil in a cascading relationship of causality: from the *gymnasiarch* as a manager of education of the body to the *paidotribe* as an exercise instructor, and from a bodily exercise instructor to the pupil of the ascetics of bodily formation. In every relationship, someone was influencing someone on the basis of unconditional causation. The pupil had to submit to the pressure of the instructor, being forced to exercise their physicality, and the manager had to impose a repertoire of shaping exercises on the instructor – adequate

to the purpose of the external social preparation of the pupil. A different set of exercises was selected for military and agonistic purposes, and a quite different set again, for the purposes of public health. When the idea of “arming” the body with vigour became about the transformation of its naturalness into the artificiality of a sword, sabre, spear or throwing disc, the spirit of militarism then permeating the mentality of the teacher made them into a *gymnasion* tyrant and trainer\ tamer. When the king was going to war, he would, with the help of *gymnasiarch* place the pupil’s body on the training field of war and make him (it was always a “he”) a pawn on an imaginary chessboard of the game of life for armed struggle. The king would subject the pupil to strict orders through his intermediary (the instructor) – to shape him using force. Bodily education turned into the objectivity of relationships and made its goal the object of the physicality of the pupil’s body. Not in himself as a personal being, but as an impersonal substance, under the pressure of physical exercise. The bodily physicality of the flesh was subject to exercises *nomen omen* “physical”, which could lead the subject learning its objectified singularity to call the relationship “physical education”.

The theory of the trivial beginning of bodily education is in fact the theory of the objective relationship – “pushing” the pupil towards activity – and the objective goal placed on the material substance of the pupil. There is a reason why it is called the “specific” goal of the pupil’s physicality [8].

The primary teacher was trivial, and so was the first theoretician who recognized the objectivity of physical education as a relationship property and it is the only possible consequence of it when it comes to the extent of the pupil’s transformation. The quantitative difference was that physical education was definitely an authoritarian objective relationship when it was established by reason of military power, and a humanitarian one, when the reason was for *family* power i.e. through public, not state power which justified its sense through the happiness of a person’s life *in company*, as in Śniadecki’s theory, where its goal was to improve bodily healthiness. This is what could have led the doctor to believe that the relationship with physical education is much more akin to “health upbringing”. This is also why it is more appropriate that physical exercise – as opposed to movement as the best medicine for health and as opposed to physical activity as a means of intensifying physical vigour – corresponded more accurately in terms of meaning to the health-related purpose of the relationship – and made this linguistic expression more subtle.

The details of the reasons for physical education show that regardless of the content of the bodily exercises assigned to the pupil: utilitarian, health, aesthetic or sports reasons – the trivial (simplified) expression comes from the fact that: firstly, the causality of physical education is carried out through the relationship with the objectification of the pupil, and secondly, that the consequences of the teacher’s causal influence are related to the corporeal – substantial object, anthropologically reduced to the somatic and corporal nature of the pupil.

On the other hand, the theory itself, as a cognitive structure, is obviously not trivial. The theory of trivial physical education assumes the objectification of the student in relation to the teacher, and the objective character of the teacher's goal of action, which is located in the body substance, expressing the specificity of the change made in it. It is therefore legitimate to recognize that the concept of trivial physical education includes the taking care of a child.

The relationship between the concept of being to its theory

While taking into account the fact that physical education is a two-subject and intergenerational social being, its comprehensive concept must include concepts that are subordinate to it, and at the same time equivalent to each other. Following the principle of dividing the concept from the whole of a divided *totum division*, the overall concept of trivial physical education (PE) includes equivalent concepts (PE¹) and (PE²), which have the status of members of the division – *membra divisionis*. Therefore, separate from the comprehensive conception of trivial physical education (PE), which would take into account all the entities participating in the formation of the pupil, including themselves – which should also explain that the pupil is at the same time a trivial physical education – it is possible to use abstractions to describe the essential features of a trivial pupil; not the primary or secondary teacher, nor the methodics, but just the pupil.

The concept of “a trivial pupil of physical education” is true because it takes into account that which is essential for their existence: the objectivity of the bodily substance of the goal of action and the objectification of being. If we consider the concept of the essence of being as a logical structure belonging to the theory, the function of which explains the origin of being and the reasons for the variability of its existence, then the content of the concept could not take into account irrelevant facts since the theory explains more than describes the concept contained in its matrix. In theory, they are included, and in the concept of being they are omitted. For this reason, the secondary consequences of changing the pupil, which are taken into account in various theories that go beyond the “framework” of his/her physicality, and which the theoreticians call – coincidentally – non-specific consequences of physical education, show physical education as a non-trivial fact, or, at least, not as simplistic as the concept itself would suggest. What was the *non-specific* consequence of a change of pupil, because it has become *irrelevant* to the notion of physical education, has, to put it bluntly, become useless in the notion of being [9].

It follows that the theory of physical education contains the general concept of being, and equivalent concepts separated from the whole, which describe the essence of each subjective being in relation to another being in a two-subject and intergenerational system. And, of course it uses logical true terms that explain the

external cause-reason for the origin of being in general (“what” makes physical education **exist**?) as well as explaining the reason for the internal volatility of the subjects of the relational structure.

Towards a theory of nontrivial physical education

The breakthrough in thinking came when what was considered in the theory of trivial physical education of the pupil to be a non-specific consequence of his or her change – regarding changes to his or her personality, as opposed to *specific* changes in bodily functions – was recognised as a *gist*, that is, important to the essence of being. The non-specificity of the resultant changes to the pupil obtained the status of specificity within the concept of “physical education”, that is, an accident essential for their existence. Personality, not the body, is important; alternatively, the personality is important, and the body of the pupil is of secondary importance [6]⁴.

The pupil’s physical *aktywizm* and exercise, leads to the internalisation of the patterns of body culture – through its autonomous disclosure (externalization) in the act of bodily asceticism, as has been idealized here – as is true in any theory. The effect of the pupil’s physical *aktywizm* does not manifest itself immediately. One could even say that it is unknown at what point it occurs after becoming dependent on a teacher, or even say that there are no known pathways for the pupil’s transition from the stage of subjective empowerment to that of bodily self-education in social adulthood.

As for the *gist* of the personality change – following the adoption of the formula by the pupil – it is expressed by the act of self-education of bodily property. Specificity **makes** non-specificity so that the secondary depends on the primary: the objectification of the act of asceticism in the bodily structure of being depends on the objectification of the pattern of asceticism in oneself, while the condition for both is the primary metaphysical act of bodily exercise contained in the pu-

⁴ The article must not exceed the editorial word limit. In the book version of *Homo Physicus* (in print 2022) I discuss the non-trivial understanding of the causality of physical education, known since the famous FIEP Manifesto in 1970. The list of commented views on the goals of physical education is long. However, it was opened by Znaniecki – a Polish scientist who lived in the USA from 1938 until his death (1958). In *The Sociology of Education*, he wrote that in physical education, “...it is not only a question of the pupil fulfilling certain activities during the educational relationship, but of him acquiring the will and the ability to perform them later, after he has matured and become independent of the educator” (1928); The similar thinking about aims of physical education presented much later: Demel [4, 5], Zuchora [5], Grabowski [9], Osiński [17], Cynarski [3], Femiak [7]. During the time when I was a university assistant, I published [18] comments on the British educators’ view on physical education Roy [20], Bate [1], Whitaker [24]. I supplemented them over the years, pointing to the theoretical importance of the works of Burt Crum [2], McNamee [15], Green [10], Kirk [12, 13], Stolz [21], Naul [16] or Margaret Talbot [23] – with whom I have often exchanged views personally.

pil's activity. The activity of the pupil initiates their physical education. Here is the simplicity of the causal complexity of non-trivial physical education (called "education to the value of the body") [19].

Therefore, it can be considered that the concept of non-trivial physical education includes, as important for causality, a subjective relationship with the teacher and a cognitive disposition of consciousness, liberating the pupil towards independent bodily formation [5, 14, 17].

Content of upbringing through the *gymnasion* culture

Pupil's physical *aktywizm* is about actively learning the pattern of action. Activity is an active experience of action, initiated by the teacher who knows the pattern, that is a consequence of a trust relationship with the pupil. It is here that physical education has its external causal beginnings, where the pupil acts according to the rule, and the internal-cognitive – where he or she accepts the rule. Entrustment assumes the adoption of a pattern. The pupil accepts a cultural design as a "gift" to him or herself, because the action is intended to equip the bodily object of their reference with supernatural perfection. Through it the goal of personal aspiration in the participating action to be attained is enabled; the improved bodily capacity is intended to make it possible to attain the goal of a higher action. "It pays off" to accept a cultural gift from your teacher to increase the potential of your own naturalness. It is worth taking it and objectifying it in the corporeality to allow oneself to improve one's humanity.

If success in achieving the goal of action of a participating adult, is conditioned by their supernatural bodily endowment, and perfected according to the rule of the *gymnasion* – which indicates the *actor's* reflective approach to the dependence of life in the culture of destiny on an ascetic lifestyle – then the content of the pupil's cognitive and moral experience in subjective physical education must be the patterns of bodily formation adequate to the goals of action in the culturally promised future. According to the law, the content of physical education depends on the pupil's tasks in social adulthood.

Using the law of two levels of dependence: a) conditioning the act of cultural destiny of the *actor* through the act of his own bodily formation, and b) attributing the act of bodily formation in adulthood to cognitive experiences of its cultural pattern by the pupil in the *gymnasion*, it can be stated – with reference to the *theory of the beginning* of physical education – that the causal relationship between the *gymnasion* teacher and the pupil initiates the success of social life in adulthood. The truth of this statement is a general metaphysical principle, which shows the body as the source of existence, and thus it elevates the bodily potency to the ontic condition of the action of the subject participating in culture. The theory of physical education contributes to this principle.

Therefore, the content of the pupil's *aktywizm* are the rules of body culture appropriate to the social roles and tasks involved in adult life. By the division of participation in culture into the following categories: being, symbolic and social, the patterns of bodily culture, can, for practical purposes, be divided into biotic, vital, utilitarian, aesthetic, artistic, agonistic, perfectionist, mystical, moral-aesthetic and hedonistic. They contain rules of bodily asceticism – characteristic of *gymnasion* culture. Their extensive content “expands” the cultural framework of physical education far beyond trivially interpreted health and utilitarian education, especially military physical education. There is therefore no such thing as “general” physical education. Such a being does not exist. Physical education is always culturally particular – appropriate in terms of content to the culture of the pupil's destiny in adulthood.

From a nontrivial theory to the philosophy of physical education

In the contemporary non-trivial theory, it is necessary to ask about the pupil's inner causality of physical education, explicitly taking into account the necessary concept of human subjectivity and – due to social easement – the ideological reasons for making sense out of being. And it cannot be just any concept, only the truest possible, *which crowns understanding of the subjective being*, not just any ideological reason for the social existence of this entity, but only the one that does not turn it into its opposite; which places it in a relationship of easement towards an impersonal being with reason higher than itself as a personal subject.

Would some hypothetical nontrivial theorist skilfully using the terms “subjectivity” and “personality” have the courage to tell a social philosopher that he does not know of the school of thought according to which man does not live for society but for humanity. What would a non-trivial theory of physical education look like in the eyes of a philosopher, if it justified the mechanics of the pupil's independent pursuit of bodily perfection with the reason for his or her being. Would this mean that the student/subject, striving for bodily perfection of his/her property, devoted themselves to the object? Has the pupil been empowered to place the fleshly and fit body, “improved” by themselves, into the object of impersonal reality: in order to fulfil the task of a bloody revolution, a military spurt towards physical death inflicted by the leader, always against the corporeality of someone else?

I suggest that in authoritarian ruled societies – despite the fact that the theory of physical education meets the requirement of non-triviality – the consequence of deliberate personality change to the pupil may be justified by the reason of impersonal good, and not a reason for the good of the person; that is good that is regarded in philosophical anthropology as the “top formation of being in general”, where society cannot be a higher being – regardless of what fashion society is shaped into.

Conclusions

1. The conclusion is that the non-triviality of the theory of physical education is not only determined by the motif of the empowerment of the pupil and the empowerment of the personality for bodily self-improvement, but also by the axiological motif, which justifies the reason for physical education with the good of the person.

And since the reasons for non-trivial theories of physical education are different, their clash is also possible in the metadiscourse. For this reason, even theoreticians may not like each other personally, when they learn that everyone is a spokesperson for the social system they come from and which they describe in their theorizing.

2. From the methodological point of view, the use of normative rationality in the non-trivial theory would determine the transformation of the entire logical structure – working simultaneously on the waves of causality and meaningfulness of being – into the philosophy of physical education with a personalistic ideological orientation.

3. The transformation of a theoretician into a philosopher of physical education takes place alongside the operation of justifying the meaningfulness of being; the transition from explaining the existence of being, in the light of the truth of the cause, to justifying the existence of being in the light of the truth about the good.

As long as the theoretician is focused, and works alone as a seeker of the cause of purposeful being, even reaching the mystery of its nontriviality, because the triviality of the object they had previously learned does not satisfy them – for that time they do not stand out in the group of recognized researchers like *Mr. Cogito* (the character in a poem by Zbigniew Herbert) representing epistemically basic rationality. They want to know how a being works and where it comes from, what are the reasons for both the internal achievement of the full objective and its external origin. Certainly, this second curiosity (in terms of the origin of being) is childishly difficult – hence never raised by trivial theoreticians – takes the theoretician to the source of knowledge of the reason of all beings, that is simply to metaphysics. It takes them there, to give an understanding of why physical education is a universal; why *it is and must exist everywhere!* In this episodic excursion into the field of meta-science, each theoretician becomes a philosopher of being only for a moment, then they return to the original rationality.

4. The return to pure theory was aimed at supplementing the “find” of non-trivial physical education with the missing concept of the pupil as a person. And at the same time it came down to the exclusion of the behaviorist “makeshift” concept from circulation; which in fact blocks access to the mystery of internal causality, which makes it impossible for the theoretician to show the act of decision making of the student’s will as a source of self-determination. And here, where the seemingly nontrivial concept of physical education ends, the question

arises about the meaning of the destiny of being. The theoretician becomes a philosopher. Like a weaver, who weaves threads in the warp and whose finished work depicts being, at the end they ask a question about the goodness of the image justifying its existence. A theoretician in the role of a *weaver* of the causal model of physical education must therefore complete their knowledge of being with the axiological reason for its rightness. Metaphysical thinking enables the theoretician to describe physical education as a causal-ideal reality.

References

- [1] Bate R. (1972): *Physical Education – Do they Understand?* British Journal of Physical Education, vol. 2, no. 2, 19–20.
- [2] Crum B. (1993): *Conventional Thought and Practice in Physical Education: Problems of Teaching and Implications for Change*. Quest, vol. 45, issue 3, 19–20.
- [3] Cynarski W., Warchoń K. (2011): *Wybrane problemy współczesnej teorii i metodyki wychowania fizycznego*. PWSZ. Krosno.
- [4] Demel M. (1973): *Szkice krytyczne o kulturze fizycznej*. SiT. Warszawa.
- [5] Demel M., Zuchora K. (1975): *Cele kształcenia i wychowania fizycznego oraz zdrowotnego*. Kultura Fizyczna, nr 4, 1–4.
- [6] Demel M. (1989): *O trzech wersjach teorii wychowania fizycznego. Próba ujęcia komplementarnego*. Wychowanie Fizyczne i Sport, 2, 3–30.
- [7] Femiak J. (2018): *Ciało a możliwości poznawcze podmiotu w filozofii i w naukach społecznych o kulturze fizycznej*. AWF. Warszawa.
- [8] Gilewicz Z. (1964): *Teoria wychowania fizycznego*. SiT. Warszawa.
- [9] Grabowski H. (1997): *Teoria fizycznej edukacji*. WSiP. Warszawa.
- [10] Green K. (2008): *Understanding Physical Education*. SAGE Publications Ltd.
- [11] Jirásek I., Hopsicker P.M. (2010): *Philosophical Kinanthropology (Philosophy of Physical Culture, Philosophy of Sport) in Slavonic Countries: The Culture, the Writers, and the Current Directions*. Journal of the Philosophy of Sport, vol. 37, issue 2, 253–270.
- [12] Kirk D. (2010): *Physical Education Futures*. Routledge. London.
- [13] Kirk D. (2018): *Physical Education-as-Health Promotion: Recent developments and future Issues*. Education and Health, vol. 36, no. 3, 70–75.
- [14] Krawański A. (2003): *Ciało i zdrowie człowieka w nowoczesnym systemie wychowania fizycznego*. AWF. Poznań.
- [15] Mc Namee M. (1998): *Philosophy and Physical Education: Analysis, Epistemology and Axiology*. European Physical Education Review, vol 4, issue 1, 75–91.

-
- [16] Naul R., Scheuer C. (2019): *Research on physical Education and school sport in Europe*. Aachen: Meyer & Meyer.
- [17] Osiński W. (2012): *Teoria wychowania fizycznego*. AWF. Poznań.
- [18] Pawłucki A. (1975): *The problems of physical education in British Journals in 1961–1973*. SiT. Warszawa.
- [19] Pawłucki A. (1992): *Wychowanie jako kulturowa rzeczywistość*. AWF. Gdańsk.
- [20] Roy H. (1971): *Is School P.E. Really Meaningful*. British Journal of Physical Education, vol. 2, no. 1, 1–2.
- [21] Stolz Steven A. (2015): *The Philosophy of Physical Education. A new perspective*. Routledge. London.
- [22] Śniadecki J. (1855): *O fizycznym wychowaniu dzieci*. Wydawnictwo Kazimierz Turowski. Sanok.
- [23] Talbot M. (1998): *Physical Education: Contested Positions, Competing Discourses – The Need for Renaissance?* European Physical Education Reviewer, vol. 4, issue 2, 104–116.
- [24] Whitaker K. (1972): *Root and Branch: Some Thoughts on the Teaching of Physical Education*. British Journal of Physical Education, vol. 3, no. 5, 46–47.
- [25] Znaniecki F. (1973): *Socjologia wychowania*, t. 2. PWN. Warszawa.
- [26] Znaniecki F. (1987): *Pisma filozoficzne*. PWN. Warszawa.

Deklaracja braku konfliktu interesów

Autor deklaruje brak potencjalnych konfliktów interesów w odniesieniu do badań, autorstwa i/lub publikacji artykułu *The importance of metaphysics in the theory of nontrivial physical education – Polish tradition*.

Finansowanie

Autor nie otrzymał żadnego wsparcia finansowego w zakresie badań, autorstwa i/lub publikacji artykułu *The importance of metaphysics in the theory of nontrivial physical education – Polish tradition*.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author declared no potential conflicts of interests with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of the article *The importance of metaphysics in the theory of nontrivial physical education – Polish tradition*.

Funding

The author received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of the article *The importance of metaphysics in the theory of nontrivial physical education – Polish tradition*.
