FATHER FIGURE AS FOUNDATION OF PHILOSOPHICAL DISCOURSE

Tomasz Drewniak, Ewa Smolka-Drewniak

University of Applied Sciences in Nysa, Armii Krajowej 7, Nysa 48-300, Poland

Abstract

The paper presents a critical analysis of the relationship between the ideas of philosophy (philosophical language) and the figure of the father (spiritual, institutional, divine). The philosophical discourse reverses the natural attitude of man towards the world and introduces the idea of spiritual fatherhood (Apollonian religion, figure of the divine father and relationship based on logos, non-corporeal filiation of man), constitutes a new form of humanity that transcends the natural relationship with existence (needs, consumption, work). Philosophy shifts man from the world of apparent appearances into the world of life in truth and also makes displacement in man himself - corporeality, affection and desire are subordinated to reason. Philosophy - if its basic discursive formula is the question about the sense of being as a whole and the sense of humanity - is associated with the loss of being in the world, its intelligibility, and at the same time opens the sphere of freedom, history and shaping humanity. Thus, philosophy goes beyond phenomenal and symbolic obviousness, showing its incoherence and inhuman character, opens the world as a sphere of free and rational human activity, at the same time transforming the world of everyday life, orienting it on life in truth and goodness.

The research method rely on the analysis and interpretation of the philosophical, linguistic, psychological, religiological and sociological conceptions. Particular issues are thus highlighted through confronting them with the analyses and works of Plato, Nietzsche, Schelling, Bachofen, Heidegger, Patočka, Lacan, Eliade, Legendre, Bauman, Sennett, Maffesoli, Lakoff. As a consequence, the figure of the father – placed, on the one hand, in the context of the question about the genesis of European culture and metaphysics, on the other hand, utilising diagnostic models of their current state, appear to be the basic hermeneutic tool of postmodernism crisis of value and identity.

Keywords: *father figure, mother, metaphysics, care for soul, responsibility*

1. INTRODUCTION: THE DISCOURSE ON ORIGIN AS THE TRANSGRESSION OF THE ANTINOMY OF MODERNITY

Modernity, which seeks validation of philosophy through being in confrontation with the decomposition of the pre-modern image of the world and social order, the development of science and technology, the crisis of the holistic sense as well as its metaphysical and religious discursive form, radicalizes the tendency of philosophy to understand itself. The hermeneutic process is fulfilled through the construction of a narrative form which carries the antinomies growing on the ruins of the "lost world" into its founding moment, becoming at the same time a story of a fall and a new beginning [1]. This trail of thoughts toward the beginning is also attempting to discover its split, into - as is the case of Friedrich Nietzsche's *The Birth of the Tragedy* and *Philosophy in the Tragic Age of Greeks* - two forms of discourse. The first one, is closely related to myth and tragedy; the second one, initiated by Socratic separation from traditional ethos and Plato's idealism. The former in this interpretation model is a forgotten and true source of philosophy, the latter leads directly to rationalism and the crisis of modern culture and modern humanity. In their interaction, a discourse unfolds revealing loss, descent in oblivion, obliteration, exclusion, and at the same time leading to the assimilation of what is located outside metaphysics, revealing the conditions of its creation, as well as discursive- and problem-related transformation.

2. DISCURSIVE FATHERHOOD AND PHILOSOPHY

This dichotomy clearly puts us before the problem of filiation in philosophical discourse, and more broadly filiation as such. Hence, the question is: Who is or who is supposed to be a discursive (spiritual, institutional) father? How is filiation established? What is fatherhood and how does it fit into the relationship between European culture and philosophy? Where is the mother figure situated? In the case of Nietzsche, a demarcation line is drawn between the Greek tragedy and Heraclitus on the one hand, and Anaximander, Parmenides, Pythagoreans, Socrates and Plato on the other hand [2]. The first party, as it is known, is associated with the affirmation of existence as becoming, oneness of suffering and joy, development and destruction. The second party, holds directly onto the negation of a given world, ultimately leads to nihilism. Thus, the split between the beginning and the father figure includes the split between the purpose of history and the form of European humanity: the superman is the *telos* of tragedy; the *telos* of metaphysics, Platonism and Christianity – "the last man". In each filiation line, the image of the father moves, while his distribution movement is also a movement to bring to light the final consequences of the founding act. From the very beginning we see legitimate fatherhood with heritage, but without inheriting (tragedy) and unlawful fatherhood, transforming the proper position of man in relation to existence and implanting nihilism (Socrates). That is why Nietzsche's Zarathrusta, responding to the experience of losing paternity "mad man", proclaiming "the death of God", moves the filiation line into the sphere of tragedy, and at the same time activates its heritage to lead to a superman. Generalizing: the movement of sense takes place in a filiation relationship, and fatherhood includes both *arche* and *telos*, a reference to the beginning and fulfilment. The father communicates what is initial and at the same time obliges to assimilate and develop it. He also conveys the attitude to the whole existence – he is not only a teacher but a master – a spiritual person leading to moral, social and institutional adulthood.

To understand the relationship between philosophy and the idea of fatherhood, we may use a metaphor. The philosophical language is not the original language, the language in which we experience the world and ourselves. Even if we are professional philosophers then we immerse ourselves completely in the sphere of experience in the horizon of everyday life and related care. When entering a room, we head towards a chair, we sit down, we lean back, we take notes, we use a computer. We are not asking about the way these things exist, about their relationship with my being. They are already in the world, and we am among them, we are interested in how to use them. The language in which we came into the world and which we speak fluently "matches" things, is enough to articulate their use, confirms my position in the world.

Philosophy introduces discontinuity in my being in the world and in the language describing it. The original philosophical experience - for example wonder (Plato), doubt (Descartes) or anxiety (Kierkegaard, Heidegger) - is associated with temporary loss of speech, being on the edge of language, with the necessity to activate otherness, allowing to express what lies beyond the horizon of experience and everyday speech. *Apeiron*, as the first technical philosophical concept, has already the above character: after all, in the world we experience things with more or less clear boundaries. Philosophy is not a simple translation of the original experience of the world into the language of abstract concepts, it opens up a different way of experiencing the world and expressing this experience, as it appears in relation to the Other, to Being. Along with this experience, humanity is reoriented to participation in the horizon of truth and good [3].

At the same time, this experience must be entwined with the original experience of difference and its symbolic expression. While being in the world, we are already in this difference, the matrix of all differences. The ontological difference is mediated by the difference between mother and father as centers of symbolic constellations of what is similar and different, conditions of being at home and displacement. On this difference is based the possibility of articulating the difference between beings and Being [4]. The father, as psychoanalysis shows, is the "Great Other" separating the child from the mother [5]. It is an image of the non-corporeal, and thus of the discursive, institutional and symbolic order. The father figure as the symbol of spiritual, institutional leader separates the child from its family and leads it to maturity. The father appears as the second one, remaining distant and disturbing – he is no longer "dad", mother's doubler. He ceases to appear as a complement to the mothers world,

but as someone radically opposed to it - a stranger [6]. The father separates from the calmness of being at home, familiarity, from the presence of things while directing beyond them and within himself. It introduces the border between the child and mother, between the child and its surroundings, and with it the "depth", directs the look beyond and towards the inside, and therefore towards the invisible. Differentiates what is explicit apparent and what remains apparent to reason and as such binding. The discursive father, therefore, belongs to the order of the word and sense, another word and another sense, empirically absent, but at the same time, as an ideality, binding on itself, revealing holistic meaning. Therefore, he moves to the principle of reason and dissimilarity.

3. PHILOSOPHY AS ACT OF LEAVING THE MOTHER'S WOMB: THE METAPHOR OF THE CAVE

Philosophy attempts to discover experiences conditioning the discursive explication of the world. Phenomenology teaches that being in the world is realized through the eye and hand (Heidegger revaluated the meaning of hands in everyday experience of the world [7]) - hence the metaphors of seeing and producing become essential to philosophical discourse. Note, however, that the experience of unity with the mother is a more primary, pre-linguistic and pre-conceptual experience. Mother's metaphor as the “primary metaphor” organizes the initial way of feeling and conceptualizing the world [8].The womb (which can also manifest itself in mother, family home, family and neighbourly ties, ideology) protects the child from the world and in this protection enables the development of the fetus and then the child. Everyone is born, which results in painful separation from the mother and at the same time indicates earlier unity. This experience conditions our being in the world that initiates the act of leaving our mother's womb. This process has two stages: the first one is birth, the second one is separation from the mother's breast. The further steps – already taking place within the language and in presence of the father – are shaping identity and independence. Each of these steps is associated with suffering, loss of confidence and security. This intuition appears in philosophical discourse - the Greeks’ original experience of being was referred to as *physis* (nature), and thus giving birth, emerging from secrecy, ruling, returning to secrecy. The mother also rules beyond unity with her offspring – by giving life, she puts us in the daily nutrition process and care for preserving existence, but also she gives death, situates man in the unity of opposites.

In this perspective, when we look at Plato’s “allegory of the cave”, it brings images of darkness, close relationship, closeness and unconsciousness. Chained people are looking at the pictures and are as if in a dream in which act of looking has pushed away all critical consciousness. They are located entirely within entities. They remain - as Heidegger noted in his lecture of 1929 - in a situation of peace (*Geborgenheit*), since they are secretive of the truth, they do not know the anxiety of self-care connected with the care for a soul [9]. Outside the maternal womb, man is faced with the unconcealedness of being, and at the same time with his own problems. The transition to the area of light – act of leaving the mother's womb - is at the same time an experience of loss of security and protection, on the other a constant longing for safety. Hence, this movement is associated with the suffering of separation, ignorance and growth. A philosopher who travels up and down is depicted by Plato as a model of a spiritual father who not only transforms his own life, but is responsible for his companions who remained in the cave. The spiritual father is a guide on the road to full humanity, living in the light of truth, which is possible only in community [10]. This return after his comrades to the cave as the mother's womb means the philosopher's full initiation into the role of the father [11]. He does not plunge into darkness and ignorance, but motivated by responsibility leads them to light. Philosophy establishes a new kind of community in which the ideal of rational life that goes beyond the physical world is based on the practice of virtues. Virtues relate man to the eternal existence of ideas and transform his existence into infinite existence in the light of Good.

In the mythical mother world, the ontological difference remains hidden, the question of being as a whole is absent, which triggers the experience of groundlessness, loss of support in being. Jan Patočka, identifying the desire to return to mother's womb as something that is orgiastic and demonic, notes: "The cave is a remnant of the subterranean gathering place of the mysteries; it is the womb of Earth Mother. Plato's novel idea is the will to leave the womb of Earth Mother and to follow the pure

"path of light", that is, to subordinate the orgiastic entirely to responsibility. Hence the path of the Platonic soul leads directly to eternity and to the source of all eternity, the sun of "The Good"" [12]. It is worth noting that enlighten and brightness are part of Greek religion of the Apollonian order, establishing clear boundaries of human existence, and at the same time calling on man to control himself and to light himself. Philosophy fits into the Apollonian thread, replacing the religion of the mother with the religion of the father and son, demonic and orgiastic character of returning to the beginning of the whole existence, maintaining the difference between the sacred and profane, god and man, good and evil.

In essence, there are two symbolic universes and their two references – mother and father – which manifest themselves in the phenomenal order. Two ontologies correspond to them: the centre of the first ontology is occupied by the concept of becoming (unity of birth and death) whereas the other one is constituted by the category of non-carnal existence – ideality. Those ontologies are related to two types of symbolic universes, which are in constant tension: the discourse of corporeal existence (the primacy of maternity) and the discourse of ideal existence (the primacy of fatherhood). The symbolism of body and empirical existence implies erotic disorder in orgy whereas the symbolism of spirit and ideal existence is related to order of conscious life.

4. MOTHER AND RETURN TO THE BEGINNING

According to the Greek mythology and phenomenology (M. Heidegger, J. Patočka, M. Merleau-Ponty) the original form of being a human in the world is the experience of belonging to the Earth, *physis*, inscribing human life in the rhythm of the world around him. In this experience there is an echo of the relationship with the mother. Hence, there is a symbolic interference: the Earth is like the mother, and the mother is like the Earth. Mother Earth gives birth to gods, man and nature. In this horizon, it is not only the original, but also inseparable designation that penetrates thinking, emotions and the human body. Man – as expressed by the chthonic myth, tragedy and pre-Socratic concept of *physis* – emerges from the Earth, goes beyond it and returns to it again. The whole of existence is enclosed in the eternal circle of birth and death, the eternal return of the same and to the same.

This relationship is also reproduced within the individual life of a human being oscillating between everyday life and what is demonic, the dominance of *principium indivituationis* and total loss (reminiscence of motherly bliss). The central figure for demonic orgiasticity is the mother and the rites are associated with exceeding the norms constituting a society, as well as a peculiar identity, which is expressed through madness. Therefore, the "I" turns out to be secondary to the temporarily present source layer, remains filled with longing for a return to itself, and humanity appears to be external and transient towards the inhuman or beyond-human core of the world. "To the life which is bound to itself, to the self-bondage of life, there belongs an orgiastic pendant, life engendering what we cannot procure and what is not at our disposal. For that reason the orgiastic dimension is not absent simply because responsibility as such is not discovered or taken into account, where we avoid it, but, rather, there it becomes pressing. Its inevitability and its rule extend from the "primitive" natural peoples to our own day" [13]. Escape from the burden of everyday life, work and individual responsibility is also the nullification of the meaning of the human world, meaning as such. This annihilation aims to revitalize meaning and protects, as Nietzsche has already demonstrated in relation to Dionysian orgiasticity, man against the senselessness of existence. The truth of what is demonic is a reversal of the first words of the prologue of the Gospel of John: In the beginning there was chaos, no difference and no sense. This chaos, the nullification of difference and norms must return so that life regains its creative power [14]. The Great Mother kills in order to be able to give birth later or as Nietzsche expressed it in reference to the sentence of Heraclitus: a playing child destroys to create, i.e. "builds up piles of sand only to knock them down again" [15].

The idea of discursive spiritual, divine fatherhood is placed within the fundamentals of metaphysics and introduces the non-carnal link and, along with it, the emerging difference. The position of a son implies the activity "on behalf of the father", which is in essence the development of the father's ideality. Maternity refers to the corporeal presence of the Premother, whose epiphenomenon is the

mother. The fiction of spiritual (divine, institutional) fatherhood separates people from the archetype of the eternal repetition of the same thing [16] and from "the practice of metaphysical/sexual rites, which during festivals, unit the community with God's jouissance" [17]. Moving it from the sphere of the myth into the order of history and politics allows to conquer nature discursively and technically to establish the life-world as the sphere of the authentic existence.

5. TRAGEDY AND ANTINOMY OF THE MOTHER'S WORLD

The mythical world is built on the dichotomy of the mother figure: it provides both home and intimacy [18], on the other hand, as a force inscribed in human nature and the reality that surrounds it, it suddenly destroys the order of life. Her rule therefore extends to the whole of existence which she accumulates. Everyday life, i.e. being outside the womb, is inevitably associated with suffering and destruction. Man cannot strengthen his self-reliance, independence from the nascent and absorbing power. Opposites become combined in this world, and pass smoothly from one to another: day and night, life and death, good and evil, knowledge and ignorance, gentleness and cruelty, reason and madness, everyday and holiday, being holy and cursed [19]. The discursive form expressing this dualism are the sentences of pre-Socratics, and the narrative form is tragedy. The basic principle of tragedy is – hidden in what is extreme – the need to turn into one's opposite. Oedipus, the saviour of Thebes, causes their misfortunes, ignorance is inscribed in his wisdom, his life unfolds in the unity of good and evil. The opposing element does not come from the outside, but – as Patočka notes – is located in the very interior of being. "Notice that history of madness begins with the most elementary things in our *physis* (nature), it begins where man flourishes and where he finds fulfilment. Suddenly something like that can break through in life everywhere. That means we feel that in our revealing as people there is constantly the element of what can drive us from one path to the other. We are left to blind wandering" [20]. The myth is antinomical, it plunges man into a growing contradiction, the duality of the light and dark sides, good and evil [21], which is expressed in tragedy: "This duality is at home in all myths. This is not something that belongs, we might say, just to myths, but rather to myths, as long as it belongs to the natural world as the world of good and evil" [22].

Tragedy belongs to the myth as such [23], inscribing man in the circle of birth and death, despite the similarity clearly separating him from the immortality of the gods. It is a world devoid of hope for that what is different will become present. At the same time, this duality is experienced as holiness (Oedipus) [24], as it expresses the order of the world as such, the sense of "the ordinary blind wandering" [25]: "Those two sides of the world of our revealedness that belong together like day and night. Heraclitus' teaching lies in just that: to hold these two things that are separated otherwise, constantly together. This is that the unapparent connection is stronger than the apparent one (fr. 54)" [26]. Man belongs to the myth in such a way that the myth defines him in his entirety, structuring his action and thinking: he plays a predefined role, reaching into the sphere of what is inhuman and what constitutes the world's warp. At the same time, he remains unclear to itself – the sense of the role can only be articulated, when it is played to the end, when nothing can be changed, happen any other way. The myth is the umbilical cord from which man derives his vitality, and at the same time cannot separate himself from, as it retains man within himself, subjecting him to the rule of eternal return. The predetermination that characterizes the myth is that it makes everything apparent, that the answers exist in it before the questions, that its logic reveals and makes this mythical *a priori* more tangible, bringing man to understand and assimilate what *is* not only there but what he *already knew*. Hence – if we recognize the myth of Oedipus as paradigmatic – we know from the beginning who Oedipus is: his parents know it, this knowledge is also given to him by the oracle in Delphi. In the course of events, *he becomes what he actually is*. In the myth, therefore, man is expressed in its entirety, and his individual existence only confirms the general truth, while doing it indirectly, i.e. against the will of the protagonist himself. Therefore, he cannot change the course of events, and all actions lead to fulfilment of destiny. Hence, the myth clearly shows the discrepancy between intentions and action, as the uncritical awareness of being in the world is located between them. Man is given the knowledge of the difference between good and evil, but at the same time he is given ignorance of such implementation of good that does not result in evil.

The myth of Mother-Earth or discourses that invalidate a rational subject express human aspirations for rooting, belonging to the whole and sense of security. This rooting in the environment and community is sought by man at the physical and emotional level [27]. It encloses him – as it can be read in *Oresteia* of Aeschylus – in the bosom of necessity, domination of the past and fall, revenge and madness. Patočka exposes the dialectics of all myths, beginning with ancient mythology, through the myth of Enlightenment (reason and technology), and ending with poetic and philosophical attempts to revitalize mythical worldview in a new mythology [28]: the myth introduces man in the world, and at the same time subjects him to destructive and inhuman power. Myth finally reveals the triumph of nothingness over being [29].

6. EUROPEAN CULTURE AND FATHER FIGURES

In this perspective, Western European philosophy and culture can be understood as an overlap of genealogical lines of paternity that lead man beyond tragedy, beyond what is demonic and orgiastic by re-establishing the relationship of discursive paternity, moving the mother's son to the position of his father's son. We can name a few examples of fatherhood, characterizing the founding fathers and the associated orders of meanings: Orestes, who kills his mother, separates himself from the primacy of the law of family revenge, a relationship of blood in favour of a relationship involving linguistic-volitional relation; Aeneas, who loses his wife in the burning Troy, and at the same time brings out his father and son, hence, he maintains and transforms his identity, becoming the founder of Rome; Abraham, whose name expresses a new identity, because, unlike his father, he obeys God's call to wander to Canaan, becoming at the same time the father of many nations and the father of faith; Socrates transforming bodily eroticism into the pursuit of learning ideas and shaping virtues; Christ revealing God as a merciful Father and through his sacrifice establishing sonship in the Son of the divine Father. Filiation occurs in the father-son matrix, where the father calls his son to commit sacrifice due to directness (attachment to place, desire, pleasure, life), while introducing his son into the order of intangible sense. In all discourses, fatherhood coincides on the one hand with separation from what is given and originally binding, reformulation of humanity and the establishment of a new type of community. The father's action consists of reversing tradition, linking leadership and inheritance to priority birthdays. Thus, the figures of father and son combine Greek, Roman and Jewish origins of Europe, they are connected with each other - according to Pierre Legendre [30] and Alain Badiou [31] in the universality St. Paul’s, or, more broadly, universal Christianity, based on incorporeal filiation of man.

Taking a closer look at the figure of Socrates, which is - as Nietzsche correctly pointed out – he renders to be a reverse of Oedipus as Dionysian hero: Socrates knows that he does not know and this ignorance protects him from falling, while Oedipus does not know that he does not know. Socrates thus places himself outside the myth and what is tragic as areas of ignorance, as well as matrices of action. The found sense of everyday moral concept is not valid for him as such, it requires justification and reference to reason. His being determines the question [32] that leads to the transcendence of being and the experience of the boundary associated with ignorance: “Greek philosophy – as Patočka explains –creates a relation to the whole that is not ordinary; it wants to penetrate behind the ordinary blind wandering, or behind the ordinary unclarity and unawareness in which we move, it wants to penetrate behind that we turn away from this revealedness” [33].

Nietzsche saw a clear image of Socrates' fatherly and therefore destructive position in the face of the tragic structure the decomposition of which conditioned the constitution of rational, unbound and responsible subjectivity. It is the principle of reason that frees man from entanglement in the tragic knot of action and life, from subordination to the unconscious, from the vastness of suffering and the depths of madness. Socrates becomes a spokesman for the authority of reason, and thus also paternity against the tragic masks of Dionysus, whose crucial moment is to turn against paternity - Oedipus murders Laius, and Prometheus questions Zeus's authority, announcing at the same time “the death of the god”. Both figures are located outside the law, and therefore outside the order, belong to a world in which “All that exists is just and unjust and is equally justified in both respects” [34]; to the order in which the contradiction and its destructive power over man are valid. Socratic questions move the

contradiction from the ontological structure of the world into a sphere of ethos and ignorance, and therefore a wrong human attitude towards the world, a relationship that can be reoriented on the basis of knowledge. Knowledge means caring for the soul, caring for virtues, and everything about self-control. Socrates, therefore, implements the Apollonian call to know himself, while Oedipus remains in the power of aggression and pride. Therefore, he does not direct himself, but is directed by these forces. At the same time, Socrates - by problematizing life as a whole and himself - is losing support and being rooted in the mother world of myth. He faces, as Heidegger puts it in the lecture above, in front of "the non-existence of what is being and groundless" (*das Nichtsein des Seienden, die Grundlosigkeit*) [35], but then he also steps into the light, his existence becomes brighter, because he looks at himself from the perspective of the other (no-demonic *daimonion*).

In philosophy – the figure of Socrates as a spiritual father is a model example – there is the formation of the care for the soul (*epimeleia tes psyches*) and responsibility, which is a response to the father's call to be himself in transcending the body and the world given in experience. In the symbolic dimension, the philosophical discourse (as a father discourse), which is establishing a hierarchical opposition between what is bodily-affective and what is intelligent, distributes it simultaneously between the oppositions: Earth-Sun, East-West darkness-brightness, mother-father, becoming-being, phenomenon-essence, body-mind, matter-spirit. Therefore, the father metaphor becomes a figure that shifts man (son) into the realm of truth and reason. The West, where the constitutive roles are played, according to Bachofen, by the Apollonian religion and the Roman law – separates from the East [36], as does the cutting of the umbilical cord separated the child from the mothers, and the image of father separates the child from the mother's rhythm of satisfying the needs and feeding. In the Greek tragedy, the process of human reorientation (breaking of the primordial relationship with Mother Earth) is presented as the murder of the mother and the purification of the mother-killer by Apollo (purification not only of guilt but also of madness). Orestes must annihilate himself as a mother's son in order to become a father's son. Culture, as the Polish philosopher Henryk Elzenberg claims, is based on a hero who gives his life for others and for whom the values associated with life become secondary to the spiritual values symbolized by the figure of the father [37]. Hero, faced with his own weakness, suffering and the violence of chaos, becomes a proper image of male initiation, of transposition from position of mother-son to position of father-son and then to position of the father of sons (Aeneas). The hero as the spiritual father sets the bond between life and the sphere of values and meaning through self-sacrifice, as Socrates did.

7. CONCLUSIONS: DECONSTRUCTION OF THE FATHER'S FIGURE AS A DECONSTRUCTION OF HUMANITY

As Michel Maffesoli highlights, modernity combines Dionysian orgiasticity with instrumental reason, the demonic sphere with rationally organized work [38]. The discursive return of Dionysus as the son of the Great Mother is correlated with the decline of father presentation, with the "death of God-Father", with the transformation of a human being into a "technical animal" [39], into the "last man", into romantic personality [40] with its narcissism and cult of intimacy and sexuality [41]. As a consequence, the modern "return of Dionysus" – as a figure of what is not metaphysical or what is pre-metaphysical and post-metaphysical at the same time – does not revive the figure of fatherhood and serves its deconstruction, liberating the instrumental mind and the hedonistic mind from the references towards ideality and the order of values, liberating pleasure from duty. The care for the soul was replaced, as Z. Bauman points out, by the care for the body as a centre of human identity [42]. The figure of the Great Mother is embodied in the "cathedral of consumption" where according to G. Ritzer "we are increasingly consumed by consumption" [43]. The result of modern emancipation is "fatherless society" [44], the deepening absence of the father in a symbolic and real dimension, the disappearance of responsibility and commitment, lack of emotional and social maturity, rejection of authority, "flight from the sacred" and "flight from judgment" [45], nihilism and depersonalized desire [46]. The gesture of patricide (also obliteration of an image of the divine father) is simultaneously a gesture of self-destruction [47]. Depriving life world of the father's centre moves human being into the sphere of the game of power, which he activates but which he cannot control: "When meaning has

become a function of power, rather than of manifestation, transcendent restrictions on man's possible actions disappear as well. Eventually, even the human self becomes the victim of this techno-mechanistic reduction. The human individual is no longer treated as a soul, the sacred locus of meaning-fulfilment. He became a bundle of resources, to be exploited and 'optimized' for the sake of an anonymous and over-arching will to power, Patočka calls 'Force'" [48].

The figure of the "return to the East" ("the return of Dionysus") as if reverses overcoming the East (corporeality, enthusiasm, eternal return to the decline of order), on which the West was established: there is no West beyond metaphysics, spiritual and institutional fatherhood. In the neo-pre-metaphysical or post-metaphysical discourse what can be observed is the "hiding" of the West, the blurring of *telos* which organized the spiritual and institutional world of the European culture, the replacing of the figure of *ratio*, implemented by the rational and merciful Father with the irrational fatherhood or the "orphaned" world without fathers (postmodernism as the violence of unlawfulness). In this world without fathers, what has become the dominating rule is the nihilistic being for oneself, understood as increasing one's strength, enhancing one's being and - at the same time - the hysterical search for the Law [49], for violence as the only tool of creating sense. The death of father, the deconstruction of father figure immerses man in the myth which starts to be played on various levels of life [50], in the discursive and institutional spheres, with the return to the beginning (so typical of myths), to the state of chaos and violence. The figure of Apollonian fatherhood, on which the philosophy is based and which has been embodied in the ideal of virtuous community, separated the human being from the bloody terror of the myth (a series of demonic, divine fathers and mothers) as well as from Nietzsche's "the wisdom of Silenus" [51] (senselessness of existence) or tragedy of "liquid modernity" [52].

REFERENCES

1. Habermas, J 1998, *The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity. Twelve Lectures*, Polity Press, Cambridge, pp. 83-105.
2. Nietzsche, F. 1998, *Philosophy in the Tragic Age of Greeks, Regenery Publishing, Washington,* pp. 46-90.
3. Husserl, E 1965, *Phenomenology and the Crisis of Philosophy*, Harper & Row, London, pp. 160-178.
4. Heidegger, M 2011, *Seminare Hegel-Schelling*, Vittorio Klostermann, Frankfurt am Main, p. 752.
5. Lacan, J 2006, *The Mirror Stage as Formative of the I Function*, in J Lacan, *Ecrits*, W.W. Norton & Co. New York-London, pp. 75-81.
6. Simmel, G 1964, '*The Stranger'*, in K Wolff (ed.), *The Sociology of Georg Simmel*, Free Press, New York, pp. 402-408.
7. Heidegger, M 1977, *Sein und Zeit*, Vittorio Klostermann, Frankfurt am Main, p.137.
8. Lakoff, G, Johnson M 1999, *Philosophy in the Flesh. The Embodied Mind and its Challenge to Western Philosophy*, Basic Books, New York, pp. 45-59.
9. Heidegger, M 1997, *Der deutsche Idealismus (Fichte, Schelling, Hegel) und die philosophische Problemlage der Gegenwart*, Vittorio Klostermann, Frankfurt am Main, p. 353.
10. Plato 1997, 'Republic', in J M Cooper (ed), *Plato Complete Works*, pp. 1132-1138.
11. Eliade, M 1958, *Rites and Symbols of Initiation*, Harper & Row, New York, pp. 51-52.
12. Patočka, J 1996, *Heretical Essays in Philosophy*, Open Court, Chicago and La Salle, p. 104.
13. Patočka, J 1996, *Heretical Essays in Philosophy*, pp. 99-100.
14. Elide, M 1959, *Cosmos and History: the Myth of Eternal Return*, Harper Torchbooks, New York, p. 88.

15. Nietzsche, F. 2007, *The Birth of Tragedy and Other Writings*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, p. 114.
16. Elide, M 1959, *Cosmos and History: the Myth of Eternal Return*, p. 108-112.
17. Lacan, J 2013, *On the Names-of-the-Father*, Polity, Cambridge, p. 88.
18. Patočka, J 2002, *Plato and Europe*, Stanford University Press, Stanford, pp. 44-45.
19. Patočka, J 1996, *Heretical Essays in Philosophy*, p. 13.
20. Patočka, J 2002, *Plato and Europe*, p. 45.
21. Patočka, J 2002, *Plato and Europe*, pp. 44-45.
22. Patočka, J 2002, *Plato and Europe*, p. 46.
23. Patočka, J 2002, *Plato and Europe*, p. 46.
24. Patočka, J 2002, *Plato and Europe*, p. 49.
25. Patočka, J 2002, *Plato and Europe*, p. 50.
26. Patočka, J 2002, *Plato and Europe*, p. 50.
27. Patočka, J 1998, *Body, Community, Language, World*, Open Court, Chicago and La Salle, pp.143-161.
28. Frank, M 1982, *Der kommende Gott. Vorlesungen über die Neue Mythologie I,* Vittorio Klostermann, Frankfurt am Main, pp. 153-216.
29. Patočka, J 2002, *Plato and Europe*, p. 44.
30. Legendre, P 1989, '„Die Juden interpretieren verrückt". Gutachten zu einem klassischen Text"', *Psyche*, vol. 43, pp. 20-39.
31. Badiou, A 2003, *Saint Paul. The Foundation of Universalism*, Stanford University Press, Stanford, p. 42.
32. Heidegger, M 1997, *Der deutsche Idealismus (Fichte, Schelling, Hegel) und die philosophische Problemlage der Gegenwart*, p. 356.
33. Patočka, J 2002, *Plato and Europe*, p. 50.
34. Nietzsche, F. 2007, *The Birth of Tragedy and Other Writings*, p. 51.
35. Heidegger, M 1997, *Der deutsche Idealismus (Fichte, Schelling, Hegel) und die philosophische Problemlage der Gegenwart*, p. 356.
36. Bachofen, J J 1948, *Das Mutterrecht. Eine Untersuchung über die Gynaikokratie der Alten Welt nach ihrer religiösen und rechtlichen Natur*, Meuli, Basel, pp. 63, 974-975.
37. Elzenberg, H. 1990, 'Naród i ojczyzna. O polskim narodzie. Katharsis', *Etyka*, vol. 25, pp. 78-79.
38. Maffesoli, M 1993, *The Shadow of Dionysus. A Contribution to the Sociology of the Orgy*, State University of New York Press, Albany, pp. 17-157.
39. Heidegger, M 1989, *Beiträge zur Philosophie (Vom Ereignis)*, Vittorio Klostermann, Frankfurt am Main, p. 98.
40. Sennett, R 2002, *The Fall of the Public Man,* Penguin Group, London, pp. 259-340.
41. Giddens, A 1992, *The Transformation of Intimacy. Sexuality, Love and Eroticism in Modern Societies*, Stanford University Press, Stanford, pp. 176-182.
42. Bauman, Z 2006, *Liquid Modernity*, Policy, Cambridge, pp. 76-80.
43. Ritzer, G 2005, *Enchanting a Disenchanted Word: Revolutionizing the means of consumption*, Pine Forge Press, Thousand Oaks, p. X.

44. Mitschlerich, A 1970, *Auf dem Weg zur vaterlosen Gesellschaft*, R. Piper & Co. Verlag, München, pp. 146-366.
45. Scruton, R 2012, *The Face of God*, Bloomsbury, London, pp. 163-164.
46. Houellebecq, M 2002, *Platform*, Vintage International, New York, pp. 174-175.
47. Iwanow, W 2001, *Ukierunkowania ducha współczesnego*, in J Królikowski (ed) *Neopogaństwo. Nowe czasy – stare idee*, Pallotinum, Poznań, p. 101.
48. Doms, M 2018, 'Spiritual Leadership and Dissidence. Roger Scruton and Jan Patočka on Care for the Soul in the Modern Era', MPhil Thesis, KU Leuven, Leuven, p. 22.
49. Houellebecq, M 2015, *Submission*, William Heinemann, London.
50. Schelling, F W J 1857, *Philosophie der Mythologie*, J. G. Cotta, Stuttgart-Augsburg, pp. 170-611.
51. Nietzsche, F. 2007, *The Birth of Tragedy and Other Writings*, pp. 22-23.
52. Bauman, Z 2008, *Liquid Times. Living in the Age of Uncertainty*, Polity, Cambridge, pp. 5-26