

MIROSŁAW MICHALIK

Pedagogical University in Krakow
Faculty of Humanities, Institute of Polish Philology
Department of the Polish Language

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9260-3014>

The subject of logopedics. Methodological sketch

INTRODUCTION

The following text is supposed to initiate a series of methodological logopedic sketches, which are sometimes studies, or essays, often revisions of existing judgements, and frequently voices providing a brief sketch of the theoretical problem, whose aim is to encourage an already deep reflection¹. And even though the idea to work on something resembling metalogopedics as part of Polish speech therapy in the third decade of the 21st century, which already has the actual status of science, may seem unfortunate, redundant, separated from patients' real problems, non-mainstream, characterised by excessive dialectics, or even – after skimming the reviews of some readers – sophistic, I have deliberately decided to take it up, fully aware of the risk. Why?

First of all, I believe that logopedics, in order to strengthen its status as science, apart from describing and interpreting logopedic facts by means of sentences about reality (practice level) and adapting various scientific theories to diagnostic-therapeutic needs using sentences about sentences about reality (science level), deserves to climb up a level still higher – metatheoretical, metascientific, which is created by sentences about sentences about sentences about reality (cf. Bobrowski 1993; as cited in:

¹ The planned cycle is entitled: *Logopedyczne szkice metodologiczne*.

Życiński 1983). Speech therapy as a whole has an embedded structure – on the outside there is the most conspicuous practice, under which there is science, containing a metascientific, methodological nucleus. For some it is just a hard pip in a sweet and juicy fruit, but for others it is the tiniest stunted matryoshka. I am fully aware of the fact that this methodological, metascientific casket, lying at the bottom of the two others, i.e. practical and scientific, usually seems the least tempting, being perceived by many with pity and generally not deserving exploration effort. At the same time, I have a conviction bordering with certainty, that without it the other two are empty, like “church without God.”

Second of all, building a metalogopedic, i.e. metascientific / metatheoretical reflection, which strictly correlates with speech therapy as a field of science, while being only indirectly implied by diagnostic-therapeutic practice, strengthens the status of the former one. By no means is it about treating the so-called practical logopedics and the so-called theoretical logopedics as areas which are permanently and mutually isolated. However, sometimes this method, a kind of interpretation trick could be necessary. Already some years ago, Franciszek Gucza, who was building up his concept of metalinguistics, the main inspiration for my concept of metalogopedics, claimed that the separation of the two aspects – practical and theoretical – is an indispensable condition to assess the links between them. (cf. Gucza 1983, 43). Certainly, I admit that a separatist cognitive radicalism is a temporary and ‘laboratory’ approach, since, “science and practice condition each other and are mutually interdependent,” as Gucza suggests (1983, 43). Despite all that, such an approach in times characterised by the relativisation of borders between interpreting facts and decisive inclination of contemporary Polish speech therapy towards practical solutions, might prove interpretatively fruitful. On the other hand, if I follow Max Scheler’s theory that science is built of two cooperative layers: “the state of free people who are capable of contemplating, and the state, which in a rational way has collected experiences of working people and craftsmen” (1990, 144), I will not resist the temptation to create metatheory, as a man who is tired of work and crafts, but absolutely free and willing to contemplate.

Third of all, I would like these considerations to add merit to the two types of conclusion methods, connected with each other, which are undervalued in logopedics: deductive (verificationist) and falsificationist. Inductionism, which is still dominant in Polish logopedics, serves practice well, at the same time frequently helping the unaware – or, even worse – in some ways scientifically cynical authors to blur the boundary

between itself and science. Science cannot be built, contrary to the ideas of the unaware or cynical, on induction only, because, it is always substantiating (reliable) deduction, as the number of detailed circumstances is always limited (even if that number was very big). There is no certainty then that these detailed sentences, which we took into consideration while concluding, were not contradicting our conclusion, as Ireneusz Bobrowski claims (1998, 22). At this point I can only hint that induction is sometimes perceived as 'the creation of rhetorics', 'sophistics of illusions permeated by metaphysics' (cf. Popper 1977, Życiński 2015, 135-136). My verificationist method of deduction, which uses certain falsificationist procedures, apart from building metalogopedics, is also supposed to contradict completely new ways of quasi-induction, derived from post-modernism that are adequate first of all for the anarchist concept of knowledge, according to which "everything is allowed, because what counts is the recipients' taste" (Paul Feyerabend), and second of all, the concept of deconstruction (Jacques Derrida), which often comes down to constant production of new texts that may be treated as scientific (cf. Bobrowski 1998). Verificationism and falsificationism, integrated in methodological considerations, could be the remedy for that.

The last two motivations to undertake metalogopedic studies are of personal character. Being a practitioner speech therapist, I entered the world of science a quarter-century ago under the safe wings of Professor Teodozja Rittel, a theoretician and methodologist of logopedics, as well as a careful and warm look of Professor Jan Ożdżyński, a linguist and theory expert. Now, that they are gone, even if I wanted to, I cannot think in a different way than they did. And finally, I have to mention, as a modest person, the last but not least important motivation. In September 2019 I received from Professor Stanisław Grabias a copy of the fourth edition of *His Język w zachowaniach społecznych* with a dedication, whose fragment I would like to quote here: „Twoją misją jest budowanie teorii logopedii. Trzymam kciuki” (Your mission is to build the theory of logopedics. I will keep my fingers crossed). I cannot afford to let down the Professor of Professors by letting him keep his fingers crossed for too long.

TOWARDS METALOGOPEDICS

The reflection upon the subject of logopedics is of metascientific character, since I am trying to describe some part of scientific reality in an 'overbuilt' way. After fulfilling research assumptions, that is to say

accomplishing a metascientific description of selected phenomena of logopedics as science, the objective contents of cognition, a framework of metalogopedics might arise. The first phenomenon to describe is the subject of logopedics.

Referring to features and principles of organising scientific and meta-scientific reflection, I would like to declare that the digressions undertaken to build a certain metatheory, possess the following attributes: 1. They are of conditional and negotiable character; 2. The solutions are incomplete and burdened with the risk of error; 3. The illustrated subject of reflection is open, it is developing and may encompass new fields; 4. There is a possibility to apply in it the paradigm of falsificationism, although it is constructed, above all, in the spirit of verificationism and deductive science.; 5. There is a strong endeavour to accomplish logical cohesion and consistency of the theory; 6. They maintain neutrality towards axiological systems and, in accordance with the neopositivist² paradigm, to which I will frequently refer to, they try to be only a pure description, the observation of facts; 7. In attempts at answering the question about the essence of described phenomena of logopedics as science, I make a radical withdrawal from simplified rational imagination and intellectual schema; 8. The undertaken reflection only makes sense on the basis of the conviction that the development of logopedics as science must be accompanied by methodological reflection, which is of *ex post* character; 9. The conducted research is of transcendental³ character, that is to say it crosses the boundaries of experience (Pilch, Bauman 2010; cf. also Aduszkiewicz, ed., 2004; Bobrowski 1998; Michalik 2018; Popper 1977; Tatarkiewicz 1993b; Życiński 2015).

The above-mentioned conditions place the suggested metatheory on the side of science, rather than ideology. Although there are numerous similarities between ideology and science (including collections of preliminary convictions/assumptions, putting forward a system of notions and ideas, qualifying the relationships among notions, processes), the constructed concept of metalogopedics: does not offer full certainty, is not constant, closed, finished, does not avoid testing and falsifying, is not subject to axiological evaluation due to the subject of reflection, at the same time locating itself in opposition to ideology (cf. Pilch, Bauman 2010).

² I treat neopositivism quite instrumentally in the categories of a certain classical pattern of metascientific reflection, to which I will refer frequently, looking for interpretational inspirations, however, not approving of it completely.

³ Although the noun 'transcendent' is of the same origin as 'transcendental', they mean something different. The former one refers to such demonstrations which exceed the limits of experience, while the latter – to those which exceed the limits of the subject and apply to objects (Tatarkiewicz 1993a, 165).

In turn, Zygmunt Hajduk, differentiating between ideology and science, claims that "Ideology differs both from science and world-view. It contains directives for fulfilling particular requirements of social class. Ideology always demands loyalty and obedience, imposes directives which concern the scope of research and research methods" (Hajduk 2007). At this point I need to apologise in advance for my lack of obedience, loyalty and rejection of many directives, as well as no sighs over metaphysics, even the most tempting one⁴.

Moreover, it must be mentioned that nowadays – due to the alleged failure of rational metascientific theories – referring to externalism, which emphasises links between substantial content of science and external conditions of its development (historical, social-cultural, psychological), extra-rational factors are considered more and more frequently (Życiński 2015, 179-180). Since Polish logopedic reflection *de facto* has not so far used the potential of internalism, in which the content of theory and scientific judgements is determined by internal content of their rational justifications (Życiński 2015, 180), I do not see the need to reject *a priori* the substantive, rational content of science for the sake of its external conditions. If internalism, with its verificationism, falsificationism, rationality, focus of attention on pure facts, but also cognitive radicalism, a tendency to polarise attitudes, will fail in the process of creating metalogopedics, it will probably be externalism that will enter the methodological scene, with its contextuality, culturality, psychologism and extrarational weakness towards metaphysical factors.

Distinguishing and characterising particular phenomena of metalogopedics, e.g. the subject of logopedics from the title, I must confront them with logopedics as science *sensu stricto*, which includes logopedic scientific work and its products. Logopedic scientific work and its products constitute speech therapy as science *sensu stricto*; they are its essence, a scientific core. Logopedic scientific work, referring to the general theory of science and the concept of metalinguistics, is divided into: scientific cognitive work and scientific transference work. The aim of the former one is to gain knowledge, namely collecting in the mind of the subject scientific information about the object of cognition, while the goal of the latter one is externalisation, expressing by the subject of science collected scientific information and making it available to other subjects (Grucza 1983, 31; cf. also Michalik, Horyń, Olma 2021).

⁴ I understand metaphysics in science analogically to neopositivists. Knowledge which is not certain and true, which does not serve the prognostic function, as claimed by Moritz Schlick, "is only a senseless emission of sounds, gibberish, it is metaphysics" (as cited in: Muszyński 2006, 39).

As far as the question of scientific output is concerned, the concept of Grucza's metalinguistics accepts the knowledge about the subject of cognition as the most important effect of every science (1983, 60). Other products of scientific work include: 1. methodology, i.e. metascience about scientific methods and research methods, in other words – gnoseologic basis of science, theory of scientific methods; 2. scientific methods, namely all of the ways in which truth can be attained, as well as its conceptual representation; 3. research methods, i.e. ways of obtaining research material; 4. terminological system representing the knowledge about the object of particular discipline, as well as conceptual network describing it (cf. Czarnecki (ed.) 2009; Hajduk 2007; Michalik, Horyń, Olma 2021; Zieliński 2012).

To develop the methodological issue, which in my opinion is the most important one of the four creations of logopedics as science *sensu stricto*, and to postulate certain solutions, I think that the methodology of speech therapy, as a relatively new branch of science, which has a dynamic and active dimension, should first of all deal with the process of building a theory, and only then with the results of the process. It would be good if it became a theory of scientific methods, which describes and clarifies the applied methods and praxeologically evaluates the justified and designed research solutions. (Hajduk 2007). At the same time, I am convinced that logopedics, as science *in statu nascendi* needs more the methodology of constructive and descriptive, rather than critical and normative character (Puzio, Ziółkowska 1998; Życiński 2015). To sum up, I suggest that the methodology of logopedics, which belongs to the order of metascience, serve the following functions: constructive, descriptive, to a lesser extent critical and normative (Puzio, Ziółkowska 1998), gnoseological (Grucza 1983), praxeological (Hajduk 2007) and verificational (Hamerlińska-Latecka 2016). In order to serve them, it must possess a dynamic and active dimension (Hajduk 2007). I treat the subject of speech therapy as the object of this type of logopedic methodology.

THE SUBJECT OF LOGOPEDICS IN THE LIGHT OF EXTERNALISM

Even though in the above section I talked about the externalist model of science rather critically, the subject of speech therapy is the category, whose preliminary description requires the consideration of social, cultural, and even historical contexts. It results from the fact of colloquial understanding of the category which is dominant in logopedics, but whose

peak of theoretical advancement is the judgement that the object exploring some reality is a man conducting cognitive acts (cf. Czarnocka 2017, 285).

The growing popularity of speech therapy as a professional activity, whose purpose is to provide help to the needy, as well as the social prestige of the profession, its attractiveness and the ever-increasing availability of logopedic services in our country, leads to the consolidation of its status as important, useful, desirable and lucrative. These factors, by building a particular atmosphere around logopedics, strengthen its practical aspect, which is re-established, or even constituted by the above-mentioned phenomena. This trend is similar to a torrential river, which attracts to speech therapy more and more entrants, who get involved without fear, but with pride and, frequently, with a feeling of superiority over other humanistic or pedagogical professions. However, at the initial stage of the trend there is a deep reflection upon the procedures and strategies of logopedic process in the field of therapeutic activities that has a long tradition, which some people seem to forget about. (Grabias 2012, 59–60). This trend is characterised by the following aspects: social, institutional, utilitarian, praxeological, economic, but also populist and mercantilist (cf. Michalik, Horyń, Olma 2021).

The symptoms of the latter, as perceived by the so-called ‘people dealing with logopedics’, may be noticed already at the stage of educating speech therapists. An overwhelming majority of students approach the practical aspects of the field with approval, or even enthusiasm, looking for uncomplicated methodological solutions, which do not require any cognitive effort. On the other side, which is rapidly outweighed, there are theoretical subjects, strictly linguistic or methodological, and even medical. The consequence of this academic trend are << the judgements about reliability >>of their<< therapeutic methods that unlike others, guarantee success, which are popularised by >>salesmen of logopedic therapy<< (Grabias, Panasiuk, Woźniak 2015, 9), the fact which was clearly and bravely emphasised for the first time by the editors of the coursebook *Logopedia. Standardy postępowania logopedycznego* (2015). Speech therapy is supposed to be easy, result in quick profits, add prestige through scientific glamour and colourful.

The practical trend of Polish logopedics clearly dominates and is more and more expansive (Michalik 2015, 32). The subject of logopedics shaped in this way seem to be speech therapists-practitioners. However, it is not true, since assuming the gnoseologic thesis that cognition objects are dependent on cognizing subjects, in a way implied by their point of view (por. Grucza 1983: 12, 25), means that the subject of logopedics is

determined by a broadly understood group dealing with logopedics or having a more or less close relationship with it. This group constitutes not only speech therapists-practitioners. Apart from them, logopedics is also a field of interest for patients and their families, publishers of logopedic aids, owners of Internet portals about logopedics, organizers of trainings and courses for speech therapists, postgraduate studies, administrators and moderators of thematic groups on social networking sites. The last four groups, bearing in mind the financial aspect, are becoming more and more influential and are striving to determine ever-new frameworks for logopedics, in this way redefining its subject. Redefining is frequently accompanied by blurring its borders, relativising its essence or negating – in the name of popularising activity and the simplicity of message serving ‘ordinary people’ – its scientific character. Moreover, assuming an epistemic thesis about the role of cognizing subject in distinguishing the cognized object (Grucza 1983: 12, 25), must incline to ask the question what will be the scope of logopedics if it is defined above all by manufacturers of logopedic aids, organisers of easy and pleasant pop-scientific trainings, owners of logopedic portals, or bankrupt (extremely mercantiled) professors and PhD’s, for whom academic titles and degrees are a guarantee of desired income and proper rate of expanding influence zones? (Michalik, Horyń, Olma 2021).

TOWARDS INTERNALISM

Abandoning the interpretation of subject of logopedics in a different way than is done as part of the so called practical logopedics is not an easy task. First of all, in the case of positions heading for metalogopedics, reasonable thinking and argumentation are abandoned. Second of all, this category is strongly embedded in a broadly understood epistemology (descriptive and normative), but may also be the object of reflection in cognitive psychology, sociology of knowledge, cognitive science, or even neurophysiology. Third of all, the emphasis is placed on the thesis about the superiority of logopedics as science *sensu stricto*, which comprises logopedic scientific work and its products, and whose main role is the scientific cognitive work which serves the gaining of knowledge, i.e. discovering reality. The outlined context makes the metareflection concerning the subject of logopedics quite hermetic. This hermetism develops even more when – in accordance with the third condition – the subject of logopedics as science *sensu strico*, which primarily discovers reality – will be equalized with the subject of cognition in general. Consequently, the reflection

upon the subject of logopedics must be embedded, not to say submerged in the epistemological reflection upon the subject of cognition.

The paradigm in which the commonsensical attitude to the subject of cognition is abandoned, but the role of external factors that shape this subject is strongly and nontranscendentally emphasised, is the sociology of science, that is a branch of sociology analysing links between conditions for the formation of knowledge and science (context) and its content, which is known in the USA as social epistemology or constructivism. Although it is Karl Mannheim (1893-1947) that is regarded as the founder of this trend, the concept of subject of cognition by Max Scheler (1874-1928), based on the theory and sociology of culture, as well as anthropology, seems to correlate well with the constructed theory of the subject of logopedics. According to the thesis about ontic superiority and primality of society over human individual, the process of cognition is not treated as an act, and then the result of individual actions, but rather society, or at least, act and/or result, in which social factors, including the so-called social subject, e.g. society of scientists, are one of the conditions for cognition and gaining knowledge (Czarnocka 2017, 98, 106). In the field of sources of knowledge and cognition, Scheler is the author of two internally incoherent implications. According to the first one, the so-called weak, social conditioning is weak because social factors do not intervene in the form or content of cognitive results, but rather co-influence them. As far as the second (strong) one is concerned, social factors determine the forms of cognition, since originally they constitute the very subject of cognition. The interpretation of the strong implication sounds a bit like social constructivism (Czarnocka 2017, 112-113). In an attempt to solve the interpretation impasse, it is worth mentioning the name of Scheler himself, who claims that the basis of cognition is an individual man, but there is no 'I' without 'we'. In turn, 'we' is the so-called collective subject of cognition, which may assume the status of 'spirit of the group', which is the consciousness of intellectual elites, or the soul of the group, personifying impersonal 'social downs' (Czarnocka 2017, 115). The lexis of this antiegalitarianist interpretation may offend, however if it is enriched by the thesis, according to which each cognitive act is of spiritual-impulsive and ideal-realistic nature, it creates in turn a certain social-epistemological system. Its interpretation could be a thesis according to which "the basis of cognitive processes are instinctive but spiritually processed directives of the naturalistic subject, i.e. the one belonging to nature, however not completely, as it is accompanied by elements of group spirituality, which permeates the individual subject and conditions its acts." (Czarnocka 2017, 115). To sum up, the

chosen aspects which construct the status of subject of cognition according to the sociology of knowledge by Scheler, it is worth mentioning one more thought: the easiest way is to produce the kind of knowledge which satisfies human interests (Scheler 1990).

Implications for metalogopedics and logopedics as science

Avoiding flat constataions and simplistic analogies, undoubtedly it is worth paying attention to a few aspects of Scheler's sociology. Firstly, the subject of logopedics may be of collective character. Secondly, sometimes it could be the consciousness of intellectual elites, i.e. 'the spirit of the group', however, more frequently it is a glint of a shapeless 'soul of the group.' Thirdly, it turns to us its instinctive face too often, which results not in objective knowledge but the one that satisfies interests.

THE SUBJECT OF LOGOPEDICS IN THE LIGHT OF INTERNALISM

Internalism in epistemology places emphasis on theories and scientific judgements determined by internal content and cohesion of their rational justifications (Życiński 2015, 180). It also allows to exceed the borders of commonsensical empirical subject, without which the constructed metatheory would get stuck at the most at the level of theory.

Internalism is inscribed in: the theory of cognitive subjectivity by Kant, the subject of cognition according to Neo-Kantians, as well as the approach to the subject of logopedics itself, which derive from the concept of metalinguistics. The choice of these three approaches of epistemological character is quite arbitrary, motivated by my subjective interests, however, undoubtedly in the centre of my interests is the subject of cognition and the subject of science. The followers of Neo-Kantianism develop and modify the thought of Kant, an epistemological classical philosopher, whose theory of cognition is regarded as the peak of philosophy about the category of subjectivity (Czarnocka 2017, 89), while the concept of metalinguistics was already used as the inspiration for metalogopedics which was just being constructed (cf. Michalik 2015).

The object of cognition in Kant's epistemology

To introduce the topic, it must be emphasised that Immanuel Kant's research (1724-1804) was of transcendental character because its purpose was to find presentations which would exceed the limits of the subject

and apply to objects (Tatarkiewicz 1993b, 165)⁵. Already in this statement it is visible that the commonsensical, pre-philosophical perception of reflection, in the centre of which there is a judgement that man is the only subject of cognition, is negated.

The topic of Kant's object of cognition/knowledge, may not be investigated without referring to at least five theses which organise the whole output of the philosopher: :

1. As part of the transcendental, or critical philosophy, Kant conducted two types of assessments – empirical assessments obtained on the basis of experience, i.e. *a posteriori*, and the ones independent of experience, which originate in the mind itself, i.e. *a priori*; the former ones are more important, common and necessary;
2. The key role in epistemology is played by *a priori* judgements of synthetic character, that is the ones which in statement, contrary to analytical judgements, express something more than results from the semantics of subject, they have the power to expand the scope of knowledge;
3. As a starting point for the transcendental theory, Kant chose the axiom about the existence of science as an objective entity, which might only be analysed by philosophy;
4. There are 'two trunks of cognition', i.e. senses, thanks to which we come into contact with the subject of cognition, and mind, which makes it possible to understand them and possesses the ability to create notions and draw conclusions;
5. Cognition was divided into two factors – form (more important) and matter. The form is the basis of a priori knowledge. (Tatarkiewicz 1993, 165-174).

As far as the theory itself is concerned, despite remarks about its ambiguity and something like unknowability, resulting from the fact that it is "a thing in itself" (Czarnocka 2017, 30-31), it shows itself as inspiring, also in the context of the constructed theory of the subject of logopedics. What results from it for sure? Firstly, the guarantee of cognition is only the transcendental subject (*transcendental Me*), rather than the empirical subject (*empirical Me*). The former one is the representation of a pure rational being of the subject, while the latter represents a corporal, animalistic aspect of human existence. The transcendental subject is a kind of construct, a formal figure, which is not a realistic image of man who cognises. It is

⁵ cf. note no. 3.

constructed through aperception, which is a pure feeling and necessary condition for knowledge, and according to Ernst Cassirer, a representative of Neo-Kantian Marburg School, it is the self-consciousness which is of logical character (following: Czarnocka 2017, 12-16). The cognitive process of the transcendental subject takes place thanks to synthesising impressions, however synthesis is not grouping and matching, but processing and unifying (Czarnocka 2017, 26).

Implications for metalogopedics and logopedics as science

In order to construct metalogopedics, or logopedics as science, one must not identify its subject in the categories of a real man who cognises a fragment of the world empirically. The subject of logopedics uses a priori judgements, while the cognition of logopedic reality (the object of logopedics) is of formal character. The subject of logopedics must possess self-awareness of logical character, while its cognitive activity goes beyond grouping and matching; since it is capable of unifying and processing. Thanks to that, it may generate new knowledge, mainly due to synthetic judgements, certainly a priori.

The subject of cognition according to the Neo-Kantians

When constructing the basics of analytical philosophy and the foundation for linguistic paradigm, the Neo-Kantians developed the spirit, rather than the letter of Kant's philosophy. Their radical antipsychologism, epistemic fundamentalism, but also objectivity and weeding out the notion of awareness from the transcendental subject, became the guarantee for creative transformations in the heritage of the Progenitor from Królewiec (Czarnocka 2017, 57-58).

Studies into the subject of cognition/knowledge were undertaken most of all by the representatives of the so-called Baden School: Heinrich Rickert (1863–1936) born in Gdansk, and Bruno Bauch (1877–1942) from Lower Silesia, as well as the members of the so-called Marburg School: Paul Natorp (1854–1924) and Hermann Cohen (1842–1918)⁶. For example, Rickert, who claimed that any subjective approach is shameful in science, based his concept of the transcendental subject on the idea that at the stage of constructing it is preceded by psychophysical and mental subject. The guarantee of objective cognition is the epistemological subject, which is of universalised character. In turn, Bauch thought that the objective (tran-

⁶ Ernst Cassirer is also associated with the Marburg School, while the Baden School is connected with the universities in Strasburg and Heidelberg.

scendental) subject which correlates with the object of cognition, is the condition for obtaining objective knowledge. The transcendental subject, as opposed to the empirical (psychological) is – as I mentioned before – objective, but also non-psychological, non-personal, and even unreal. It might be conceptualised in matrix categories, cognitive perspective and the structure of meanings, the last of which gives it a linguistic dimension. To compare, Natorp, identifies the cognitive psychologism with subjectivity in general, while the object of cognition, according to him, are not phenomena (contaminated by subjectivity), but the rights, which the transcendental subject gains through objectivising phenomena. On the other hand, Cohen treated that subject, which was a collection of logical acts, in the categories of a notion that links the principles of thinking with cognitive methods and procedures. Following Cassirer, the subject of cognition is a function, which connects various symbolic capabilities of human mind, is of logical character and is an equivalent of the transcendental unity of apperception (as cited in: Czarnocka 2017).

Attempting a certain synthesis of Neo-Kantian views in the scope that is interesting for me, it must be emphasised that the appropriate subject of cognition must be a transcendental subject. It is a cognitive matrix, a system of notions, a structure of meanings, an entity which is of logical character and which connects the principles of thinking, cognitive methods and procedures, which generates simultaneously content and importance of cognition. It enables to learn the laws, which are – contrary to phenomena – the proper subject of science; it conducts cognitive processes, i.e it is the creator of knowledge; it enables the cognition of the world (Noras, Kubalica (red.) 2011).

Implications for metalogopedics and logopedics as science

The subject of logopedics should be the maker of objective knowledge about the subject of cognition; knowledge resulting from the laws of logics, connecting the principles of thinking, cognitive methods and procedures into a coherent system. It may not be of personal, but rather abstract character, separated from experience and the so-called common sense; in accordance with transcendental reasoning, it should have the ability to exceed its own borders in order to conduct autoanalyses and directly reach the object of cognition – logopedics as science.

The subject of logopedics versus the concept of metalinguistics

Scheller's sociology of knowledge emphasised that the subject of cognition/science could be a collective subject. As part of externalistic

approach, I described it in detail in the first section of the text. To sum up, I would like to point out that it is about people who are concerned with the so-called practical logopedics (not necessarily only speech therapists), who by expressing their views on logopedics, determine its object.

Apart from the described subjects of logopedics, this field is also in the area of interest among people of science, however - statistically speaking - rather infrequently. Who are they? According to Grucza, "a real scientist may only be a person who performs scientific work *sensu stricto* and possesses the qualifications which are necessary to do it" (1983, 38). In other words, "a scientist is a person who performs, above all, creative cognitive and transferential work" (Grucza 1983, 36). The issue of qualifications seems to be quite simple to interpret. A short list of academic degrees and one title which are respected in Poland should basically dispel all the interpretation doubts, but the fact that "in Poland it is still impossible to obtain a PhD or habilitation in logopedics because it is not mentioned on the list of scientific disciplines" (Tarkowski 2018, 403), does not facilitate the situation. A Polish academic speech therapist is most frequently a PhD or habilitated doctor in the Humanities (linguistics) or pedagogical (special needs education), possibly a professor in the Humanities and simultaneously speech therapist - from a realistic perspective - having completed postdoctoral studies. There is no balance or proportion in this kind of configuration. It is the tradition of treating logopedics as a speciality or specialization that is to blame in this situation - it is the effect of recent years - a political trend towards connecting, rather than separating scientific disciplines and fields of study (cf. Tarkowski 2018, 403; cf. also Michalik, Horyń, Olma 2021).

An even more complex problem, in the context of status of the subject of logopedics, concerns a logopedic dissertation, including a cognitive and transferential work, which are the components of science *sensu stricto* (Grucza 1983: 19). In my opinion, only restricting the scope of logopedics and limiting its frames to a narrow understanding of science as academic work (serving mainly cognitive and transferential purposes), as well as its output (above all methodological and terminological solutions), may protect its autonomy and essence against the expansion of too broad, uncontrollable and expansive group of subjects, including people who do not undertake scientific work or produce methodological solutions, but who give themselves the right to determine the object of logopedics. Such subjects of logopedics, even if they pay attention to science in a narrow meaning, *sensu stricto*, seem to appreciate in scientific work only a transferential purpose, striving for "[...] externalising, or expressing through

a given subject collected scientific information and sharing it with other subjects" (Grucza 1983, 31). Only the cognition of the basic task of science, that is trying to cognise reality and gaining knowledge, may prevent the phenomenon of taking over 'the right to logopedics' by subjects of logopedics and institutions, which despite being more and more numerous, do not contribute to the development of logopedics as science (as cited in: Michalik, Horyń, Olma 2021).

Referring directly to the theses of metalinguistics, I think that the subject of logopedics as science differs from the subject of logopedics in general. It must be assumed that the scope of the former is narrower. To my mind, the subject of logopedics are people who deal with logopedics as science – science *sensu stricto*, whose components are academic work and its products. The subject of science, including logopedics, may be individual, but the collection of all individual subjects is a general subject of science. In the theory of science also a collective subject is distinguished, which is located between an individual and general subject. Group subjects and the general subject are collective subjects (cf. Grucza 1983, 36). From the perspective of undertaken works, we can distinguish in the theory of applied linguistics: the subject of creative cognitive and transferential work (of a scientist), the subject of cognitive reproductive work (of a student / pupil), the subject of reproductive transferential work (of a teacher) (Grucza 1983, 36-37). Perhaps very soon, as a result of the division into research and didactic academics, which is spreading, the former group will be separated into two smaller groups: subjects of creative cognitive work (researchers) and subjects of creative transferential work (didacticians). Undoubtedly, the key role in creating logopedics as science should be assigned to the subjects of creative cognitive work.

Each type of subject of logopedics as science – individual, group and general, being at the same time always the subject of creative cognitive work – in order to be one, must perform scientific work and construct its products.

Implications for matalogopedics and logopedics as science

The subject of logopedics as science, which may be identified with epistemological, transcendental subject, deals with creative cognitive work: it may be individual, group or general and fulfills three tasks: performs scientific work, brings to existence its products (methodology, scientific methods, research methods, terminological system) as well as distinguishes, determines and formulates its object.

SUMMARY

Knowledge about the subject of cognition is the most important effect of all types of science, including logopedics (Grucza 1983, 31, 60). This kind of knowledge is produced by the subject of cognition by conducting cognitive processes. If this is supposed to be knowledge concerning the subject of cognition, it must be acquired by the subject of cognition as science. Being a follower of descriptive, rather than normative methodology and metascience, I have not indicated what it must be like. In the paper, I have only mentioned what it may be like.

If the subject of logopedics is supposed to belong to the order of science, rather than practical activity, its description must be conducted from the meta-level, namely metalogopedics. Following the most hermetic and transcendental approaches, i.e. Kant's philosophy and Neo-Kantians, the transcendental subject of logopedics (epistemic subject) uses synthetic a priori judgements, and the cognition of logopedic reality is of formal character. The subject gains knowledge which derives from the laws of logic and connects in a coherent system the principles of thinking, methods and cognitive procedures. It must possess self-awareness of logical character, and its cognitive activity goes beyond grouping and matching as it is capable of unifying and processing. It is not of personal but abstract character, it is separated from experience and the so-called common sense. Following transcendental reasoning, it should have the possibility to exceed itself in order to conduct autoanalyses. It is a certain type of cognitive matrix, a system of notions, a structure of meanings.

Referring to the sociology of knowledge, it can be stated that the subject of logopedics may be of collective character, sometimes is the awareness of "the spirit of the group", "intellectual elites". Unfortunately it possesses an instinctive character, which satisfies the needs of individuals and groups.

On the other hand, following a metalinguistic approach, the subject of logopedics is seen as epistemological, transcendent and transcendental; it deals with creative cognitive work, it may be individual, group or general and fulfills three tasks: performs scientific work, calls to existence its products (methodology, scientific methods, research methods, terminological system), and distinguishes, determines and formulates its object.

The presented concepts certainly evoke various reactions of readers. They show the problem of the subject of logopedics, as shaped from the perspective of metalogopedics, descriptive logopedic methodology,

as well as epistemology of logopedics. The confusion of readers, which I fully justify, should be briefly summarised by means of a verbalised desire: I have a dream that logopedics will gain an unquestionable status of science *sensu stricto*. Without metalogopedic reflection, that goal will never be accomplished.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aduszkiewicz A. (ed.), 2004, *Słownik filozofii*, Warszawa.
- Bobrowski I., 1993, *Językoznawstwo racjonalne. Z zagadnień teorii językoznawczej i metodologii opisów gramatycznych*, Kraków.
- Bobrowski I., 1998, *Zaproszenie do językoznawstwa*, Kraków.
- Buczynska-Garewicz H., 1993, *Koło Wiedeńskie*, Toruń.
- Czarnecki K. (ed.), 2009, *Nowy leksykon metodologiczny*, Sosnowiec.
- Czarnocka M., 2017, *Koncepcje podmiotu poznania we współczesnej filozofii*, Warszawa.
- Grabias S., 2012, *O ostrość refleksji naukowej. Przedmiot logopedii i procedury logopedycznego postępowania*, [in:] S. Milewski, K. Kaczorowska-Bray (ed.), *Logopedia. Wybrane aspekty historii, teorii i praktyki*, Gdańsk, pp. 56–69.
- Grabias S., Panasiuk J., Woźniak T., 2015, *Wprowadzenie*, [in:] S. Grabias, J. Panasiuk, T. Woźniak (ed.), *Logopedia. Standardy postępowania logopedycznego*, Lublin, pp. 9-11.
- Grobler A., 2006, *Metodologia nauk*, Kraków.
- Grucza F., 1983, *Zagadnienia metalingwistyki. Lingwistyka – jej przedmiot, lingwistyka stosowana*, Warszawa.
- Hajduk Z., 2007, *Ogólna metodologia nauk*, Lublin.
- Hamerlińska-Latecka A., 2016, *Logopedia a metodologia badań nauk społecznych*, [in:] I. Jaros, R. Gliwa (ed.), *Problemy badawcze i diagnostyczne logopedii*, Łódź, pp. 19-34.
- Kołąkowski L., 2015, *Filozofia pozytywistyczna*, Warszawa.
- Michalik M., 2015, *Transdyscyplinarność logopedii – między metodologiczną koniecznością a teoretyczną utopią*, [in:] S. Milewski, K. Kaczorowska-Bray (ed.), *Metodologia badań logopedycznych z perspektywy teorii i praktyki*, Gdańsk, pp. 32-46.
- Michalik M., 2018, *Lingwistyczno-logopedyczne podstawy komunikacji alternatywnej i wspomagającej. Ujęcie metodologiczne*, Kraków.
- Michalik M., Horyń E., Olma M., 2021, *U źródeł polskiej terminologii logopedycznej. Podstawy teoretyczne i metodologiczne*, Kraków.
- Muszyński Z., 2006, *Założenia filozoficzne w koncepcjach językoznawczych*, [in:] *Metodologie językoznawstwa. Podstawy teoretyczne*, red. P. Stalmaszczyk, Łódź, pp. 38–56.
- Noras J., Kubalica T. (ed.), 2011, *Neokantyzm badeński i marburski. Antologia tekstów*, Katowice.
- Ostapiuk B., Pluta-Wojciechowska D., Grabias S., Woźniak T., 2018, *Dyskusja po dyskusji na konferencji w Chorzwowie, czyli o niektórych problemach logopedii w Polsce*, „Logopedia” XLVII, issue 1, pp. 369-398.
- Pilch T., Bauman T., 2010, *Zasady badań pedagogicznych. Strategie ilościowe i jakościowe*. Warszawa.
- Popper K., 1977, *Logika odkrycia naukowego*, Warszawa.
- Puzio A., Ziółkowska K., 1998, *Wybrane zagadnienia z metodyki pracy naukowej*, Katowice.
- Scheler M., 1990, *Problemy socjologii wiedzy*, Warszawa.
- Stępień A., 1982, *Elementy filozofii*, Lublin.
- Tarkowski Z., 2018, *Wizerunek i samoocena logopedy*, „Logopedia” XLVII, issue 1, pp. 399-407.

Tatarkiewicz W., 1993a, *Historia filozofii* (vol. 2: *Filozofia nowożytna do roku 1830*), Warszawa.

Tatarkiewicz W., 1993b, *Historia filozofii* (vol. 3: *Filozofia XIX wieku i współczesna*), Warszawa.

Zieliński J., 2012, *Metodologia pracy naukowej*, Warszawa.

Życiński J., 1983, *Język i metoda*, Kraków.

Życiński J., 2015, *Elementy filozofii nauki*, Kraków.