

PHILOSOPHY

ANDRZEJ PAWLUCKI

ORCID 0000-0003-1383-1754

University School of Physical Education in Wrocław (Poland)

e-mail: asp48@wp.pl

Olympic Opera

Submission: 14.03.2023; acceptance: 20.03.2023

Key words: Olympism, Olympic Games, art, philosophy of sport

Abstract

Problem. In this essay I take up the issue of sport and art. The craftsmanship in combat sports determines that warrior creates a work of art (Martial Arts). Similarly, every sport can be considered as the art of movement. But this is not the understanding of the relationship between sport and art. The problem is whether the Olympic Game itself (in the singular) can be recognized as a separate art in analogy to opera seria. The Olympic Game is art because it is a theatricalization of the drama of the life of a man of peace.

Method. In recognizing the Olympic Game as a work of art, the semiological and axiological criterion of symbolic culture was used. The Olympic Games of the naive phase – the utopian philosophy of Olympism – were compared to the realistic-objective phase – theoretically probable.

Results. It has been shown that the Olympic Game is a ritual stadium event that symbolizes the idea of a cyclical rebirth of life. The sports agonism itself, which ends in reconciliation in friendship, symbolizes Olympic peace. For these two reasons, the stadium Olympics can be considered a work of art *theatrum olympicum*. The difference between the truce as a state of warlessness in ancient Olympia and the Olympic peace was explained.

Conclusion. There is no axionormative continuity in the making of the art of the Olympic Games. The Olympic Game is a work of art telling about the misfortune of war, which is overcome not by the state of no-war (*ekecheiria*), but by a completely real conversion to the path of a decent life. The law of friendship is not confirmed when haters and supporters of war crimes infiltrate the stadium. The real destroyer of sports law, due to his moral disability, cannot have access to the sign reality of the Olympic Games.

Once, during my gymnasium school years, when I was ready for poetry, I found *Olympic Laurel* in my city's libraria shop, and soon after I dug out a pre World War II copy of the *Olympic Discus* from a heap of stall valuables. Both books were awarded medals at Olympic art competitions in Amsterdam (1928) and Berlin (1936). I was looking for something else that would organize my training practicality, and instead of sports *technē* I came across sports *poiesis* – presenting in verse and prose the runners of the Olympic stadium. The same runners as me, who make a sprinting movement to the finish line, are measured by the length of one stadium.

For Jan Parandowski, it was the young man Glaukos from the island of Chios, and for Kazimierz Wierzynski, the American seniors Charles Paddock and Arthur Porritt. Unexpectedly, I came across the characters of two different characters of the Olympic stadium: the ancient one in Olympia (476 BC) and the modern one in Paris (1924), which, however, had nothing to say to me about the practicality of training. And I would probably never have paid attention to the unique copies of the two Olympic medalists – which, by the way, the Polish language teacher did not include in her list of recommended reading – if not for the simultaneous award of the third Olympic

For citation – in IPA style:

Pawlucki A. (2023), *Olympic Opera*, “Ido Movement for Culture. Journal of Martial Arts Anthropology”, vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 56–67; doi: 10.14589/ido.23.4.7.

In other standard – e.g.:

Pawlucki, A. *Olympic Opera*. *Ido Mov Cult J Martial Arts Anthropol*, 2023, 23 (4): 56–67 DOI: 10.14589/ido.23.4.7

ring – announcing my participation in the Olympics – and the school distinction for participation in English Olympiad. The teachers did not know Olympism, and from the art itself they extracted only the works of the “only the right” literary current *socrealism*. The subject of art and sport did not exist, just as sport in general was not considered intellectually. And I doubt that teachers have heard about the Olympic art competitions with the participation of eminent Polish artists.

At one time, I became an Olympian of two identities: stadium and school. I did not study English, although I identified with an Olympian – probably because the teachers placed some finiteness of their expectations in the students’ Olympism. I did not participate in the Olympics either. I was becoming a sports Olympian, but I never became one.

As for sports in art, yes, during school and club years at the same time, I heard somewhere about the runners of ancient Olympia: that they were praised by poets and even elevated to the pedestals of sculptures of their figures. But it was not in art that I sought the truth about the athlete himself. I wanted to know how an athlete is muscular, and how he is to be trained. I did not need such a discovery, neither lyrical nor epic, but epistemic – from which I could derive the concept of the muscular apparatus of the runner and understanding the post-traumatic repair of the *musculus biceps femoris*. I was helpless, and I still wanted to run. In the search for extra reading, I have not achieved anything that would enrich my already poor sports *techne*. The question about sports *techne* remained forever unanswered because I prematurely stopped being a runner. When I left the sport, plagued with injuries, it no longer mattered how the *biceps femoris* was built, and what therapy was used to strengthen the muscle structures. Anyway, I didn’t ask for anything else, which would broaden the horizon of knowledge, even the historical and philosophical question of the origin of an Olympic runner. Nor did I notice that the *Olympic Discus*, as a historical novel, was written by an eminent epistemic authority, and the *Olympic Laurel* by a poetic authority. Parandowski’s work is a scientific work, and Wierzyński’s is an artistic work. Both works have been awarded Olympic medals in the field of arts and literature, and this is what they have in common; the function of the content differs: the former has a cognitive meaning, the latter a contemplative and emotional one.

1) The case of the *Olympic Laurel* – a poetic work – shows that empowered sport is an object of art. It does not show that sport is not art, but that it can be praised through the art of painting, sculpture or singing. On the principle that an artist who turns to the agonist distinguishes him in his work as one of the many possible objects of his story [Wierzyński 1928: 7].

2) The case of the *Olympic Discus* – an epic work – is quite different. Although, yes, it also shows that in

historical literature the Olympic agonism can, and in a way must be taken into account, by depicting the ritual in detail – on the example of the Olympiad of 76, 476 BCE. – reveals the presence of artists in the stadium itself; such as flute players and lutenists – starting the Pythian or Nemean games in the odeon. But in this case it can be seen that although the competition of singers, flute players, lutenists or poets has the characteristics of an agon, it does not belong to the “stadium art”. As nowadays, the Chopin competition is not a sport, even though the competitors are fair play in the proceedings. Nor can it be said that the ritual of the art competition in the odeon causally determines the stadium agonism of the athletes. Pankration and boxing also expressed craftsmanship, but they did not belong to beautiful activities. Which does not mean that the artists did not see the ugliness of the athletes as a subject for fine art. As Krapiec notes, “the product itself, and its criterion - generally called “beauty” (which also includes ugliness), come from the very subject making this type of cognition” [1996: 202].

However, the presence of artists in the agonistic games did not fundamentally change the stadium ritual of the event.

And finally, both cases show that sport is not art, but only art finds its confirmation. However, there is a third possibility of relating the world of art and sport, contained in the question of the Olympianist Sotion of Tarentum – a participant in the 76th Olympiad of 476 BCE, who said directly that running, pentathlon, wrestling and all competitions are art [Parandowski 1973: 87].

We will consider to what extent it is legitimate to consider sport as a field of art – not analogous to the existing ones, but quite separate and unique. Even more – art so different – that in order to understand its otherness, one had to use the metaphor of a symphony orchestra (below). Which is what Pierre de Coubertin did in the *Unfinished Symphony*. But even that was not enough to understand the idea of Neoolympism. Statesmen, princes, politicians and generals – aristocrats in general – did not understand the idea of the Olympics according to Pierre de Coubertin’s philosophy of Olympism anyway, and they identified the Olympic Games with the circus. Probably because they associated the Olympian nature with the circus theatricalization of the very art of the body of perfectionism – the then fashionable *Cirque Olympique* of the Franconi brothers. Nobody knew that the proper place for Olympic sport is not the theater, but the amphitheatre. A circus performer is entitled to an arena, and an athlete to a stadium. In this sense, neither the circus nor sport is theatre, because the actor is entitled to the stage. The circus arena is circular in shape, which is where the circus gets its name from.

The art of Olympic sport resembles each of the theatrical performances in a general sense, but it is not the identity of any of the theatres: the living word, pantomime or ballet. Yes, the Olympic Games is a the-

atricalization of the drama of the life of a man of peace – which will be discussed v but it has never been a dramatic theater. Even more, in the history of the theatrical arts, everything has already happened in modern times, with the exception of the art of the Olympic Games, which resembles each of the performing arts – remaining their analogue – but is also none of them. If we assume that the Olympic Games is an art in itself – synthesizing numerous forms of semiotic marking of the content of the Olympic libretto (the text of the action of the Olympic family) v then the only analogue of the art of the Olympic Games may be *opera seria*. It is not noticed that the Olympic Games are art in themselves only because – as it should be assumed – the definition of art was narrowed down in every consideration to recognized poetic works. The question was asked how much art is in sport, and most often – how much sport is in art. Of course, the issue of sport as art was not omitted, but in the decision, which incidentally redefined the concept of art, art was seen in the body beauty of the athlete and in his agonographic mastery of kinetic action. This consideration was enough, which is confirmed by the image of sport as the art of bodily beauty, presented by Pierre de Coubertin in *Ode to Sport*:

“O Sport, you are Beauty! You are the architect of this edifice of the human body, which, given over to low desires, is worth contempt for, and carved with noble effort becomes a cup of sublimity. The desired beauty cannot exist without proportion and balance, and you are the unequaled master of both, because you create harmony, you give rhythm to movements, you adorn strength with charm, and you imbue suppleness with power” [1994a: 65].

The athlete participates in the art of movement, but he is not the creator of an agonographic piece. Neither is the coach – although it might seem that both of them are the authors of the work of spatial staging of the dynamic agonist's body. The athlete and the coach seem to play instrumental roles in a symphony orchestra – performing a piece written by the composer. The image of the Olympic Games as a symphony orchestra is presented by Pierre de Coubertin – the author of the first libretto of the Olympics, written in the Olympic Charter and, of course, in the essays of his own philosophy of Olympism [1994b: 142].

The Olympics were invented by a dreamer who did not yet know that he was a utopian. When he wrote the Unfinished Symphony for voices, he had a new, happy world in mind [1994c:142]. He came to war-weary humanity with a plan for its moral and physical renewal – which he called *neolympism* – and intellectual renewal – which he called *neencyclopediaism*. The dreamer and social reformer intended to invite the representation of humanity from various parts of the world to the Olympic stadium, where the moral transformation of the Olympian towards the feeling of brotherhood in friendship

would take place in front of the audience. He created a world in his imagination that was nowhere to be found. Life in the world of Olympism would take place in reality, but at the same time in signs and metaphors. So that his stadium model can be transferred to real societies. The Olympic Games would consist of three acts – more on that below. What cannot be realized by ideologically politicized societies and thus fighting for their superiority, the peacefully tuned Olympic society creates the custom of celebrating after a successful transition from the affect of alienation to a state of higher emotionality. And precisely because the Olympic Games actually transforms the life of the stadium community into a rite of humanistic universalism – despite the fact that in the author's imagination the Olympic libretto was conceived metaphorically as a reality that did not take place – the Olympic Games is an ideologically engaged art. So let's not just ask about the relationship between sport and art – which is easy to prove – but about the sports and Olympic Games *en block*, i.e. a field of art that is completely independent; analogous but never the same as ballet or pantomime. The Olympic Games belongs to the art of opera by analogy, but only in that it is similar to the eclecticism of self-contained arts put together. Everything else: the signs, songs and works that make the stadium essentiality of the Games constitute the art of Olympic sport *per se*. The fact that the Olympic Games belongs to ideologically engaged art is determined by the fact that it is a utopian event created in the imagination of the author of the libretto – theoretically invalid – and in the changed realistic and objective version – theoretically probable. In both ontological approaches, the author of the imaginary social reality places an Olympic action hero who suspends literal life and arrives at a stadium saturated with signs symbolizing his destiny; he comes to correct evil by converting to goodness as the reason for the desired existence. The Olympian is to desire peace, so that life in conditions of reconciliation – as in a family – could finally be accomplished.

This figure reminds me – *mutatis mutandis* – of the legendary Adape, who was revealed to the erring “as a model for people” – being “a man of deep understanding and wisdom” [Sitchin 2018: 166]. The myth says that Adape was beautifully embodied. Of course, he had to meet such a condition with his appearance, since he was spiritually and materially similar to his divine donor. The Olympian must take care of his bodily beauty and moral virtues himself – which is revealed and commanded by the philosopher of Olympism in the libretto. If he did not comply with this condition, the just judge expelled him from the kingdom of Olympism.

If art consists in the fact that – as Antonina Klo-skowska claimed – “it expresses similarity to an event that could happen although it never happened, phenomena that never happened, introducing the human imagination into the sphere of similarity to reality, as well as into the

sphere of its negation, extraordinary, improbable” – this Olympic Games is a field of art independent of all others [1981: 174]. Various arts can semiotically support the art of the Olympic Games, which is actually done ornamentally, but indispensably. Which means that without the participation of a poet, composer, musician, vocalist, dancer and painter, the Olympic Games – deprived of the signs of the sacred – would resemble a common sports festival.

The three relationships between the Olympic Games and art can be described, in a somewhat simplified way, as follows.

1) Olympic sport is performed with the participation of art – which can be confirmed by every participant of the stadium community. Art in Olympic sport is present in signs and symbols to such an extent that – similarly to religion – it co-creates the ritual of the Olympics. Olympic sport – devoid of aesthetic and artistic message – would be an incomprehensible, meaningless social event. The artist sits in the Olympic stadium as one of the many audience members, and after coming back to it, he brings works of artistic expression: poetic, prose, sculptural, painting, musical or even architectural, to the space of semiosis of Olympism. Not only artists, but also former sportsmen bring to the culture of Olympic symbolism works and works they have created in poetry, painting or literature.

2) However, as to the participation of an Olympian athlete in art, the question about the art of sport itself becomes more important: is sport itself art, and the elementary question about the athlete – whether he participates in art because he is a stadium agonist and whether in connection with the image of agonographic dynamism produced by him – analogous to choreographic creation – he creates a work of aesthetic value, expressed in beauty, charm or heroism.

On the other hand, as for the inverse relationship: the presence of sport in art – art can be done without sport, not only Olympic sport, which only means that the athlete with his stadium world does not have to be the subject of an artistic work.

3) The issue of the identity of the Olympic Games with a work of art expresses the question whether sports Olympism is art, and specifically, whether the ritual of the Olympic stadium itself is a quest, as is the operatic ritual of theatricalization of the drama of life.

Assuming that the Olympic Games – understood as a ritual stadium event – symbolizes:

a) the idea of a cyclical rebirth of life (the Olympics is a sign of this idea),

b) and the sports agonism itself, which ends in reconciliation in camaraderie and friendship, symbolizes the Olympic peace, because peace is a trusting approach of agonists to each other – you can consider the stadium Olympics as a work of art.

The Olympic Games itself belongs to the operatic para-theatrical art because in its signaling semiosis,

which surpasses the need for literal transmission of content (which is precisely the hypertrophy of semiosis), in its philosophicalized libretto it tells a story about life without war. The philosopher of Olympism conveys to the Olympic family – gathered in *Theatrum Olympicum* – that when literal life is a war, one should turn away from the culture of death towards the culture of life, and at the same time reconcile oneself through actions symbolizing the idea of life. The philosopher explains that participation in the Olympic theater he imagines is as significant as sitting in an *opera seria*.

Why in a serious performance, and not some ludic one with the hallmarks of spectacular fun?

The reason is eternally the same: war, which prevents societies from proactive self-determination, and humanity – in the case of a global war – from remaining important in species continuity.

We will present a justification that will show the Olympic Games as a field of independent art.

Philosopher – creator of the libretto of the Olympic Games

Usually, the Olympic movement includes all nations, thanks to which the aspiration of moral renewal of humanity contained in its mission can be carried out quite realistically. For this reason, modern Olympism is neo-Olympism. Whoever comes to the stadium, finds a well-thought-out order, order “from above”. As the philosopher of Olympism postulates, an athlete is to bring both agonographic perfection – which is supposed to make him beautiful – and agatonic eminence – which will make him morally good. Thanks to both virtues, he will grow to the role of a master. The expected transformation will take place, which will announce the esthetician and ethics of the figure of the Olympian. An athlete will find the ideal of his character before he actually becomes an Olympian, because it does not depend on him how he was conceived. Similarly, a coach who has a directorial share in the actor’s mastery finds the convictions of the sports culture to which he must submit; in the same way as a theater director does to the playwright of a stage work. In *Theatrum Olympicum*, the equivalent of the playwright is the philosopher of Olympism, who acts through the director of all three acts of the show, as well as the director of the agonistic competition staged by the coach. Neither the director nor the actor has any influence on how they are conceived as characters for their role. The judge as the moderator of the agony was also conceived as the performer of his role. And even the spectator was also “invented” and even if he wanted to, he will not be able to denature his character. All the performers of the opera find a *theatrum mundi* space – arranged according to the rules of the culture of Olympic sport, already invented by the philosopher of Olympism

and “top down” in terms of norm, meaning and sense. All four of them find ready knowledge about their character, mental representation of their characters, remaining in the alliance of the characters of the director and the actor – co-performers of the given piece of the act of the opening ceremony, the act of the competition and the act of the closing ceremony of the Olympic Games. The rank and file athlete seemingly begins his own existence in the act of the stadium competition, not noticing that without the participation of the director his performance would not have taken place. The director is integrated with the actor and brings himself into the existence of the athlete. Both are integrated with the philosophical creator of the theater of Olympism – which they usually do not know.

It follows that in order for the Olympic Games to take place, it needs three if not four: the author of the opera libretto for all the works of the work, the director of each of the three acts (the opening ceremony, the competition ritual, the closing ceremony) and the actors of all parts, among which the agonist is foreground place. The athlete of the Olympic opera plays the role of the protagonist. And this means that the very script of the role of an athlete is given to him - whoever he is in the discipline and sports competition he is practicing – by the usually unknown composer of agonistic kinetics. The composer of agonism should not be identified with the philosopher, i.e. the author of the libretto of Olympism. The composer of the Olympic competitions of a given competition is a technology that designs the agonographic performance of the athlete. When the sports performer of the role introduces himself to the audience in kinetic action, he does not realize who the creator of his agonography is. Which of the shot throwers or high jumpers knows the composer of the technique of movement known to him, not to mention which of them realizes the dependence of their acting style on the kinesiological composition of their agony act; a composition creatively invented by someone and usually technologically probable. I do not know a sprinter who can identify the creator of the running technique from the starting blocks, or the biomechanical idealization of the kinetics of the subsequent phases of the run. You could also ask football players if they know the creators of football strategy and tactics, and swimmers about the creators of swimming styles. And so on almost endlessly – every agonographic thought is taken by the athlete from the coach, and both find it as a ready-made kinesiological solution, including choreographic and musicological, when it comes to artistic sports. Every act that an athlete exhibits in a stadium is preceded – in a logical order – by the creative thought of the composer of agonic kinetics. When the coaching director considers the achievement of the athlete’s form of action to be in line with the ideal – in the sense of optimizing the kinetic chain – it can be said that the athlete shows ingenious, and therefore pre-

cise action. An observer may say that an athlete performs an agonic task with artistry. In this dimension – the compatibility of the act with the agonographic composition – a sporting act becomes art, and more generally and in a certain simplification, the view about the identity of sport and art becomes legitimate; it becomes legitimate to say that sport is an art. This was the opinion of the agonists participating in the games of the 76th Olympiad in 476 B.C.E. One of the interlocutors of the ongoing dispute over whether agonism is a profession, addresses the others - Grylos, Sotion and Menalkes with a rhetorical question whether wrestling is an art: – “if the word: profession offends you, let’s say: art. I don’t suppose any of you will deny that running, pentathlon or wrestling are arts? We learn it, not everyone has equal abilities. Gone are the days when Glaucus of Karystos became a pugilist straight from the plow [...]. There are dozens of good players here, each of us passed the bar, then the gymnasium, some of them got an aleiptes or a gymnast who continued his education” [Parandowski 1972: 87].

Excellence in spatial action, in which embodiment manifests itself in extremely efficient kinetic killing, was seen not only in the warriors of Hellas. At the same time, hand-to-hand combat warriors in China, Japan, Korea, Okinawa were training – achieving, as is known, the artistry in the “artistic” annihilation of the opponent on the battlefield. The ancient Asians did not invent the stadium, though beyond any doubt in the intervals between wars they perfected the accuracy of efficient action in the training game of pretend combat. In kinetic action, they were extraordinarily skilled. They became masters of the art of bodily combat. The warriors had a direct part in the creation of the bodily art of kinesis, but they were not the creators of the kinesiological work. Yes, a warrior who excelled in bodily control of himself – to the extent that his composition of actions became a living work of art – was the performer of the work, but not the originator. His generational predecessor, a teacher and at the same time the heir to the entire pedagogical thinking of the master’s school, contributed to the culture of martial arts. It can be said that the martial arts philosopher of that time initiated the creation of the work *in vivo*, and the warrior was the performer of the work written down into kinetic sequences. Hand-to-hand combat was imbued with artistry (executive craftsmanship) and for this reason could be identified with art. And to this day it is defined as Martial Arts. Which may evoke false associations with the divine perfection of Mars – the Roman god of war. European Martial Arts is named after this god. It should be added, however, that a modern martial artist is subject to ethical evaluation, not only aesthetic – for the very beauty of the action itself. Similarly, he is recognized: for the fact of truthfulness in noble conduct, a contemporary Olympian – about which below.

The normative ethicist will reveal to the contemporaries that the literalness of a martial arts warrior in

opposing moral and ontic evil consists in participating in a confrontation with evil in a fight to the death. A martial arts warrior does not want to kill, but when confronting evil, he always identifies himself as a defender of the just cause. One becomes a true warrior by participating in a just war. Wojciech Cynarski, the author of this philosophy, calls the Martial Arts warrior “a wanderer on the path of virtue” [Cynarski 2022: 153-154]. He does not fight, but he wins in humanity as a man of honour, humanity and justice, and - what paradoxically distinguishes him – a lover of all life.

Thus, sport is an art when the action of the agonist complies with the agonographic prescription from the creator of the “work”. Participants of this Olympiad were also aware of the dependence of their craftsmanship on the knowledge acquired by the author in the written text. The same Ikkos reveals that “when I tell you that I have been thinking about gymnastics, I do not mean that I have invented everything that surprises you so much about me. Did you know Milton wrote a book? You can laugh, Philo. It’s so far from Tyras that maybe your great-grandson will get this book. Although it would be useful to you too. You would find there an indication that the wrestler needs some meat once a day” [Paradowski 1972: 85].

What does this experience of action, already recognized as art by the ancients, mean for the present? Isn’t it still the case that not everyone who practices the same action achieves mastery to the measure of the agonographic pattern. Among similar athletes, seemingly equal in their efforts to achieve mastery in kinetic self-imagining, one usually becomes famous for his craftsmanship, such as Usain Bolt – an unsurpassed runner or Armand Duplantis – an extremely haughty pole vaulter. They both contribute to the creation of the work of bodily kinetics, but both of them had to use, through the director, an already existing composition of action sequences in order to achieve agonic artistry.

In this ontic dimension of sport – agonographic and choreographic – we see that sport is beautiful. Everyone can see that it is not the mere harmonious embodiment of an athlete (a sporty *Homo Quadratus* in stillness is already beautiful, like Michelangelo’s David), but only his action, which is aligned with some imaginary kinetic ideal, evokes the impression of artistry, and thus gives the agonist the value of a master of kinetic art. The craftsmanship of the agonist’s action – reduced to kinetics – obviously meets the criterion of aestheticism.

However, the operatic art of Olympism is not enough if we can say that the work presented by an athlete is beautiful in its kinetic performance. The philosopher of Olympism assumes that it will also be good in an agatonic form. The artistry of the Olympian is to be defined by two measures of perfection: agonographic and agathological. Wasn’t it said by the philosopher in *paideia* – long before the Neolympics – that the ideal of participation in culture is a man acting for the sake of

knowing the truth, good and beauty. Thus, the Olympic ideal is an agonist working towards beauty and noble good (*kalos kagathós*).

Of course, the feat of an Olympian can be estimated by the measure of aestheticism, and sport in general can be perceived aesthetically. From this perspective, the Olympic athlete co-creates the art of movement beauty, similar to the art of ballet. Just as dance, i.e. a combination of rhythmic body movements, is in ballet the carrier of the semiotic message of the story contained in the libretto text, so in the Olympic dispute, agonographic and choreographic kinetics (in artistic sports) is also – and not by analogy to ballet – a means of without words of autotelic semiosis.

In the sociological understanding, the agonistic situation in the stadium is a dual-subject reality of the parallel agon (competition) and the counter-current agon (feigned fight), the reason for which is the greater virtue of justice. As the philosopher of morality – the author of the libretto – wants it, the Olympic agonism must be fair, which results from the requirement to comply with the rule of fair play (an act of honesty is judged fairly in the consequences of the competition). The desired outcome of the agon depends on whether the competitors are fair. A morally regulated agonist is called a sport, and a morally good agonist is called a true Olympian. Participation in the Olympic agony is always shared by the moral good of honesty-in-justice. The victorious agonist becomes a living example of real and symbolized fairness.

There is a material symbol among the many signs of Olympism that expresses “fairness in justice.” It is a gold, silver and bronze medal that distinguishes sporting nobility. The main postulate of sports ethics requires symbolically distinguishing an athlete for his humanity with a medal made of precious metal. To the one who behaves noble, the precious metal is due. The ethicist says that the agonist should be honest in action – which means true in giving evidence of his naturalness perfected in training work. By not hiding the truth about yourself, it becomes possible to choose the winner fairly.

Fairness presages fairness, provided that some unexpected external factor, such as a biased “wellington” judge, does not harm the rightful victor. It happens that the competition takes place between the honest and the unjustly judged. In the idealized situation of sporting competition, justice is served when the winner is the one among equals in honesty. Moral perfection is expressed in the fact that an honest athlete is fair to himself after the competition. This is how honesty and justice “go hand in hand” in a sports dignitary. An honest athlete will give himself as much good as he is rightfully entitled to. In this sense, an athlete can be a fair judge in a common cause. Like that Paul the Apostle, who in his second letter to Timothy assured of his honesty towards himself and the Lord, and expressed the conviction that the value of his actions was judged justly. These words imply that this

participant in the metaphorically presented competition is justice towards himself (which will be confirmed by the due good received from the judge – symbolized by a laurel wreath), because after his conversion he honestly testified to the divinity of his Lord.¹

If athletes competed on fairness, everyone would be a winner and everyone, as morally equal to the others, should receive a medal for a dignified way of existence. A dignified feat of an athlete is expressed in that it is preceded by honesty and crowned with justice. A self-confident athlete becomes fair after the competition in adjudicating his victory before the referee has spoken.

So, there is an Olympic sign: not a torch fire, nor a flag, nor pigeons, but a medal that symbolizes the athlete's ideal of dignity, and especially distinguishes his virtue of honesty in fairness (what is due to me) and social (what is due to others). It is true that a stadium referee is responsible for fair distribution of sports goods, but he differs from an athlete in that he is able to objectify the final result of the competition. The athlete does not see himself clearly when he focuses the attention on himself in the heat of the competition. The part of the judge – as it happens in real life – is to ensure that everyone is entitled to what is due to him. The ethicist expects the ideal referee to introduce himself to the stadium community as the “priest” of justice. After each competition, the referee is also judged by a higher instance of sports justice. He can be singled out, reprimanded, but also removed from power. The referee of the Olympic stadium takes an oath – according to the philosopher's libretto (the first part was written by Pierre de Coubertin) – ensuring complete impartiality and respecting the applicable rules for the good name of sport.

If the role of the referee is so significant in bringing moral order to the sports community of the stadium (spectators are not subject to the regulative causative power of the referee), it is puzzling that he does not stand on the podium with the agonists. When everyone is a winner in an Olympic competition, even the last loser is awarded a medal, one can ask the ethic of Olympism (the author of the libretto) why the judge does not receive a medal for empowerment right after the final of the competition. It also depends on the judge whether the Olympic society will realistically substantiate the possibility of moral renewal within the scope set by the philosopher of Olympism. And all this so that the world could follow the example of a dignified lifestyle in the stadium, so that the literal social life – taking place outside the framework of *Theatrum Olympicum* – imitated the art of Olympic sport.

¹ The apostle Paul wrote, “I have fought the good fight, I have finished the race, I have kept the faith. Finally, there is laid up for me the crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, will give to me on that day, and not only to me but also to all who have loved his appearing” (2 Tim 4:7-8); Pallotinum, Poznań 2003.

In literal life justice is sought in vain, wrote Pierre de Coubertin in Ode to Sport. Meanwhile, in sport there is a “just measure of merit”, which objectively determines what is rightfully due to whom. Sport, which is Justice, he wrote, should be used as an example in objectively judging human actions [de Coubertin 1994a: 65].

The medal decorating ceremony is the second act of the laudatory ritual. In the first act, before the start of the competition, the Olympian is introduced to the audience with a brief description of his personal sporting excellence. The audience finds out what culture he comes from and what he has achieved. In the second act of the laudatory ceremony, the winner receives a gold medal for agographic excellence, which is also a distinction for agatonic nobility. And because the loser turned out to be as morally noble as the winner, he too receives a medal award: both he – awarded with silver – and each of the losers, which in turn symbolizes the bronze medal. In this sense, medals made of three metals – given to each participant of the agony, regardless of the place they occupy – symbolize everyone's victory in the Olympic agony. It is commonly said that in Olympic competitions everyone is a winner, which means that every agonist admitted to the competition by the referee: a whistleblower, a cheater tracker, is considered a winner in sporting humanity. The medal is a sign of recognition for acting in accordance with the oath, *according to the principles of noble competition and the spirit of fair play - without any doping*.

Just as an individual Olympian receives a “wreath of justice” in a bouquet of flowers and a medal around his neck (not a green olive branch or laurel leaves entwined in a wreath, as it used to be) – for truthfully testifying to his honesty in achieving competitive championship – so the society of his cultural origin receives a laudation award for raising “a son and daughter of his land” in the spirit of sports integrity and gymnasium diligence. The society of the Olympian's country of origin is praised “to the heavens” with the sign of the flag raised on the mast and the anthem of a patriotic song.

As you can guess – which the libretto of the Olympic opera does not say in detail – both acts of the ceremony of medaling the Olympian and the musical flagging of his homeland – are an expression of thanks to the author of the neo-Olympism opera for his participation in creating the universe of Olympic humanism; are a gesture of gratitude for strengthening the ties of friendship in such a super family of homeland nations, in which the neo-Olympic ideal is a new man of the stadium – new because he does not come from the battlefield as before, but originally from the agogon's children's playground, and secondly from the professional stadium, undergoing exhausting gymnasium asceticism. The ethics of Olympism seems to remind us that whoever is not first like a child at play: honest and just, not quarrelsome and vicious, will not enter the Olympic stadium without conversion to the path of righteousness.

Does the whole stadium event, which is preceded by the life of an Olympian in gymnasium asceticism, consist in something more – although it is still a lot – in creating a metaphor for a society of social justice. If only the thought of sport was led to this conclusion by the philosopher of Olympism, every manifestation of sports professionalism would in itself be an act of commitment to the Olympic mission. And as we know, the sport of professionals does not assume any mission of moral renewal of the nations of the world, although it is organized in the dimension of international championships. Besides, no one has examined to what extent non-Olympic sport is recharging, and in what cases – destructive for the dignity of the existence of a sports man.

The philosopher of Olympism of the naive phase announced the physical and moral renewal of all humanity. The leader of the renewal was an amateur of sporting fun, that lover of selfless sports, who, due to his noble roots, was the only one in the society of the class (aristocrats as descendants of the knighthood) to cope with the task of noble rivalry; he could testify to the nobility of competition so that others would imitate him. The Olympism of the naive phase assumed the happiness of humanity, but through its aristocratic autocracy (discrimination of women and elimination of professionals) it shattered the mechanism of causality of social influence on the outside world. He never achieved the assumed goal, although he held the aspiration of transforming society into a civilization of friendly brothers as high as Christianity in establishing a civilization of love. Moreover, in the very philosophical libretto of the Olympic Games, he did not logically explain the causality chain of the Olympic sport. Few people knew how sport was supposed to establish friendly relations between people, and especially how a logical transition from truce to friendship and from friendship to life as the birth of a child is possible. The Olympics was recognized as a sign of a cyclical rebirth of life and thus became a social movement affirming the well-being of young generations. Colloquially, the Olympic Games itself was most often called the Festival of Youth.

The Olympism of the second phase – the philosophy of realistic objectivism – explained the relationship between reconciliation in friendship – which is precisely the establishment of the Olympic peace – and access to the culture of life. Without this theoretical explanation, the poet's call "O Sport! You are Peace!" it has no value of logical truth and is simply a myth.

So if we assume that the Olympic social peace is a relationship of bonds in friendship (colloquially – reconciliation in brotherhood), which actually takes place, then what may be the reason for this change of affect, occurring among opponents of stadium competitions. As a consequence of the struggle for primacy in sport, do not competitors become more alien to each other, and especially does the loser not harbor aversion to the

winner? – And if not, how to explain the paradox of reciprocal approach after the end of the competition?

Well, it turns out that the act of fair selection of the winner is not the final event of the Olympian's stadium performance. The chain of social causality of competitions has another link – the affective transformation of the agonist – whose place in the sequence of the transformation of the athlete's "spirit" is explained by the law of respect [Pawlucki 2022: 164]. The end of the competition in the proxemic sense consists in the spontaneous and literal approach of the opponents of the competition to each other – as when leaving the treadmill or leaving the field. It happens that athletes avoid meeting face to face after the end of the competition.

Both situations are explained by the *nomos* of respect, which shows the dependence of trust (which is the effect) on the recognition shown during the competition, and especially after its completion, for the masterful action and thanksgiving for noble behavior (which is the cause). The aroused trust in the opponent of the competition may lead to establishing a personal relationship and, consequently, to establishing a bond of friendship. In the phase of established trust, the bond of camaraderie becomes a bond of friendship. Establishing such a relationship of higher-order feelings can be called making the Olympic peace. In short, explaining the consequences of the Olympian's personal transformation, the Olympic peace, which "spreads" around the world, becomes a condition of procreation, as if unintentional, but still a real guarantor of the continuity of life.

It can be said that wherever there is peace in friendship, life becomes possible. Even more or less – if you prefer – wherever the state of warlessness was announced by the spondophores – the population fertility of the belligerent societies increased.

In short, the relationship between neo-Olympism – a social movement on a global scale – and the continuity of life is explained as follows.

A) War causes destruction, it is the cause of the moral decline of humanity. The evils of war can be prevented by establishing a good competition in the Olympic stadium.

B) Competitors of aristocratic origin know the ethos of noble fighting, as they are descendants of the knightly state. They are the only ones able to cope with the requirement of noble competition. Noblemen are the only ones who are noble, and even disinterested – not like professionals who are about earning money, and not just winning with dignity. Let us add that this was a logically false assumption of the philosopher of naive Olympism, and from an ethical point of view – highly unfair. A professional is also a person of dignity, although he comes from the state of "lower" born.

C) Amateurs of aristocratic descent can act "chivalry", that is, fair during the competition and honorably after it, when they show mutual respect.

D) The reciprocity of recognition for the nobility of the fight, and in particular for the honesty shown in sports, brings people closer and inspires trust. The sports relationship of strangers and cultural strangers turns into a relationship of bonds in brotherhood. The relationship of closeness between nobly rival aristocrats can also be considered as state solidarity. An amateur only befriends an aristocrat equal to himself.

E) The Olympians become so close that they become peaceful. And the Olympic peace is not a truce (warlessness) – as in ancient Olympia – but a bond of brotherly friendship.

F) According to the philosopher’s assumption, the spirit of Olympic friendship acts as a regenerator by being transmitted to civilized humanity. Peacefulness enables participation in the culture of life. The Olympics symbolizes the cyclical nature of a renewing life.

In comparison, the relationship between the *ekecheiria* (sacred truce), the Olympic Games and the continuity of life from conception and birth in ancient Hellas is explained as follows.

A) The Games in Olympia were preceded by an act of establishing a truce, no war a month before the competition. At this time, the men of the Peloponnese do not die, because they do not fight!

B) For the games, the men lay down their weapons, strip naked, and begin the games in military competitions; they engage in a make-believe war that actually prepares the agonists for a real war.

C) After the games in Olympia, the men return home during the ongoing truce, where they stay with their wives until early autumn. A new life is conceived.

D) The state of warlessness – *ekecheiria* – announced for the participants of the games in Olympia was conducive to marital procreation, but was not its cause.

The philosopher of neo-Olympism has the right to talk about the regenerating power of the Olympic Games in maintaining the intergenerational continuity of society. And it was not without reason that he included the third act in the libretto of the Olympic Games – the closing ceremony of the Olympics. They were wrong who would connect the act of closing the Games with the ritual handing over of the flag to the host of the next Olympiad. Formally, the libretto of the Olympic Charter contains descriptions of symbolic behavior (removal of the flag, extinguishing the torch, closing speeches and some other heralds of the future Olympics), but – consciously or not – it allows **disorder on the stage of the stadium**.

Just as the first act depicts the unknown participants of the Games, moving along – one representation of the Olympic nation after another – and then arranged in a parade formation next to each other – as if culturally alien – so in the third act all formations are broken and the borders of literally drawn lines of the stadium stage are crossed in searching for already acquainted, close

ones in comradeship and friendship; not so long ago – in the second act of stadium competitions – completely strangers. The Olympic peace, awaited by the author of the libretto, arrives, which – in psychological terms – is a relationship of bonds in friendship, resulting from mutual trust (second act).

The difference is that the truce, as a state of warlessness, conditioned the establishment of the agonistic movement in Olympia, and, as a consequence of its duration, enabled a safe return to the marriage bed so that the wives of the Eleans could conceive a child [Pausanias 2004]. In neo-Olympism, social peace comes after competition.

The neo-Olympism of the naive phase – salutary in a messianic sense – did not set itself the condition of no war (holy truce) for its beginning. It is known that *when the guns of war rumble, all the muses fall silent*. It is a social movement against war. The Olympic Games establishes peace after the end of the competition, when strangers culturally respect each other, inspire trust and, consequently, begin to remain in brotherly friendship. The neo-Olympic peace is not without war, but the spirit of friendship that haunts the community of the stadium.

Games in old Olympia

If it wasn’t for the destructive power of war, which kills men, deprives women of hope for motherhood, and prevents both of them from participating in procreation, there would be no reason to oppose the evil of war in every possible act of counter-response: literal – like the League of Nations, which was supposed to ensure peace in the world after the first global war, as well as signs like a supplication song that implores God for deliverance from war.

Just as Lent can be a sign of a new life that occurs through conversion to a life of love, so the Olympics – as a sign reality – is an imagined and postulated return to the culture of life thanks to the faith in the humanity of the opponent of the pretend fight awakened in the agony. In such an image of the agon – as a sign symbolizing the literal nature of the clash of antagonists – reconciliation in friendship may quite realistically occur, and thus, as a logical consequence, also imaginary, the mistake of a man of war may be corrected.

Was it not such a transformation that Pierre de Coubertin, the composer of the first Olympic opera, expected from the agonist, in which a man reconciled by the bonds of friendship “becomes pure by participating in the temple ritual of peace”. Demonstrating such psychological reasoning – probably derived from his own experience of sport – he preached that Olympism is a kind of life; as if one believed that by repeating the Olympics “triumph over the evils of war” is possible [de Coubertin 1994b: 133].

The logical truth of this relationship: the spirit of friendship and the aroused affect of recognition and thanksgiving for the masterful participation in the agony of the righteous can be falsified in a hypothetically created situation of mutually hostile agonists – arriving at the stadium from the literal battlefield as warriors. This methodological requirement is well met by the Olympic Games of the ancients, in which warriors took part – coming from the battlefields to the stadium in Olympia during the “holy truce”.

Well, at any time of the Olympics, and not only during the militarized ancient Games, the Olympic agony will not be fulfilled in the moral ideal postulated by the ethics, if warring parties – coming from feuding parts of the world – join it. How to explain that after more than three hundred years from the establishment of the law of *ekecheiria* – “holy peace” – and thus after more than seventy times by spondophores in the cities of Greek Olympic Games – there was a thirty-year war between Athens and Sparta - devastating and weakening both sides of the conflict.²The warriors of both sides of the conflict entered the games - wherever in the Peloponnese they were announced - and the same agonists returned to the battlefields and seas of deadly combat; gaining nothing in consequence, but by weakening each other, bringing upon themselves the eternal enemy of the Persian empire.

The Peloponnese was a land of wars and games, alternately for hundreds of years, as if the same warriors – fighting for their lives – came to Olympia to use the stadium as a pretend battlefield for the duration of the armistice by the law of *ekecheiria*. Entering the competition with the attitude of warriors, they undertook in the stadium competition the same actions as in a military confrontation: in running, wrestling, boxing, pankration, discus throwing, javelin throwing, as well as chariot racing and horse riding itself. Military antagonists turned into stadium agonists. The spirit of war reigned in the stadium of Olympia, and the final competition of the armored warrior’s race heralded his return to the battlefield.

In the agony of Olympia, blood was shed quite often, and breaking bones, breaking joints, breaking noses and even gouging out eyes occurred in every competition. The Games were a continuation of the war, its continuation, in which the confrontation took place without weapons. A disarmed warrior entered athletic competitions naked, which was supposed to prove his vulnerability. If he had entered the stadium in a chiton, he might have brought in some sort of combat weapon in secret. Nudity was mandated by the rules of the competition.

² It is about the Great Peloponnesian War between Athens and Sparta in the years 431-404 BCE, which was caused by an incident of little territorial significance. It was about gaining omnipotence over Hellas. The societies of both city-states have participated in the Olympic Games for centuries.

Therefore, those who came from the field of war to the games participated only in the occasional renewal of life by procreating an offspring in the interval between skirmishes to the death. The warrior managed to return to his family home during the truce to meet his wife’s expectations, then he went again to his military unit – some Spartan *mora* or Arcadian *eparittoi*, to come under the orders of the Strategist. The stadium warrior was a cruel man in competition and a tormentor of animals in the ritual killing of sacrificial animals. There was blood before the games were announced and there was a lot of blood as the agonists battled each other in the stadium. It would not be possible to dagger a black ram and slaughter oxen in the dimension of a hecatomb if the participants in the ritual sacrifice did not practice killing the enemy, and if they did not actually kill the enemy from the neighboring polis by bleeding and dismembering.

O poet of *olympiake agones*, who praise the greatness of the olympionist, and do not see that through the suffering inflicted on the oxen, the victor is his own negation, because he is cruelty. His parade style in nakedness, which is not beautiful, but shameless, is useless, when he leads dozens of oxen to the altar of priestly torturers to be stabbed and chopped off. And your beauty, Olympian, is useless when in the chariot race for fame you mutilate beautiful Arabs, break their bones, and finally slit their throats. You are not a beautiful Olympian, and let the poets praising your uniqueness not be so euphorically unreal.

I cannot imagine that Pierre de Coubertin’s Olympic Games would begin with a fight with animals that resisted being brought to the altar of the sacrificial candle. It is good that the chief composer of the Neolympic Games did not imitate the ancient butchers of the ritual slaughter of animals. But I also cannot understand that in the last year of the 2nd Olympiad in Paris, 1900, pigeons were shot “for sport” and killed *en masse*. What a breakthrough must have happened that from the VII Olympiad in Antwerp, 1920, a live pigeon was “lifted” to the sign symbolizing peace and rebirth of life.

It follows that those who came to the stadium from the battlefield or were imbued with the hatred of a fighter before the competition could not take part in establishing peace relations and thus truly participate in the culture of life. King Ifitos was not motivated by establishing the Olympic Games as a peace-affirmation movement against war – which would give the stadium community 2,800 years in advance a truly humanistic reason – but only to announce a state of warlessness for a “moment”: from late spring to early autumn; so that the life of the warrior’s offspring could begin in the home lair. As Pausanias wrote, “the wives of the Eleans, seeing the country’s military reserves completely exhausted, prayed to Athena that they might conceive children” [2004]. The women’s expectations were met by King Ifitos, who, after seeking

advice from the Delphic prophetess, declared the Olympic Games to be a sufficient reason without war. Ifitos wanted nothing more for the subjects of his kingdom of Elida than a warless, i.e. a truce between the belligerents of the conflict. But the truce – pathetically called “holy” – by the reverence shown to Zeus – was only a relationship without war, not peace.

It is impossible, then, that the enmity and hatred brought by the warriors into the stadium can lead to a conversion to a peaceful way of life; as a consequence, the Olympic Games in Olympia would turn into a “Peloponnesian movement of friendship affirmation” in the closing ritual, and thus become a guarantee of peace for the continuity of life.

Thus, anyone who is still guided by the Olympic law of war in the stadium to this day, or arrives at the stadium with a martial attitude – such as the modern fighters of the Russian group state – transforms the Olympic agon into an anolympas, and himself into an antagonist. Sometimes the sowers of hatred, for racial or class reasons, declared war on the world. And each time they sent fighters to the stadium (Germany – national-socialism, Russia and China – international communism, North Korea, Cuba and many countries – authoritarian socialism) to compete in war formation – poisoned by hatred of opponents as enemies. Hatred destroys a sports relationship not because the opponent enters the competition with a hostile attitude (which he can skillfully hide), but because he cunningly intends to gain an advantage. An enemy who comes to the stadium with a bad conscience will not become a friend of humanity when he leaves the stadium. Olympic sport with the participation of an anti-athlete does not transform an agonizing relationship into a mutual friendship company. The law of friendship is not confirmed when haters and supporters of war crimes infiltrate the stadium. Like those athletes from neo-Bolshevik Russia who, with the Z sign, signaling the wartime identity of the attackers of the “special operation” against Ukraine, invalidate the dignity value of the stadium agon.

It follows that the real destroyer of sports law, due to his moral handicap, cannot have access to the sign reality of the Olympic Games. The sports situation is constituted by the fairness of the opponents and the fulfillment of the norm of “pure fun” (fair play) depends on it. However, when opponents are ready to appreciate each other’s achieved mastery with an active gesture of praise – they are ready to show respect to each other – they arouse gratitude for the sincerity of unnecessary recognition. This relationship of emotional closeness, resulting from a sincere recognition of the nobility of the athlete’s act, brings the agonists closer, not further apart. And this seems to explain why sport in a modern stadium, where warriors have long since stopped coming, is a source of friendship, not enmity. The ancients distinguished in the agony only the first, who, as the winner

of all, went to fame as an Olympian. Thus, they updated the image of a war confrontation, in which only one is always victorious and one is carried off the battlefield as defeated. Just as the Strategist expresses his appreciation to the victorious warrior, the priest crowns the head of the first agonist with an olive wreath taken from the Callistefanos tree. And only the first among many goes to fame. What was the contribution of the poet, singer and sculptor.

Without art, the game of the ancients did not take place, and it would be a field of art in itself, if one sought in it – as in the contemporary ontology of art – the hypertrophy of semiosis. However, the second, axiological criterion of artistic-aesthetic symbolism, which would have to include the hecatomb of sacrificial animals, would show the Olympic Games as a real slaughter with particular cruelty. Not only this manifestation of the Olympic ritual shows that there is no axionormative continuity in the creation of the art of the Olympic Games. Neolympic modernism presents the art of the Olympic Games in the perspective of integral humanism.

Conclusions

The most important question about sport and art concerns whether the reality of the Olympic Games creates sign-symbolic situations which in non-representative art, i.e. art which is not a “reflection of reality” – there are situations of a creatively imagined social order – even a utopian imaginary one – and whether it appears in it a new man, modeled on a physically beautiful and morally good Olympian. If the Olympic Games really create a metaphor of happiness in the world of a fair competition of life – it itself becomes an art. If an artist-painter would paint an image of the Olympic Games on canvas in a triptych, of course with the content consistent with the libretto of the philosopher of Olympism, his work would be considered art. And if then the statism of the three-part work was dynamized by the painter in the space of the stadium, creating its holographic analogue, the artist would create a work of holographic-painting art. And if the artist breathed the spirit of Olympism into every participant of life in the stadium – equipping them with a recipe for a meaningful life – he would be equal in aspirations to the creator of the Olympic libretto. The artist-painter would become the identity of the philosopher of Olympism, and the created work would gain the status of the ontically independent art of the Olympic Games.

Thus, Olympic sport is an art unlike any other, but the same as any true art. And every true art is so that life should imitate the ideal of a person in the community contained in it. The Olympic Games is a fine, good and true art. Not as a “sign of the mark” of the artist of a painting, poetic or musical work, but as a living image

of adult children of the Olympian family v as a symbol of its hope and redemption of evil done by strangers.

As for the eponymous Olympic opera, it can be assumed that it is composed of successive acts that dramatize the stadium and pre-stadium reality – such as bringing fire from antiquity to the present day – becomes a work telling the story of war misfortune, which is overcome not by the state of warless *ekecheiria* – as in OLYMPIA – but a completely real conversion to the path of a decent life – as in NEOOLYMPIA.

References

1. Coubertin P. de (1994a) *Ode to Sport* (trans. G. Młodzikowski) [in:] P. de Coubertin, *Speeches. Miscellaneous writings and letters* ("Library of the Polish Scientific Society of Physical Culture" series), Polish Scientific Society of Physical Culture, Lea, Warsaw.
2. Coubertin P. de (1994b), *Philosophical foundations of modern Olympism* (trans. G. Młodzikowski) [in:] P. de Coubertin, *Speeches. Miscellaneous writings and letters* ("Library of the Polish Scientific Society of Physical Culture" series), Polish Scientific Society of Physical Culture, Lea, Warsaw.
3. Coubertin P. de (1994c), *The Unfinished Symphony* (trans. G. Młodzikowski) [in:] P. de Coubertin, *Speeches. Miscellaneous writings and letters* ("Library of the Polish Scientific Society of Physical Culture" series), Polish Scientific Society of Physical Culture, Lea, Warsaw.
4. Cynarski W.J. (2022), *Philosophy of Martial Arts*, University of Rzeszow, Rzeszow.
5. Kloskowska A. (1983), *Sociology of Culture*, National Scientific Publishing House, Warsaw [in Polish].
6. Krapiec M.A. (1996), *Man in Culture*, Gutenberg-Print, Warsaw.
7. Parandowski J. (1973), *Olympic discus*, National Publishing Institute, Warsaw [in Polish].
8. Pausanias (2004), *Hiking in Hellas. On the Olympic treadmill and in battle* (translated by in Greek and edited by J. Niemirska-Pliszczyńska), The National Institute of Ossolin-ski - Publishing House of the Polish Academy of Sciences, Wrocław, and De Agostini, Warsaw [in Polish].
9. Pawlucy A. (2022), *Olympic Pedagogy*, "IMPULS" Publishing House, Krakow.
10. Sitchin Z. (2018), *Chronicles of the Anunnaki*, (trans. K. Kuraszkiewicz) "AMBER" Publishing House, Warsaw.
11. Wierzynski K. (1928), *Olympic Laurels*, MCMXXVIII, J. Mortkowicz, Warsaw [in Polish].

Opera olimpijska

Słowa kluczowe: Olimpizm, igrzyska olimpijskie, sztuka, filozofia sportu

Abstrakt

Problem. W tym eseju autor podejmuje zagadnienie sportu i sztuki. Kunszt wykonawczy w sporcie walki przesądza, że działający wojownik tworzy dzieło sztuki (Martial Arts). Analogicznie każdy sport może być rozpatrywany jako sztuka ruchu. Ale nie o takie rozumienie związku sportu ze sztuką tu chodzi. Problem dotyczy tego, czy samo igrzysko olimpijskie (w liczbie pojedynczej) może być ujmowane jako dziedzina sztuki odrębnej, analogiczna do opera seria. Igrzysko olimpijskie jest sztuką dlatego, że jest teatralizacją dramatu życia człowieka pokoju.

Metoda. W rozpoznawaniu igrzyska olimpijskiego jako dzieła i dziedziny sztuki posłużono się kryterium semiologicznym i aksjologicznym kultury symbolicznej. Porównano igrzyska olimpijskie fazy naiwnej - utopijnej filozofii olimpizmu do fazy realistyczno-objektywnej - teoretycznie uprawdopodobnionej. Wyniki. Wykazano, że igrzysko olimpijskie jest rytualnym wydarzeniem stadionowym, które symbolizuje ideę odradzającego się cyklicznie życia. Sama agonistyka sportowa, która kończy się pojednaniem w przyjaźni, symbolizuje pokój olimpijski. Z tych dwóch powodów można uznać stadionowe igrzysko za dzieło sztuki theatrum olympicum. Wyjaśniono różnicę między rozejmem jako stanem bezwojnia w starożytnej Olimpii a pokojem olimpijskim. Pokój neoolimpijski, to nie bezwojnie, a duch przyjaźni, nawiedzający społeczność stadionu po zawodach.

Wnioski. Nie istnieje żadna ciągłość aksjonormatywna w tworzeniu sztuki igrzyska olimpijskiego. Igrzysko olimpijskie jest dziełem sztuki opowiadającym o wojennym nieszczęściu, które zostaje przewyciężone nie stanem bezwojnia ekecheiria, ale całkiem realnym nawróceniem się na drogę godziwego życia. Zawody sportowe tworzą, według libretta filozofa olimpizmu, metaforę społeczeństwa sprawiedliwości społecznej. Prawo przyjaźni nie potwierdza się, kiedy do stadionu przenikają nienawistnicy i zwolennicy wojennych przestępstw. Realny niszczyciel prawa sportowego z powodu ułomności moralnej, nie może mieć dostępu do znakowej rzeczywistości igrzyska olimpijskiego.