

THE LUBLIN SCHOOL OF PHILOSOPHY

Ivan Zelić — Split

UDK 141.3 Lublin

1. Introduction

In this paper I shall give a brief and accessible account of the origin of the Lublin school of philosophy, its main figures and ideas. This school came into being after World War II at the Catholic University of Lublin (Katolicki Uniwersytet Lubelski — KUL), and after Poland it became much better known after a member of it, Karol Wojtyła, became Pope in 1978. The actual title “Lublin School of Philosophy” was first used by Kazimierz Kłosak¹, and today it has become standard. Other terms that are occasionally used are the “Lublin school of classical philosophy” or the “Lublin Thomist school”.

I would like at once to put to one side certain possible misunderstandings. Firstly, although the school came into being and flourished at the Catholic University of Lublin, not all the teachers of the faculty of philosophy belonged to it. On the other hand, the school was not limited to professors from Lublin, because its influence, via the publications of members, and still more through former students, spread to other centres.

Secondly, those who belonged to the school did not think the same about everything, which is probably out of the question with true philosophers. Still, they did share many essential common views, and worked together, discussed and influenced each other in a very lively way. The circle of the foun-

1 Stanisław Judycki, Anna Modrzejewska & Marian Wnuk, *Informator o studiach*, Lublin, Katolicki Uniwersytet Lubelski, Wydział Filozofii, 2002. p. 12.
Kazimierz Kłosak (1911–1982) did not belong to the Lublin school, although in the sixties he taught at KUL. While Karol Wojtyła was studying theology at Krakow, Kłosak was his teacher of philosophy. When he became archbishop, Wojtyła said that it was worth recalling “in particular Professor Don Kazimierz Kłosak, the only teacher who initiated me into philosophy while I was in the seminary. (Vita come vocazione. 1964: Karol Wojtyła racconta la sua storia, “*Tracce*”, n. 11/1996). (<http://www.tracce.it/arch/novembre96/nvita.htm>, 20. 6. 2002.)

ders who formed the school and most affected the development were: Stefan Swieżawski, Mieczysław Albert Krapiec, Jerzy Kalinowski, Stanisław Kaminski and Karol Wojtyła, that is, two laymen, two clerics and one future Pope. In this review we shall restrict ourselves only to these five and say something about each one of them².

2. A historical review

How did the school come into being? The Catholic University of Lublin was founded immediately after the reconstitution of the independent state of Poland in 1918. But the faculty of philosophy was opened only after World War II, in 1946. The time of the development and flowering of the school was the time of communist rule in Poland after WWII. Thomism had been present in Poland between the wars too, but had a fairly eclectic character and was dependent on foreign influences, mostly of the Louvain school. Only after World War II did Polish Thomism come of age³.

Right at the time of the worst communist reign of terror, in the fifties, during extremely difficult external influences, this essential advance was made. Why was this? Perhaps just because the real answers were at that time more necessary than ever before. The school came into being from the profound conviction that it was necessary always to seek and love the truth, and that this was always possible and always fruitful. It came into being as against the conviction of the old school of so-called traditional Thomism, which thought that all the answers had already been given and that they only had to be learned, and also against the modern spirit of the time that held tradition needed to be rejected and a new start made from the beginning.⁴

The school was a collective work, although not each individual member made an equal contribution. But this contribution is impossible to estimate only according to writings that have been published. The lively conversations and exchanges of opinions were vital contributions. Maliński describes the

- 2 Although many young members have made an important contribution, when one looks at the philosophical training of Karol Wojtyła, the founders of the school were certainly more important. Apart from that, a detailed review of the school would require a whole book, not just an article
- 3 Cf. Antoni B. Stepien, *Elementy filozofii*, Lublin, Redakcja Wydawnictw Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego, 1986. p. 122. Here Stepien gives hints about further literature on the topic.
- 4 From the end of the forties to 1956 was the period of the most ruthless communist reign of terror and persecution of the Church in Poland. The situation did not improve on Stalin's death, on the contrary, it deteriorated.

atmosphere in this way: "Dr Karol meets the young teaching staff, the junior assistances, docents and professors who would like to rebuild the world with the help of this new scholarship. [...] Dr Wojtyła joined in this group of young enthusiasts, making friends at once with all of them, particularly with Jerzy Kalinowski and Mieczysław Krapiec. Karol took part in the making of the new philosophy at the Catholic University. [...] Dr Wojtyła understood that he was young and had a lot to learn. He attached great importance to talks, discussions, meetings with fellow scholars... Such discussions went on into the night. Sometimes they had to leave the University through the window, because the janitor had already locked the gate. As a new scholar, Dr Wojtyła spoke a lot, but listened even more. He was open, expressed his opinions, but allowed himself to be corrected and criticism. He was humble in the discussion, as Father Bednarski later stated.⁵

Karol Wojtyła, when he was being enthroned as Archbishop of Krakow, recalled this atmosphere as follows: "Philosophy took me, perhaps mainly thanks to the help of Professor Swieżawski, to the Catholic University of Lublin, to the Faculty of Philosophy. I found myself in a very lively and youthful milieu. In the many discussions outside classes, along with a cup of tea (it too had its meaning) we were able to discuss many problems, things themselves and method. Thanks to these discussions I was able to look at my scholarly task in a new way."⁶

Still, Stefan Swieżawski can be considered the founder of the school, for he was the only one to have received his philosophical training before World War II and the only to have lectured at KUL from the foundation of the Faculty of Philosophy. He was born in 1907 at Holubie, and studied at and took his doctorate from Lwów University. He was taught there by leading Polish philosophers Kazimierz Twardowski, Roman Ingarden and Kazimierz Ajdukiewicz. The first was the father of 20th century Polish philosophy, the second the leading Polish phenomenologist, and the third one the chief Polish analytical philosopher.⁷

5 Adam Bujak nad Mieczysław Maliński, *Ivan Pavao II.*, Zagreb, Kršćanska sadašnjost, 1980. pp. 51-52.

6 Vita come vocazione. 1964: Karol Wojtyła racconta la sua storia, "Tracce", n. 11/1996. <http://www.tracce.it/arch/novembre96/nvita.htm> (20. 6. 2002.)

7 Kazimierz Twardowski (1866-1938) was born in Vienna and was a student of Franz Brentan. From 1896 he was professor of philosophy in Lwów and worked there vigorously on the training of expert and competent Polish philosophers. It is necessary to know that Poland had been partitioned between Russia, Germany and Austria for more than a century, and that only in this smallest and third part was there teaching in Polish. The teaching of Twardowski was not in vain, for almost all the leading Polish philosophers of the first half of the

Working on his dissertation, Swieżawski spent some time in France and there met Jacques Maritain and Etienne Gilson, leading 20th century Thomists. In Gilson he made a permanent friend and correspondent. After the war he arrived in France in 1956 just for a week.⁸ Then he acquainted Gilson with the work of the Lublin philosophers during the communist reign of terror, much to Gilson's amazement. Later, he went twice (1960/61, and 1964/65) to France as maître de recherché in the Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique in Paris.

Swieżawski taught for thirty years at KUL, from the foundation of the Faculty of Philosophy until his retirement in 1976. At his seminars, he educated a whole school of medievalists, who went on to research into medieval philosophy in Poland and elsewhere, to issue critical editions of manuscripts and write monographs. He was the most to be credited with Karol Wojtyła's arrival in Lublin. In 1953, young Wojtyła started asking the well-respected Professor Swieżawski for an opinion about this *habilitation* work. Thus started a correspondence that lasted for half a century and was recently published⁹. The next year, at Swieżawski's recommendation, Wojtyła was invited to the position of docent at KUL.

At the end of the Second Vatican Council, Swieżawski received from the hands of Pope Paul VI the message of the Council to intellectuals, together with Maritain and Jean Guitton¹⁰. He was the only contemporary Catholic philosopher in the communist countries to be mentioned by the Soviet "Philo-

20th century were his students. One of the students later wrote that at that time "there were no Polish philosophical schools at all. Twardowski founded it. It was over when Poland attained independence again in 1918 and was strong and had such solid foundations that it was dominant". (Tadeusz Czezowski, K. Twardowski as Teacher, "*Studia Philosophica 1939-1946*", quoted from: Francesco Coniglione, A Short History of 20th Century Polish Philosophy, *Polish Philosophy Page*, <http://www.fmag.unict.it/PolPhil/ShortHist.html>)
Roman Ingarden (1893-1970) was born in Krakow and studied in Lwów, Göttingen and Freiburg, with Twardowski and Husserl. He was one of the leading phenomenologists in general, and incontrovertibly the leading one in Poland.
Kazimierz Ajdukiewicz (1890.-1963.) was born in Tarnopol, and studied in Lwów with Twardowski. He was one of the leading representatives of the well-known Polish analytical school of Lwów and Warsaw.

8 Although a relatively palliated communist regime came in during 1956 in Poland, the government did not want to give Swieżawski and his wife Marija a visa until the Polish Marxist philosopher Adam Schaff intervened.

9 See: *Radio Vaticana*, Radiogiornale 25. 1. 2003.; Pubblicato in un libro il carteggio privato tra il giovane Karol Wojtyła e l'amico filosofo Stefan Swieżawski, http://www.vaticanradio.org/radiogiornale/ore14/2003/gennaio/03_01_25.htm (22. 4. 2003.)

10 Z profesorem Stefanem Swieżawskim o znakach czasu, *Rozmowy na koniec wieku*, <http://mateusz.logon.bydgoszcz.pl/rozmowy/swiezawski.htm>, (20. 6. 2002.)

sophical Encyclopaedia"¹¹. In 1956 he was made a fellow of the Polish Academy.

Like Gilson, Swieżawski was mostly engaged with the history of philosophy. But he did also, again like Gilson, write systematic works of philosophy¹². The two were in his opinion essentially connected, and someone who was not a philosopher could not deal with the history of philosophy, while if you did not know its history, you could not be a philosopher. He worked a fair amount on the popularisation of philosophy and the dissemination of understanding about its importance for culture in general, particularly in his articles for the magazine "Znak"¹³.

He wrote a great many books, as well as many articles, in Polish, French and German. His main work is the monumental "History of European Philosophy in the 15th century" in eight volumes¹⁴. An abridged version of this work in one volume has been translated into French¹⁵. He also wrote a great history of ancient and medieval philosophy¹⁶, as well as a book about the methodology of the history of philosophy¹⁷. In addition, he published three books of memoirs¹⁸.

- 11 Институт философии АН ПНР, Польская философская мысль, в: *Философская энциклопедия*, гл. ред. Ф. В. Константинов, Т. IV, Москва, Советская, энциклопедия, 1967. р. 309.
- 12 The first and most important book of his of this kind is: *Byt: zagadnienia metafizyki tomistycznej* [Biće: problemi tomističke metafizike], Kraków, "Znak", 1999. (1st ed. 1948.)
- 13 His articles are gathered in four books: *Rozum i tajemnica* [Reason and Mystery], Krakow, Znak, 1960.; *Człowiek i tajemnica* [Man and Mystery], Krakow, Znak, 1978.; *Istnienie i tajemnica* [Existence and Mystery], Lublin, Redakcja Wydawnictw Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego, 1993. i *Dobro i tajemnica* [Good and Mystery], Warszawa, Biblioteka "Wibzi", 1995.
- 14 Stefan Swieżawski, *Dzieje filozofii europejskiej w XV wieku*, v. 1–8, Warszawa, Akademia Teologii Katolickiej, 1974–1990.
- 15 Stefan Swieżawski, *Histoire de la philosophie européenne au XV siècle*, Paris, Beauchesne, 1990.
- 16 Stefan Swieżawski, *Dzieje europejskiej filozofii klasycznej* [Povijest europske klasične filozofije], Warszawa, Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 2000.
- 17 Stefan Swieżawski, *Zagadnienie historii filozofii* [Problem povijesti filozofije], Warszawa, Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 1966.
- 18 Stefan Swieżawski, *Wielki przełom: 1907–1945* [The Big Break: 1907.–1945.], Fundacja Jana Pawła II. Polski Instytut Kultury Chrześcijańskiej w Rzymie, Lublin, Redakcja Wydawnictw Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego, 1989.; Stefan Swieżawski, *W nowej rzeczywistości: 1945–1965* [In the new reality: 1945–1965], Fundacja Jana Pawła II. Polski Instytut Kultury Chrześcijańskiej w Rzymie, Lublin, Redakcja Wydawnictw Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego, 1991.; Stefan Swieżawski, *Owoce życia: 1966–1988* [Fruits of Life: 1966–1988], Fundacja Jana Pawła II. Polski Instytut Kultury Chrześcijańskiej w Rzymie, Lublin, Redakcja Wydawnictw Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego, 1993.

His best-known work is "Re-Reading St Thomas"¹⁹ which went through a number of Polish editions and was translated into many other languages (French²⁰, English²¹, Czech²², Russian, Ukrainian), while a Ukrainian translation is available on the Internet²³. It was created from his lectures given to the nuns who ran the Laski centre for the blind. In it, he expounds the thinking of St Thomas in a very lively way, and it is not important only for experts. It would be of great value if this book could be translated into Croatian.

Also justly considered a leading representative of the Lublin school is the Dominican Mieczysław Albert Krapiec. Born in 1921 in the village of Berezowicza Mała close to Tarnopol (today in the Ukraine), he joined the Dominicans in 1939, and in 1945 was ordained. He took doctorates in philosophy and theology. At KUL he lectured in philosophy from 1951, and was several times Dean of the Faculty, and also Rector of the University for thirteen years (1970–1983). Thanks to his research into the dignity of man and the sovereignty of peoples he was invited to give a speech at the meeting of Gorbachev with Polish intellectuals, on July 13 1988.

Krapiec was the *spiritus movens* of the Lublin School. He gave most to the construction of the school's positions, and also to the expansion of its ideas via his students and his many books, many of which went through several editions. He contributed most to the spread of the ideas beyond Poland too, with his frequent attendances at international symposia and his articles in foreign magazines and festschriften. He is member of many academies and associations (Polish Academy, Papal Academy of St Thomas), and has been awarded many honorary doctorates (e. g., Pontifical Institute of Medieval Studies, Toronto, Université Catholique de Louvain) and numbers of state decorations.

His two main works are the book "Metaphysics"²⁴ and "I — a man"²⁵. Both works are considered classics in Poland, and both have been translated into English²⁶. A translation of his "Metaphysics" was being prepared in Chi-

19 Stefan Swieżawski, *Swięty Tomasz na nowo odczytany*, Wykłady w Laskach, Kraków, Znak, 1983.

20 Stefan Swieżawski, *Redécouvrir Thomas d'Aquin*, Paris, Nouvelle Cité, 1989.

21 Stefan Swieżawski, *St. Thomas Revisited*, New York, Peter Lang, 1995.

22 Stefan Swieżawski, *Nový výklad sv. Tomáše*, přednášky v Laskách, Brno, Cesta, 1998.

23 Стефан СвеЖавски, *Святой Фома прочитаний заного*, <http://psulib.ukrweb.net/books/swez01/index.htm> (27. 3. 2003.)

24 Mieczysław Albert Krapiec, *Metafizyka*, Lublin, Wydawnictwo Towarzystwa Naukowego Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego, 2000. (1st ed. 1966.)

25 Mieczysław Albert Krapiec, *Ja—człowiek*, Lublin, Wydawnictwo Towarzystwa Naukowego Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego, 2000. (1st ed. 1973.)

26 Mieczysław Albert Krapiec, *Metaphysics*, An Outline of the History of Being, New York, Peter Lang, 1991.; Mieczysław Albert Krapiec, *I—Man*, An Outline of Philosophical Anthropology, New Britain, Mariel Publications, 1983.

nese, but I am not sure if it was carried through²⁷. The book "I— a man" exists in an abridged English edition meant for students²⁸. Two more books have also been translated: "Why Evil"²⁹ in French³⁰ and "Man and Natural Right"³¹ in English³². He has published a large number of articles in foreign languages in various foreign magazines and festschrifts (in French, English and Latin).

He dealt mainly with metaphysics and philosophical anthropology. He particularly investigated the methodology of metaphysics and philosophy in general. Thus the first chapter of his "Metaphysics" has the title "Elements of meta-metaphysics". He wrote about many other topics, about human cognition, language, culture, political philosophy and in particular the matter of sovereignty. In Poland his collected works have been published in 23 volumes³³. Their very titles show the great breadth of the philosophical problems he was involved with. He edited translations and interpretations of some classical philosophical works with interpretations.³⁴

Almost all his works include critical investigation of solutions to the problems he deals with and that have been offered through the history of philosophy. In this he consciously followed the examples of Aristotle and Thomas. The analyses show his exceptionally wide and profound knowledge of contemporary thinking and the history of philosophy. Only after that does he produce his own version of the solution.

- 27 Roger Duncan, Lublin Thomism, *"The Thomist"*, vol. 51, n. 2/1987, p. 307.
- 28 Mieczysław Albert Krapiec, *I-Man, An Outline of Philosophical Anthropology*, Abridged Version by Francis J. Lescoe and Roger B. Duncan, New Britain, Mariel Publications, 1985.
- 29 Mieczysław Albert Krapiec, *Dlaczego zło? Rozważania filozoficzne*, Lublin, Wydawnictwo Towarzystwa Naukowego Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego, 1995. (1. izd. 1962.)
- 30 Mieczysław Albert Krapiec, *Pourquoi le mal? Réflexions philosophiques*, Paris, Editions du dialogue, 1967.
- 31 Mieczysław Albert Krapiec, *Człowiek i prawo naturalne*, Lublin, Wydawnictwo Towarzystwa Naukowego Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego, 1999. (1. izd. 1975.)
- 32 Mieczysław Albert Krapiec, *Person and Natural Law*, New York, Peter Lang, 1993.
- 33 Mieczysław Albert Krapiec, *Dzieła* [Djela], t. 1–23, Lublin, Wydawnictwo Towarzystwa Naukowego Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego, 1993–2001.
We shall cite a few of the more important titles of books from this series, apart from those already mentioned: *Dzieła*, t. 1: *Teoria analogii bytu* [Theory of analogy of being], 1993.; *Dzieła*, t. 2: *Realizm ludzkiego poznania* [Realism of human cognition], 1995.; *Dzieła*, t. 5: *Struktura bytu. Charakterystyczne elementy systemu Arystotelesa i Tomasza z Akwinu* [Akvinskoga Structure of being: Characteristic elements of the system of Aristotle and Thomas Aquinas], 2000.; *Dzieła*, t. 12: *Człowiek — kultura — uniwersytet* [Čovjek — kultura — sveučilište], 1998.; *Dzieła*, t. 13: *Język i świat realny* [Language and the real world], 1995.; *Dzieła*, t. 16: *Suwerenność — czyja?* [Contemporaneity — whose?], 2001.; *Dzieła*, t. 18: *Ludzka wolność i jej granice* [Human freedom and its limits], 2000.; *Dzieła*, t. 19: *Człowiek w kulturze* [Man in culture], 1999.; *Dzieła*, t. 23: *Odzyskać świat realny* [Getting the real world back], 1999.
- 34 This concerns "Metaphysics", and of the "De ente et essentia" and "De veritate" of Thomas.

These two, Swieżawski and Krapiec, are the most influential figures in the Lublin school, for several reasons. They were the most active, and for the longest period, they probably wrote the most books and articles, and while I write this, both of them are still alive. On the other hand Kaminski died in 1986, Kalinowski left Lublin in 1958 and went to France, and in the same year Wojtyła became bishop and had to limit if not entirely give up his work at the university.

Jerzy Kalinowski, lawyer, logician and philosopher, was after Swieżawski the oldest representative of the Lublin school. He was born in Lublin in 1916, and lectured at KUL from 1948 to 1958. For some time he was dean of the Faculty. After that he moved to France, which he was connected to through his wife, and stayed there until his death in 2000. He wrote mainly in French and signed his name with the French version, Georges. His works have been translated from French into other languages (Italian, German, Spanish).

He was one of the founders of deontic logic³⁵, and wrote on logic the whole of his life³⁶. He dealt with various matters of practical philosophy, ethics, philosophy of law³⁷, as well as with metaphysics and philosophical anthropology³⁸. His main work in Polish is the book "Theory of Practical Cognition"³⁹. Together with Swieżawski he wrote in French the book "Philosophy at the Time of the Council"⁴⁰, dedicating it to Maritain and Gilson, who responded to the book with delighted approbation⁴¹.

35 He had a pioneering essay: *Theorie des propositions normatives* (printed in "Studia logica", 1953.).

36 Georges Kalinowski, *Introduction a la logique juridique, Éléments de sémiotiques juridique, logique des normes et logique juridique*, Paris, Librairie générale de droit et de jurisprudence, 1965. (Italian translation: *Introduzione alla logica giuridica*, Milano, Giuffrè, 1971.); Georges Kalinowski, *La Logique des normes*, Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1972. (German tr.: *Einführung in die Normenlogik*, Frankfurt am Main, Athenäum-Verlag, 1973.); Georges Kalinowski, *La logique déductive, Essai de présentation aux juristes*, Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1996.; Georges Kalinowski, *Sémiotique et philosophie, A partir et a l'encontre de Husserl et de Carnap*, Paris & Amsterdam, Édition Hades-Benjamin, 1985.

37 Georges Kalinowski, *Initiation a la philosophie morale*, Paris, Société d'Éditions Internationales, 1966.; Georges [Jerzy] Kalinowski, *La probleme de la verité en morale et en droit*, Lyon, Vitte, 1967.

38 Georges Kalinowski, *L'impossible métaphysique*, Paris, Beauchesne, 1981. (Italian tr.: *L'impossibile metafisica*, Genova, Marietti, 1991.); Georges Kalinowski, *La phénoménologie de l'homme chez Husserl, Ingarden et Scheler*, Paris, Éditions universitaires de Paris, 1991.

39 Jerzy Kalinowski, *Teorija poznania praktycznego*, Lublin, Wydawnictwo Towarzystwa Naukowego Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego, 1960.

40 Georges Kalinowski & Stefan Swieżawski, *La philosophie à l'heure du Concile*, Paris, Société d'Éditions Internationales, 1965. The publishing firm of Peter Lang has for some time announced an English translation of this work in its series of *Catholic Thought from Lublin*.

41 Both these answers sent in a letter to Swieżawski were later published. See: Jacques Maritain, *Approches sans entraves*, in: Jacques et Raissa Maritain, *Suvres complètes*, vol. XIII,

Stanisław Kamiński was born in 1919 in the town of Radzyń Podlaski, and lectured at KUL from 1947 to his death in 1986. He dealt with logic and the history of logic, methodology and the philosophy of science. His main work is the "Concept and Classification of Science"⁴². Together with Krapiec, he wrote the book "On the Theory and Methodology of Metaphysics"⁴³. Some works from the area of methodology and the philosophy of science were published posthumously.⁴⁴ As well as in Polish, he wrote quite a lot of articles in German.

Karol Wojtyła is of course the best known representative of the Lublin school. He was born in Wadowice in May 1920. He was ordained on November 1 1946 in Krakow. He did his post-graduate work in the Papal University of St Thomas in Rome (the Angelicum). He defended his doctoral dissertation at the Theological Faculty in Krakow. At the same time he defended his *habilitation* work, *The possibility of construction a Christian ethic on the basis of the system of Max Schler*. From 1954 he lectured in ethics at KUL, and this lasted to his election as Pope in 1978. But he was able to devote himself to teaching and research work in philosophy only to a limited extent, because in 1958 he had already become suffragan bishop in Krakow, and in 1964 was elevated to the position of Archbishop of Krakow.

His two most important philosophical works are "Love and Responsibility"⁴⁶ published in 1960 and "Person and Act"⁴⁷ printed in 1969. This second

Fribourg & Paris, Éditions Universitaires & Éditions Saint-Paul, 1993. p. 537–546. and Etienne Gilson, Frammenti di tre lettere, in: Georges [Jerzy] Kalinowski, *L'impossibile metafisica*, Genova, Marietti, 1991. p. 207–208.

- 42 Stanisław Kamiński, *Pojęcie nauki i klasyfikacja nauk* [Concept of science and classification of sciences], Lublin, Wydawnictwo Towarzystwa Naukowego Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego, 1970. (1st ed. 1961.)
- 43 Stanisław Kamiński i Mieczysław Albert Krapiec, *Z teorii i metodologii metafizyki*, Lublin, Wydawnictwo Towarzystwa Naukowego Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego, 1962
- 44 Stanisław Kamiński, *Jak filozofować?* Studia z metodologii filozofii klasycznej [How to philosophise] Studies in the methodology of classical philosophy?, do druku przygotował Tadeusz Szubka, Lublin, Towarzystwo Naukowe Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego, 1989.; Stanisław Kamiński, *Filozofia i metoda*, Studia z dziejów metod filozofowania [Philosophy and Method, Study from the history of philosophical methodology], do druku przygotował ks. Józef Herbut, Lublin, Towarzystwo Naukowe Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego, 1993.; Stanisław Kamiński, *Metoda i język*, Studia z semiotyki i metodologii nauk [Method and Language, Studies in semiotics and the methodology of science], do druku przygotowała Urszula M. Zeglen, Lublin, Towarzystwo Naukowe Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego, 1994.
- 45 Karol Wojtyła, *Ocena możliwości zbudowania etyki chrześcijańskiej przy założeniach systemu Maksela Schelera*, Lublin, Wydawnictwo Towarzystwa Naukowego Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego, 1960.
- 46 Karol Wojtyła, *Miłość i odpowiedzialność*, Lublin, Wydawnictwo Towarzystwa Naukowego Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego, 1960.
- 47 Karol Wojtyła, *Osoba i czyn*, Kraków, Polskie Towarzystwo Teologiczne, 1969.

was changed and supplemented for an English edition, and in the view of the author himself the English version is definitive and authoritative. He replied in it to the criticisms of Polish philosophers that were voiced after the publication of the Polish edition.

Both of these works have been translated into several foreign languages (Italian, French, English, Germany, Spanish, Portuguese, Swedish, Japanese⁴⁸). Some other philosophical works of his have also been translated⁴⁹. So far the only work of his translated into Croatian is "Introduction to Ethics"⁵⁰. And as Pope he has on many occasions written and spoken on philosophical questions, most of all and most systematically in the encyclical "Fides et Ratio". But it is important to distinguish between when he was speaking as philosopher, and when as the supreme teacher of the Church. He himself has distinguished this very well.

Those who do not know Polish can learn about the Lublin school not only from translations of books published in other countries, as I have already mentioned, but also from the articles that the members of it published in foreign magazines. Collections of translations of articles of the Lublin philosophers have been printed in Lublin. The most important are: "700th Anniversary of the death of St Thomas Aquinas: the contemporary importance of his thought"⁵¹ and "Theory of the being for the understanding of reality"⁵².

48 Some of these translations can be mentioned: Karol Wojtyła, *Amore e responsabilità*, Torino, Marietti, 1969.; Karol Wojtyła, *Amour et responsabilité*, Paris, Société d'Éditions Internationales, 1965.; Karol Wojtyła, *Love and Responsibility*, New York, Farrar, Strauss & Giroux, 1981.; Karol Wojtyła, *The Acting Person*, Dordrecht, Reidel, 1979.; Karol Wojtyła, *Person und Tat*, Freiburg (Breisgau) & Basel, Herder, 1981.; Karol Wojtyła, *Persona e atto*, Città del Vaticano, Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1982.

49 We shall quote some of these translations: Karol Wojtyła, *Valutazione sulla possibilità di costruire l'etica cristiana sulle basi del sistema di Max Scheler*, Roma, Logos, 1980.; Karol Wojtyła, *I fondamenti dell'ordine etico*, Bologna, Centro Studi Europa Orientale, 1980.; Karol Wojtyła, *Primat des Geistes*, Philosophische Schriften, Stuttgart, Seewald, 1980.; Karol Wojtyła, *Lubliner Vorlesungen*, Stuttgart, Seewald, 1981.; Karol Wojtyła, *Lectures from Lublin*, New York, Peter Lang, 1993.; Karol Wojtyła, *Person and Community*, Selected Essays, New York, Peter Lang, 1993.

50 Karol Wojtyła, *Temelji etike*, Split, Verbum, 1998.

51 *W 700-lecie śmierci św. Tomasza z Akwinu. Próba uwspółcześnienia jego filozofii*, red. Stanisław Kamiński, Marian Kurdziałek & Zofia Zdybicka, Lublin, Wydawnictwo Towarzystwa Naukowego Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego, 1976. Although the name of this collection is in Polish, the articles are all in French, English or German.

52 *Theory of Being to Understand Reality*, eds. Stanisław Kamiński, Marian Kurdziałek & Zofia Zdybicka, Lublin, Wydawnictwo Towarzystwa Naukowego Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego, 1980.

3. *The Ideas*

And now just a little about the main ideas of the Lublin school. Whose influence can be seen in them? First of all we can notice the influence of the French existential Thomism, as it is called, of Gilson and Maritain, more of the first than the second. This is seen first of all in the view of the central topic of metaphysics, of which more later. Then it can be seen in the criticisms of Thomas's commentators⁵³, and in the aspiration to read above all the original Thomist texts. It can be seen in the aspiration to seek in Thomas's ideas and methods the means for the understanding of the present world and current problems. In the aspiration to dialogue with contemporary thinkers and in the endeavour to find out what there is that is valuable in them.

The second impact came from Polish 20th century philosophy, which since Twardowski had placed a special emphasis on the problem of method. Tadeusz Czezowski says that the Twardowski school "also affected philosophers who were not directly linked with him, not to such an extent to make them leave their ideas and change their interests, but by Polish philosophical works being instinct with methodological requirements and the manner of dealing with philosophical problems that is typical of the Twardowski school. [...] In this manner the influence of the philosophical work of Twardowski spread over the whole country, creating a typical philosophical style of work."⁵⁴

Krapiec says that it was the distance from the West, geographical and political, that made it easier for the Lublin philosophers to "think in a much more personal manner about a whole group of matters and to devote to them studies in the analytical spirit, characteristic of the mentality of the Poles."⁵⁵ It seems to me that the most valuable contribution of the school derived both from the fertile synthesis of these two influences. One can also note a certain influence from phenomenology, but the influence of that certainly does not need overrating. A little later we shall see why.

Members of the Lublin school dealt very thoroughly with all philosophical disciplines, and even with those that are rarely explored in detail in church

53 In this Gilson is followed, not Maritain, who in his letter to Swieżawski mentions this as one of the differences between them (See: Jacques Maritain, *Approches sans entraves*, p. 544.)

54 Tadeusz Czezowski, *K. Twardowski as Teacher*, "Studia Philosophica 1939-1946", quoted from: Francesco Coniglione, *A Short History of 20th Century Polish Philosophy*, *Polish Philosophy Page*, <http://www.fmag.unict.it/PolPhil/ShortHist.html> (27. 3. 2002.)

55 Mieczysław Albert Krapiec, *La problématique et le développement de la philosophie de Saint Thomas à l'Université Catholique de Lublin*, in: *W 700-lecie śmierci św. Tomasza z Akwinu*. op. corporate income tax., p. 5.

universities, such as for example logic and aesthetics. We have seen that of the five founding members as many as two, Kalinowski and Kaminski, were logicians, and Krapiec dealt pronouncedly with the problem of methodology. Although some of them devoted themselves more to one and others to the other problem, still there was a pronounced overall view of philosophy and its problems. All the members of the school showed great breadth here.

The centre and ground of all philosophy is metaphysics, and is for Krapiec the only philosophical discipline, all others being nothing but applied metaphysics. Without a correct metaphysics, it is not possible to found a correct anthropology. Ethics is impossible without anthropology, because it is a human being that is making the moral decisions, good and evil. And a false anthropology leads to totalitarianism, which recent history clearly shows. In this area more than in any other it can be seen that philosophy is no harmless playing with words and that it has great consequence for human lives and for politics.

Epistemology, the theory of knowledge, cannot be a fundamental discipline, as is the case in many modern philosophies. Since it is about human knowledge, the root of the question is what man is, thus it is not possible without anthropology, or rather, it is just a part of anthropology. And anthropology, as we have already said, has to be founded on metaphysics.

Fundamental metaphysical insights are given us by Thomas Aquinas, and the Lublin school has always been considered markedly Thomist. What does Thomas give us? "He will not give us, nor can we expect him to give, a ready made formula of how to live and act, it is not about this. He teaches us philosophical contemplation, and this has a formative influence on the shaping of the whole of our culture. I believe that this kind of formation will finally give us what we need so much: eyes to see and ears to hear. This is a step in the direction of our culture becoming no longer individualist but social, become more a culture of wisdom than a culture of just science and individual knowledges."⁵⁶

And what should we see? We should see the reality, think it over, and not be more or less closed in our own world. Thomism is "in essence opposed to subjectivism, to concentration on the self, which alas characterises all modern European thinking. Contemporary philosophy, instead of being a consideration of the whole of the reality we are in has become, as David Hume called it, an inquiry into human understanding, thinking about the world of our products... the philosophy of what we create, and not the philosophy of reality itself... The manner of thinking of St Thomas is a radical cure for this subjectivist, egocentric way of thinkng."⁵⁷

56 Stefan Swieżawski, *St. Thomas Revisited*, pp. 14–15.

57 *Ibid*, p. 13.

But to follow Thomas does not mean to follow his commentators. "To follow correctly the historical development of the thinking of St Thomas, one first of all has to know what his real thoughts were, know it precisely and clearly."⁵⁸ For to go on with Thomas's thinking "does not mean how to quote Thomas and refer to him, but really take over his main ideas with full understanding"⁵⁹. Swieżawski says that matters went the wrong way with Thomas's commentators from the very outset: "Thomas's students endeavoured to define the teacher's doctrine as Aristotelianism in line with the principles of faith. Those that in the 13th and 14th century we call Thomists actually wanted to be Aristotelians."⁶⁰

Many of those who are considered themselves Thomists, and were considered by others to be so, understood Thomas's thinking completely falsely, turning it into essentialism. They put essence at the centre (nature, the answer to the question, What is that?) while in Thomas it is existence, the very existence of things that is at the centre. Essentialism, developed consistently, leads to idealism, because at the end the philosopher no longer deals with the really existing but with ideas. Here lies the key criticism of phenomenology, particularly of Husserl's *epoche* that existence itself puts in brackets. While the phenomenological method can be useful at the descriptive level, it can never found a metaphysics.

If existence is at the centre of attention, then it is not possible to wander off from reality⁶¹. Then no kind of a priori is possible either, because it appears whether it is essence that is seen and not being. Also, if one starts from the real being, then this kind of philosophy is open to every kind of reality and every kind of objective truth. "What characterises the philosophical system of St Thomas above all is its openness."⁶²

Metaphysics differs from other sciences in its objective research, and its object is being as being, and not some special kind of being. But it differs from them according to the method by which it arrives at fundamental concepts,

58 Stefan Swieżawski, *Histoire de la pensée de Saint Thomas. Recherches polonaises*, in: *Tommaso d'Aquino nel suo settimo centenario*, Atti del congresso internazionale, vol. II: Tommaso d'Aquino nella storia del pensiero, Napoli, Edizioni domenicane Italiane, 1976. p. 335.

59 *Ibid.*, p. 335–336.

60 *Ibid.*, p. 337.

61 A festschrift for Krapiec to mark his fifty years of scholarship has the significant title: *Wierność rzeczywistości* [Faith of Reality], Księga Pamiątkowa z okazji jubileuszu 50-lecia pracy naukowej KUL O. prof. Mieczysława A. Krapca, Lublin, Wydawnictwo Towarzystwa Naukowego Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego, Lublin, 2001.

62 Mieczysław Albert Krapiec, *Traits caractéristique de la philosophie de Saint Thomas*, in: *Atti del VIII Congresso Tomistico Internazionale*, vol. V: Problemi metafisici, Città del Vaticano, Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1982. p. 7.

and in metaphysics this is not abstraction but separation. While in other sciences one arrives at the concept by abstraction, this is not possible in metaphysics, because being is not identical in meaning, but analogous.

Instead of a definition in metaphysics we have explanation, because metaphysical concepts cannot be defined according to classical rules of definition, since they are transcendental and analogous. In metaphysics the main role is not drawing syllogistic conclusions, but the process of "liberation from contradiction". The clear absurdity of the contradictory statement is shown, and the incompatibility of the statement with the facts, or there is a reduction of the opposite judgement to contradiction or it is shown that the real or even fictive opponent cannot define the matter differently.⁶³

The question of God normally and necessarily fits into metaphysics. This is not isolated or accidental question. "The ultimate understanding of the contingent being is closely connected with the necessity of God's existence."⁶⁴ "The famed five ways of St Thomas are not autonomous proofs of God's existence; they are the deepened and ultimate explanation of the contingent being. Philosophy does not endeavour to prove God's existence, but tries the best it can to understand the beings that have been given to us in everyday existence"⁶⁵. Without God the contingent being, that is composed of being and existence, becomes inexplicable and we fall into the absurdity of identifying being and nothingness, or of rejecting the principle of non-contradiction.

The starting point of philosophical anthropology consists of the fundamental facts about man. These facts cannot be denied in the name of some philosophical theory, rather philosophy needs to explain them. It is in this, according to Krapiec, that Thomas is different from modern philosophers. "In general we might say that St Thomas in these areas of knowledge uses the method that can be called the motto "from facts towards their explanation and to theory", as against the approach of contemporary thinkers whose motto would appear to be "from theory to facts and their understanding."⁶⁶

It turns out that every false anthropology essentially mutilates man. Facts about man first of all need establishing. In this it is not necessary to rely on specialised science, because every such knowledge is limited by its own particular aspect from which it looks at man and its own special method. It is

63 Mieczysław Albert Krapiec, *Metaphysics*, p. 46.

64 Mieczysław Albert Krapiec, *La problématique et le développement de la philosophie de Saint Thomas l'Université Catholique de Lublin*, p. 8.

65 *Ibid.*, p. 7.

66 Mieczysław Albert Krapiec, *The Human Soul: The Approach of St. Thomas and Some Contemporary Thinkers*, in: *L'anima nell'antropologia di S. Tommaso d'Aquino*, a cura di Abelardo Lobato, Milano, Massimo, 1987. p. 469-470.

necessary rather to rely on what every man in general experiences and what is incontrovertible.⁶⁷ The facts that have been established need philosophically interpreting, and this once again means to employ the procedure of liberation from contradiction. At the centre of anthropology is the human person. Only by understanding man as person is it possible really to understand him.

How does the Lublin school see contemporary ethics? "Moral relativism, which is so prevalent in our time, has its main source in Kant's philosophy. Immanuel Kant brought his theory of value into philosophy and ethics, which was afterwards developed by the neo-Kantians, and which finally found a place for itself in almost every area of culture. But the main difference between value and the good is that the good is the characteristic of being (hence, the good is real) while value is brought in opposite being (as in connection with the Sollen as against Sein). Value is not real, because it is not a characteristic of being, and then it leads directly to idealism and the relativisation of morals"⁶⁸

Philosophers of the Lublin school dealt a great deal with the history of philosophy, Polish and universal, but history was not an end in itself. Historical investigation is always at the service of the theoretical. Knowing the history of philosophy and its trends of today means that we can make use of everything good that has been discovered so far, and all the solutions that are false are to be avoided, and we should even find the roots of these errors. The final aim is always to find an answer to contemporary and even more to eternal questions.

4. *Karol Wojtyła and Lublin Thomism*

Finally a bit about a question that is often raised, and to which various answers are given. Is Karol Wojtyła a Thomist or a phenomenologist or some kind of cocktail between the two? Did he and does he share the views of the Lublin school or not? Many here see what they want to see. So far I have said quite a lot about his multi-faceted and close links with the leading representatives of the Lublin school. His entire philosophical training took place in this circle.

He himself in the foreword to his main work of philosophy wrote: "The author of this study owes everything to the systems of Aristotelian and Thomist metaphysics, anthropology and ethics on the one hand, and on the other to phenomenology, primarily in the interpretation of Scheler."⁶⁹ So, he has

67 Mieczysław Albert Krapiec, *I-Man*, p. 29–30.

68 Piotr Jaroszynski, A Brief Overview of Lublin Thomism, *The Lublin School of Philosophy*, <http://www.vaxxine.com/hyoomik/lublin/jarosz1.htm> (27. 3. 2002.)

69 Karol Wojtyła, *Persona e atto*, Città del Vaticano, Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 198., p. 14.

one and the other, many will conclude quite simply, but the key question is what the relation is between them. I think that the following words from Wojtyła's article, in which he has summed up some of the central ideas of his main work, suggest an answer: "In this account my intention is not only to discuss the problem that I consider of key importance for an understanding of the human person and for a creative continuation of Thomas's visions in this area in connection with the trends of modern thinking, particularly of phenomenology."⁷⁰ This is not a matter of abandoning Thomas, but of a lively and vital development of his thinking. And that the fundamental ideas of Thomas need not be, and indeed must not be abandoned, the Pope has repeated many times.

The Holy Father answers in this way one other question that is often repeated: "Do we perhaps have to fear that acceptance of the philosophy of St Thomas might call into question the justified multifacetedness of culture and the development of human thinking? Such fear would obviously be excessive, because "philosophy that goes always", in the power of the said methodological principle, according to which all the richness of reality has its source in the *actus essendi*, the reality of existence, covers a priori, to put it this way, everything that is truthful in reality. And vice versa: every knowledge of reality — which really reflects it — has its full rights in the "philosophy of existence", irrespective of who is to be credited with having advanced this knowledge and irrespective of the philosophical school to which he belongs."⁷¹

In the same work, the Pope has also said this: "The philosophy of St Thomas deserves to be read and accepted with conviction by the youth of today, because of its openness and many-sidedness, and these are features that are hard to find in many of the trends of today's thinking. This is a matter of openness to the whole of reality in all its parts and dimensions, without reduction or limitation (without the absolutisation of individual forms), as reason demands for the sake of objective and complete truth about reality. [...] This openness is based on and springs from the fact that the philosophy of St Thomas is the philosophy of existence, i. e., the reality of existence (*actus essendi*), the transcendental value of which is the most immediate way for us to attain the knowledge of subsisting existence, *esse subsistens*, and *actus purus*, absolute perfection, that is, God. From this annunciation of existence derives the capacity of the philosophy of St Thomas to accept and to confirm everything that appears before the human mind (givenness of experience in the broadest sense) as a certain being in the whole of the inexhaustible rich-

70 Karol Wojtyła, The personal structure of self-determination, "Obnovljeni život", XXXIV, br. 1/1979, p. 5.

71 Speech on the hundred anniversary of the encyclical 'Aeterni patris', Rome, Papal University of St Thomas, November 1979.

ness of its substance;... Saint Thomas sent philosophy off along the trail of this intuition of being, indicating at the same time that the mind feels comfortable (at home with itself) on this journey, and so we simply cannot deny it unless we wish to deny ourselves.⁷²

These two quotations are just two examples taken from among many others⁷³. In the texts quoted, cannot we easily recognised ideas that are in perfect harmony with the idea of Swieżawski and Krapiec that we discussed earlier? After all, a fundamental view of St Thomas that is expressed in the words of the Holy Father quoted have been shared by many other contemporary Thomist philosophers, not just Polish. In the light of everything stated, is it possible to talk of overcoming the borders or framework of Thomist philosophy, as is commonly said: Does it have, can it have, borders: Perhaps one can and should go on, not always from the beginning. *Vetera novis augere* is needed.⁷⁴

The Holy Father is puzzled and disappointed that his calls are so generally ignored: "If in various occasions we had a need to speak from the beginning about this question and to confirm the value of the Angelic Doctor and persist in the understanding of his philosophy, this comes from the regulations of teaching not always being kept with the desired readiness. In many Catholic schools, in the years after the end of Vatican Two, a certain retrogression can be seen because it is not only scholastic philosophy that was less valued, but the whole of philosophy. In wonder and sorrow we note that a fair number of theologians are involved in this neglect of philosophical study."⁷⁵

72 *Ibid*, pp. 13–15

73 First of all one should look at the encyclical of John Paul II, *Fides et ratio*.

74 How Jacques Maritain, best known Thomist of the 20th century, looked at this question, and how he explained his views about it, see my article: Ivan Zelić, *Zašto i kako biti tomist?* (Tomizam Jacquesa Maritaina), *Obnovljeni život*, god. LII, br. 5/1997.

75 John Paul II., *Fides et ratio*, no. 61, p. 87–88.