

Karol Petryszak

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9058-4721>

The Pontifical University of John Paul II in Krakow, Poland

## **The Perspective of Archival Discoveries in the Study of Karol Wojtyła's Philosophy**

### **Abstract**

The aim of this paper is to present archival discoveries made, among others, by the author in the Archives of the Metropolitan Curia in Cracow. The discoveries concern the manuscript of Karol Wojtyła, and are connected to his work on the postdoctoral thesis. This discovery was also presented in the context of its possible influence on the study of Wojtyła's philosophy, based on Etienne Gilson's conception of the method of studying the history of philosophy (the necessity of considering the whole of thought in the context of its individual elements, the context of impersonal necessity, etc.).

### **Keywords**

Karol Wojtyła, Étienne Gilson's historical-philosophical method, archives, manuscripts, philosophy, history of philosophy.

## 1. Introduction

It may seem that Karol Wojtyła as a philosopher will no longer surprise us as far as his published philosophical work is concerned. His correspondence or loose notes on current matters, as a bishop and later a cardinal, may not be entirely revealed or, if revealed, not thoroughly studied by Wojtyła's biographers.<sup>1</sup> But in the case of his philosophical oeuvre one may think that it will bring no surprises: for various reasons his philosophy has become quite popular not only in Poland, and the group of the experts on his philosophy is quite numerous. I do not intend to claim that Wojtyła's philosophy has already been thoroughly examined. On the contrary, my aim is to draw the attention of the reader to the fact that a certain area of research has been neglected. Therefore, my purpose is to contribute to further research regarding Wojtyła's archival materials and their influence on understanding the whole philosophy of the author of *Person and Act*.

In this article, I am going to present the possibilities of making use of the latest archival discoveries as well as their significance in terms of further research in the work of Wojtyła and others (including phenomenological trends in the Lublin philosophical milieu). The prospects and perspectives shown below are proposals manifest to the author. However, they do not constitute a closed set of possibilities. Apart from presenting the discovery, the author aims to initiate, or revive, trends of thought in the studies of Karol Wojtyła's philosophy.

---

<sup>1</sup> My remark is not meant as criticism of previous studies of Wojtyła's biography. In the context of the historical-philosophical method discussed below, it only indicates such a possibility in the future. My reflection is all the more justified as it was only in 2020 that the work *Inwentarz spuścizny Karola Wojtyły w archiwum Kurii Metropolitalnej w Krakowie, t. I, Akta personalne i korespondencja (1920–1978)* was published (the book was edited by A. Kędra and M. Makowska, Kraków 2020, Wydawnictwo św. Stanisława BM). In the Introduction, one of the editors emphasizes that it was necessary to set this archival collection in order and that it has not yet been fully used (*Inwentarz spuścizny Karola Wojtyły w archiwum Kurii Metropolitalnej w Krakowie, t. I, Akta personalne i korespondencja (1920–1978)*, pp. 7–11).

## 2. A reconstruction of the research conducted

A critical edition of the complete philosophical works of Karol Wojtyła has been underway since 2019.<sup>2</sup> The initiative is part of the project to publish Wojtyła's oeuvre (including theological and literary works), a task undertaken by the John Paul II Institute of Intercultural Dialogue in Kraków and many specialists in the field.<sup>3</sup> Together with Marta Burghardt we examined Wojtyła's philosophical works. Our method has been as follows. We knew what had already been published and what was in the archives, in particular in the Archive of the Metropolitan Curia in Kraków. The Institute of Intercultural Dialogue in Kraków ensured high quality digitization of the available documents which made it possible to work on them outside the Curia Archive. In cases where there was more than one publication, we decided, together with the editor of the publication, which edition would be the basis of our research, and with which we will compare the archival materials. With this in mind, we started to search for and mark the differences between various versions of a given text.

There is, of course, variance that results from modernizing the text (e.g. Wojtyła wrote 'according to one's lights' (*wedle*) which has been changed into 'according to one's understanding' (*według*)). However, such differences do not impact his philosophical thought and as such are almost irrelevant (from the philosophical perspective, though not the linguistic one). Nonetheless, if we take Wojtyła's postdoctoral thesis,<sup>4</sup> comparative studies reveal that here, the philosophical images vary. For example, in the 1991 edition we read: 'However, the experience on which ethics is based differs from the experience on which

---

<sup>2</sup> I mean all philosophical works by Wojtyła, the most well-known: *Love and Responsibility* or *Person and Act*, as well as less-known, e.g., reviews from the 50s.: K. Wojtyła, (*Rec.*) F. Bednarski, *Przedmiot etyki w świetle zasad św. Tomasza z Akwinu*, Lublin 1956, "Roczniki Filozoficzne KUL" 6 (1958) No. 2, pp. 133–136; K. Wojtyła, (*Rec.*) Cz. Znamierowski, *Zasady i kierunki etyki*, Warszawa 1958, "Zeszyty Naukowe KUL" 1 (1958) No. 1, pp. 76–78.

<sup>3</sup> See information on the project: <https://idmjp2.pl/category/projekty/krytyczne-wydanie/> (28.02.2023).

<sup>4</sup> See K. Wojtyła, *Ocena możliwości zbudowania etyki chrześcijańskiej przy założeniach systemu Maxa Schelera*, in: *Karol Wojtyła. Zagadnienie podmiotu moralności*, eds. T. Styczeń, J. W. Gałkowski, A. Rodziński, A. Szostek, series *Źródła i monografie* No. 119 (*Człowiek i moralność*), Lublin 1991, publ. Wydawnictwo Towarzystwa Naukowego Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego, pp. 11–128.

the so called exact sciences rest.<sup>5</sup> Contrastingly, in the first manuscript we read: “This cannot be experience identical to the one which in the exact sciences is the basis for conclusions and general theses obtained by induction.”<sup>6</sup>

The above example has been chosen as it is concise (the list of the differences in various versions of the postdoctoral thesis is over 70 pages of an A4 format); it is no use quoting excerpts that show greater differences but are one page long. The above sentences show that certain intuitions of Wojtyła have been modified and as such are at variance with his original intensions (other typescripts and the first edition are the same here as in the edition of 1991). Such nuances may play an important role in the research method presented below.

Subsequently, together with Burghardt we checked whether we have all the archival versions of Wojtyła’s works.<sup>7</sup> We started verifying the resources of the Curia Archive. At first, we found texts that we expected to be there – they were not very relevant to us as they were often excerpts or copies of what we had already found (e.g. when the manuscript had been rewritten and immediately traced in several copies). However, when I was unable to locate one of the texts

<sup>5</sup> Originally: “Jednakże to doświadczenie, na którym opiera się etyka, różni się od doświadczenia, na którym opierają się tzw. nauki szczegółowe”. K. Wojtyła, *Ocena możliwości zbudowania etyki chrześcijańskiej przy założeniach systemu Maxa Schelera*, p. 15.

<sup>6</sup> Originally: “Nie może to jednak być doświadczenie w takim samym znaczeniu jak to, które w naukach szczegółowych tworzy podstawę dla wniosków i twierdzeń ogólnych w drodze indukcji”. Shelf mark AKKW CII-9/110, p. 3 (according to Wojtyła’s numbering).

In the archival collection marked as AKKW [Archive of Cardinal Karol Wojtyła (originally: Archiwum Kardynała Karola Wojtyły)], the archives we are interested in are in the collection marked as C-II [philosophical works]. The archives of Wojtyła’s postdoctoral thesis are in 4 files marked with the following reference numbers: 1. AKKW CII-9/110 [sheets: 192]; 2. AKKW CII-9/110 [sheets: 182]; 3. AKKW CII-9/110a [sheets: 188]; 4. AKKW CII-9/110b [sheets: 180]. As we can see, two files are labeled in the same way. However, these are two separate files. Also, their titles are written in various ways: 1. *Próba opracowania etyki / chrześcijańskiej według systemu / Maks Schelera*; 2. *Próba opracowania etyki / chrześcijańskiej według / systemu Maks Schelera*. Each of the above 4 files contains a full archival complement of successive versions of Wojtyła’s postdoctoral thesis.

Wojtyła’s translation of Max Scheler’s work which we discuss later on also constitutes a full archival set put in 3 small files (A5 format) with the common reference number AKKW CII-24/232 [sheets: 639 with text on both sides, approx. 13,5 x 10,5 cm].

Max Scheler’s work to which we will refer below (*Der Formalismus in der Ethik und die materiale Wertethik* from 1921) is a separate archival unit in the collection marked with the abbreviation BKKW [Library of Cardinal Karol Wojtyła (originally: Biblioteka Kardynała Karola Wojtyły)] and is numbered 84 (BKKW 84). This is a complete book.

<sup>7</sup> We consistently combed through the archival set AKKW CII, that is the one with philosophical works.

which the Archive was supposed to contain (which later turned out to be there but under a different title), I started searching all the philosophical archival materials once again.<sup>8</sup> I examined file after file and page after page (as sometimes one file contains various texts, and the description on the cover does not indicate exactly what is inside). In the process, I encountered something that is the core of this article, and now constitutes a large part of the first volume of Wojtyła's published philosophical works. I discovered three files with the manuscript of Wojtyła's 'crude' translation of Max Scheler's *Der Formalismus in der Ethik und die materiale Wertethik*.<sup>9</sup> This translation was not intended for publication. It contains Wojtyła's remarks and comments which are later to be found in his postdoctoral thesis. It is a draft which he used while writing his thesis – over 600 slips of paper with the translation on both sides, in fine letters.<sup>10</sup> The translation is complete – Wojtyła did not omit one single paragraph of Scheler's work. In the first volume of Wojtyła's philosophical works<sup>11</sup> one can find the details regarding the discovery which are systematically explained by Fr. Dariusz Radziechowski. He helped us proofread the slips and work on German notions that Wojtyła did not render in Polish.

Together with Burghardt we understood the value of our discovery so we started deciphering and rewriting the slips. Later, we adopted a more effective method: I read and rewrote the text and Burghardt checked it out.

The last step, taken with Fr Radziechowski, was the addition of suitable editorial comments. Editing the newly found materials took us around a year.

The above reconstruction of the steps that we took describes how we obtained the sources and worked on them. However, as we will see later in this article, it is also the ground on which one can strengthen the conviction that this kind of work may be regarded (by certain trends) as a philosophical study. It is worth underlining that it would have been much more difficult to examine the documents if we did not know Wojtyła's philosophy, his way of thinking, as well as phenomenology and the philosophical terms that he uses as mental shortcuts

---

<sup>8</sup> The set: AKKW CII.

<sup>9</sup> M. Scheler, *Der Formalismus in der Ethik und die materiale Wertethik*, Halle a.d.S. 1921, publ. Max Niemeyer (Ref. BKKW 84).

A Polish translation of this work has not been published yet. It was only when I consulted Burghardt and we delved into the new material that we managed to determine what it was (I was not sure when I came across it for the first time).

<sup>10</sup> Ref. AKKW CII-24/232.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. footnote no. 3.

for broad and rich philosophical traditions. Therefore, if one did not have sound philosophical knowledge, various notions in the text would be unintelligible.

Thus, the method of studying archival discoveries is of high importance in the context of the subsequent parts of this article as it enables the comprehension of the whole process of reading Wojtyła (or any other author) properly, on the basis of his oeuvre. The accurate examination of the archival materials is an important issue therefore, we give a meticulous description of the steps that we took while studying our archival ‘findings’.

### 3. An outline of Étienne Gilson’s historical-philosophical method

Étienne Gilson’s historical-philosophical method is one of the most significant methods which may be applied for archival discoveries such as ours.<sup>12</sup> I will briefly present crucial points and assumptions of this method without adding anything. This step will help more so to clearly place these newly found manuscripts in a broader research perspective.

The scholars and commentators of Gilson’s philosophical oeuvre agree that the historical-philosophical method was most explicitly and comprehensively presented in *The Unity of Philosophical Experience* in 1937.<sup>13</sup> Twelve years later Gilson’s address at the annual convention of the Medieval Academy of America was published under the title *Doctrinal History and its Interpretation* as a complement to *The Unity...*<sup>14</sup>

The model of examination presented in the two texts have been also commented on by Polish academics.<sup>15</sup> It should be emphasized that when compared

---

<sup>12</sup> The fact that Gilson and Wojtyła drew on Thomistic paradigm has not played a major role in choosing Gilson’s method.

<sup>13</sup> E. Gilson, *The Unity of Philosophical Experience*, New York 1937, publ. Scribner’s Sons. Here I use the Polish translation: E. Gilson, *Jedność doświadczenia filozoficznego*, Warszawa 1968, publ. PAX.

<sup>14</sup> E. Gilson, *Doctrinal History and its Interpretation*, ‘Speculum’ Vol. 24, No. 4, Oct. 1949, pp. 483–492.

<sup>15</sup> See e.g. J. Czerkawski, *Gilsonowska koncepcja historii filozofii*, “Roczniki Filozoficzne” 13 (1965) No. 1, pp. 61–72; M. Gogacz, *W sprawie koncepcji historii filozofii*, “Zeszyty Naukowe KUL” 7 (1964) No. 3, pp. 53–57; M. Gogacz, *O pojęciu i metodzie historii filozofii*, “Ruch Filozoficzny” 25 (1966) No. 1/2, pp. 76–80; M. Gogacz, *Rola historii filozofii w filozofii Boga*, “Studia z filozofii Boga”, ed. B. Bejze, Vol. 3, Warszawa 1977, pp. 365–413, publ. ATK; S. Janeczek, *Między filozoficzną historią filozofii a historią kultury. Z rozważań nad metodą historii filozofii*

to multiple other research methods, Gilson's model is quite demanding.<sup>16</sup> However, when applied, its contribution may be incomparably greater than in the case of other methods.

Let us consider three levels (or steps) of Gilson's method.<sup>17</sup> Subsequently, we will show the significance of discovering Wojtyła's manuscript in the light of this method.

Gilson speaks about three areas of research:

- a. the history of philosophical writings<sup>18</sup>;
- b. the history of philosophical doctrines;
- c. the history of philosophy itself.

The history of philosophical writings is the point of the method closest to strictly historical and philosophical study for it uses those elements of the historical studies (originally derived from the medieval studies) that make it possible to determine the authenticity of a given document, the time it was created, its author etc. Here our purpose is to critically analyze and present a given text,<sup>19</sup> which may serve as a variant of the critical edition. However, this step cannot be conducted in the field of philosophy if one does not know philosophy (the history of philosophical doctrines as well as terminology) since working on a given text requires (at least preliminary) comprehension of its content. This is important if, in the very beginning, one does not want to misinterpret it. For example, let us consider a short 'trans. being'. In the case of more classical doctrines,

---

w Polsce, "Roczniki Filozoficzne" 55 (2007) No. 1, pp. 103–105; P. Milcarek, *Rozumienie filozofii chrześcijańskiej przez Etienne Gilsona*, in: *Etienne Gilson. Filozofia i mediewistyka*, ed. T. Klimski, Warszawa 2007, pp. 37–48, publ. Wydawnictwo UKSW; A. Andrzejuk, *Koncepcja filozofii średniowiecznej jako filozofii chrześcijańskiej i niektóre jej konsekwencje w ujęciu Etienne Gilsona*, in: *Etienne Gilson. Filozofia i mediewistyka*, pp. 49–56; A. Andrzejuk, *Gilsonian method of the history of philosophy*, "Rocznik Tomistyczny" 9 (2020) No. 2, pp. 133–144.

<sup>16</sup> Gilson's model requires a lot of time and effort.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. J. Judycka, *Koncepcja historii filozofii Etienne'a Gilsona. (Główne tezy referatu wygłoszonego w ramach projektu "Historia filozofii jako problem filozoficzny" w dniu 17.02.2011)*, <https://studylibpl.com/doc/886752/historia-filozofii-w-uj%C4%99ciu-etienne-a-gilsona> (21.02.2022)

<sup>18</sup> Conventionally, the term 'history of philosophical literature' is used. However, it is difficult to determine what belongs to philosophical literature. Therefore, I broaden the notion to 'philosophical writings' which include handwritten notes which have not been published or even intended to see the light of day as 'philosophical literature'.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. J. Czerkawski, *Gilsonowska koncepcja historii filozofii*, pp. 61–62; E. Gilson, *Jedność doświadczenia filozoficznego*, pp. 206–207.

we obviously have two options here: ‘transcendent being’ or ‘transcendental being.’ However, if we allow for theological thinking, we may also take into account ‘trans-substantial being.’ A scholar with a good philosophical background will manage to see what this abbreviation stands for depending on the context.<sup>20</sup> Lack of such background may result in not complementing important notions (which, from an academic point of view, is less harmful) or worse, in misinterpreting them (which is much more harmful). Thus, professional examination of a given text is fundamental for further steps of research.<sup>21</sup>

Having edited a given text in this way one may proceed to step 2, that is the analysis of the content. Although a given text may contain various threads and issues, ultimately one needs to focus on reaching philosophical questions which are specific for a given doctrine.<sup>22</sup> Here, the title of Gilson’s monography becomes clearer: the unity of philosophical experience is an assumption that Gilson holds on the basis of, for example, Henri Bergson’s intuition.<sup>23</sup> Gilson shows it as a point (or a set of fundamental intuitions, axioms etc.) that unifies the whole doctrine.<sup>24</sup> This assumption enables us to understand subsequent levels of the study which is an ‘inside analysis’ of a given doctrine. If one does not know what doctrine this is, then, according to Gilson, the very research material contains sufficient clues to reveal the doctrine.

Here Gilson speaks of three necessary steps: the analysis of the sources, the contextual analysis, and the scholarly analysis (which is an extension of the contextual analysis).<sup>25</sup>

The analysis of the sources – originally described in the context of studying medieval philosophy – takes as its starting point, dealing with the original text. Thus, the return to the sources implies that we do not make use of ‘intermediaries’

---

<sup>20</sup> He will, of course, point out that it is him who explains the abbreviation e.g. ‘trans[endent] being.’

<sup>21</sup> An example of a source material that is easy and still badly edited is in modern times Feliks Koneczny’s *Cywilizacja żydowska*, vol. I–III, Warszawa 2019, publ. Capital; *Cywilizacja bizantyńska*, vol. I–II, Warszawa 2020, publ. Capital.

<sup>22</sup> See E. Gilson, *Jedność doświadczenia filozoficznego*, pp. 206–209.

<sup>23</sup> See e.g. E. Gilson, *Jedność doświadczenia filozoficznego*, p. 216.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. any chapter from parts I–III in E. Gilson, *Jedność doświadczenia filozoficznego*.

<sup>25</sup> J. Czerkawski, *Gilsonowska koncepcja historii filozofii*, p. 62 et seq.; see also: J. Judycka, *Koncepcja historii filozofii Etienne’a Gilsona. (Główne tezy referatu wygłoszonego w ramach projektu “Historia filozofii jako problem filozoficzny” w dniu 17.02.2011).*

who, with their interpretations, could 'contaminate' the thought conveyed in the source material.

The contextual analysis implies reading excerpts of a given text in the light of the whole text or doctrine. Here we assume that if the complete doctrine is made up of particular elements, then it is only in the light of the whole (that is all elements) that a given element may be properly understood.<sup>26</sup> Therefore, we should not learn about the doctrine only perfunctorily (let alone the so called 'taking something out of a given context' or through the prism of particular elements) as thus we do not draw nearer to a given thought.

The scholarly analysis is the final 'substep' in analyzing the content of a given text. It consists in placing a given doctrine in a broader context: historical, social, linguistic etc. This means that, while scrutinizing the works of Aristotle, one should know the ancient Greek of the period as well as particular historical conditions (e.g. Aristotle's ties with the Macedonian court), social (which help one understand why in *The Nicomachean Ethics* Aristotle doubts whether an ugly man may be happy<sup>27</sup>) as well as philosophical notions of the time as certain works of Aristotle (e.g. parts of *Metaphysics*) are unintelligible if one does not know the philosophy of Plato.<sup>28</sup>

The above 'substeps' of the second step in Gilson's method seem obvious. However, they are worth mentioning as they are not always put into practice.

The second step should 'crown' the study strictly connected with the history of philosophy. Assumedly, its result is rendering the author's (or a group of thinkers') thought as accurately as possible. Here Gilson does not allow for any philosophical interpretation and suggests being very cautious while 'finding' influence and sources of certain elements of the doctrine under scrutiny. Such overinterpretation, when put forward as a fact, may for many years forfeit the efforts of other scholars and lead them astray towards the alleged intellectual impressions and connections. This also applies to presenting subsequent impact of a given doctrine.

However, according to Gilson's method the two steps are not the history of philosophy itself yet, though it would be impossible to pass to step 3 without them. One should note here that a seemingly small mistake made in these steps

---

<sup>26</sup> This is certainly a well-known postulate from the hermeneutical analysis of a given text.

<sup>27</sup> See Aristotle, *Etyka Nikomachejska*, Kraków 1956, pp. 27–28, publ. PWN.

<sup>28</sup> E. Gilson, *Jedność doświadczenia filozoficznego*, pp. 206–209.

may have serious consequences as far as the ‘final point’ of the method in step 3 is concerned.

‘History of philosophy itself’ means passing from philosophical concepts and ideas being entangled historically, personally, socially etc. to considering them in themselves, as well as their ‘interactions’. For in the course of time, philosophical concepts and ideas have been related and mutually dependent; they have also changed in their ‘content’. It is exactly the examination of this content and interactions that is the aim of what Gilson suggests here. If the first two steps are made correctly, the concepts and ideas may be ‘detached’ and one may begin to philosophically study their connections and evolution regardless of the author. Gilson calls this approach ‘an impersonal necessity.’<sup>29</sup> It is manifested in concepts and their metamorphosis, and grows out of (or results from) the laws of reason. It is by finding the foundations of a given doctrine that one may, in fact, understand it. Gilson points out that each philosophical doctrine is based on a finite number of preliminary assumptions which, at the beginning, are made by a philosopher, and around which a given doctrine evolves. Changing or complementing these assumptions implies changing or complementing the whole doctrine. Therefore, they determine the whole doctrine. To refer again to the hermeneutic tradition, for a scholar it is important that a given doctrine is always finite. This means that a philosopher is capable of drawing only a certain number of essential conclusions that spring from the assumptions. However, at some point and for various reasons, he is no longer able to proceed philosophically, and the development (or the critique) of the doctrine is up to subsequent philosophers and scholars. Roman Ingarden was right when he aptly called this possibility ‘moving forward with it.’<sup>30</sup>

Gilson’s *Unity of Philosophical Experience* presents how this method (in fact its final step) is put into practice.

---

<sup>29</sup> Cf. for example E. Gilson, *Jedność doświadczenia filozoficznego*, p. 220.

<sup>30</sup> It was especially during the academic sessions of Section of Aesthetics of the Polish Philosophical Association that he ordered his co-workers and fellow scholars to ‘move forward with it’. Cf R. Ingarden, *Wykłady i dyskusje z estetyki*, Warszawa 1981, publ. PWN, p. 301 et seq.

#### 4. Wojtyła's manuscripts in the light of the historical-philosophical method of Étienne Gilson

According to Gilson's idea presented above, the proper comprehension of individual elements of a given doctrine is possible only when we refer them to the whole doctrine. That is why any text that has been discovered forces (or one would wish they force) scholars to revise the conclusions which were formerly drawn. If the material found is complete and as rich as the one that we discovered, then it requires all the more attention. Let us go through further research perspective based on Gilson's method.

The first step (the history of philosophical writings) has already been made and one can see its results in the first volume of the philosophical writings of the critical edition of Wojtyła's oeuvre. Apart from a few difficulties (e.g. certain excerpts being illegible), the material is beyond doubt written by Wojtyła (the same handwriting, linguistic style, idiolects, congruity with other source materials). Thanks to the pages and verses being marked by Wojtyła in his notes<sup>31</sup>, their comparison with *Der Formalismus* by Scheler in 1921<sup>32</sup> was found to be easier.

In this original document of 1921, which is also available in the Curia Archive, there are Wojtyła's handwritten notes in the margins, and his underlining of issues that were of special interest (the possibility of building Christian ethics on the basis of Scheler's phenomenological ethics). For example, on page XI of the original document, Wojtyła underlines 10 lines and notes: 'Such is Scheler's general attitude?'<sup>33</sup>, where instead of 'such'<sup>34</sup> there was initially 'what'<sup>35</sup> which explains the question mark at the end. However, it was changed into 'such' which suggests that Wojtyła became certain that this is indeed Scheler's stance. While altering the interrogative sentence into an affirmative one Wojtyła did not change the punctuation mark, which is quite typical in his manuscripts. Comparing the two source materials<sup>36</sup> allowed us to edit the manuscript finally and more accurately. This was the end of the first step of Gilson's method.

---

<sup>31</sup> Ref. AKKW CII-24/232.

<sup>32</sup> Ref. BKKW 84.

<sup>33</sup> Originally: "takie jest ogólne stanowisko Schelera?". See: BKKW 86, p. XI.

<sup>34</sup> Originally: "takie". See: BKKW 86, p. XI.

<sup>35</sup> Originally: "jakie". See: BKKW 86, p. XI.

<sup>36</sup> Fr. Radziechowski compared the text with the German original.

The second step, that is the history of philosophical doctrine, together with the division into 3 subsequent ‘substeps’ (the analysis of the sources, contextual analysis and scholarly analysis) opens up wide possibilities not only with regards to Wojtyła’s postdoctoral thesis. For if we look at other early ethical writings of the future pope, we will notice that the way he understands Scheler’s philosophy there, is congruent with the understanding of Scheler’s phenomenology outlined in the source material in step 1.<sup>37</sup>

Thus, the manuscript enables us to reconstruct precisely Wojtyła’s understanding of phenomenology which corresponds to the first ‘substep’ – the analysis of the source.

Subsequently, we need to conduct a contextual analysis. The remaining elements of the doctrine (not only the early ethical writings, including the postdoctoral thesis) should be read and studied ‘anew’ in the light of the new source materials.

Then we need to conduct a scholarly analysis which will reveal the variety of conditions into which Wojtyła’s doctrine is entangled. For example, one of the significant starting points here is why did Wojtyła become interested in Scheler’s phenomenology. The answer – if at all possible to have – would broaden the scope of the scholarly analysis. Further questions and answers make up the whole context not only of Wojtyła’s interest in Scheler, but also of the accurate understanding of Wojtyła’s thought.

It is only in step 3 that the examination of the development of the notions and conceptions, is possible. This is done regardless of whether Wojtyła is considered as a representative of a certain tradition, as well as regardless of specific conditions that we have discussed earlier. I assume that, apart from the analysis of the doctrine itself, it will be possible to explain (if not definite, then at least in an undoubted way) the philosophical intuitions behind a given doctrine, and to ascribe them to proper doctrines that have already been studied. A typical issue that may be examined here is: to what extent was Wojtyła a phenomenologist? I do not intend to suggest the answer. However, reaching the very sources

---

<sup>37</sup> Cf. for example the following texts by Wojtyła (in line with the first edition): *Ewangeliczna zasada naśladowania. Nauka źródeł Objawienia a system filozoficzny Maxa Schelera*, “Ateneum Kapłańskie” 55 (1957) No. 1, pp. 57–67; *O metafizycznej i fenomenologicznej podstawie normy moralnej (w oparciu o koncepcje św. Tomasza z Akwinu oraz Makska Schelera)*, “Roczniki Teologiczno-Kanoniczne” 6 (1959) No. 1–2, pp. 99–124; *Problem oderwania przeżycia od aktu w etyce na tle poglądów Kanta i Schelera (Studium)*, “Roczniki Filozoficzne” 5 (1955–57) No. 3, pp. 113–140; etc.

of the doctrine would make it possible to resolve doubts regarding this issue. It could also help us settle and verify the question whether the two broadly understood doctrines (i.e. phenomenological and Thomistic) have common grounds or are fundamentally different.

The above proposals are merely a draft of how the study of Wojtyła's work could develop. Our aim has been to show the significance of the discovery as well as the way it has been studied so far. Although the method does not seem complex, the time and knowledge (also non-philosophical) needed makes it more difficult to implement.

The above philosophical perspective should by no means shut the scholars off from other approaches (not only philosophical).<sup>38</sup> When hearing of the new discovery, a number of Wojtyła scholars and philosophers were very skeptical. Therefore, I find the study shown above even more important. In private conversations they emphasized that they did not see the point of dealing with materials that are not the final, published and authorized version. Their defiance has motivated me to write this article. Also, the conclusion of this article puts forward a proposal to stop perceiving philosophy as a strictly intellectual analysis, and to reach out to other forms of study as the one drafted above. One cannot be certain that in the archives in the Vatican, Lublin, Cracow or elsewhere there are no 'news' which – when critically and comparatively analyzed – may shed more light on the issues that have long been 'ticked off'.<sup>39</sup>

---

<sup>38</sup> Research intuitions connected with psychographology may help recognize which elements of Scheler's philosophy Wojtyła accepted with ease and which met with his intellectual defiance.

It is worth mentioning that in other areas of philosophy even small excerpts of manuscripts are being published as an important contribution to further studies (not necessarily with Gilson's method). Cf. for example J. Mączka, *Joachima Metallmanna rozumienie prawdy*, "Studia z Filozofii Polskiej" 15 (2020), pp. 257–277.

<sup>39</sup> While analyzing the manuscript, typescript, the first and subsequent editions of *Love and Responsibility*, I may point out that at least some crucial questions vary in the different editions. It is possible to show the differences as well as the intuitions and threads which were given up either by Wojtyła or by the editors. The critical edition of *Love and Responsibility* is to be published in volume III of Wojtyła's oeuvre.

## 5. Conclusion

First of all, I do realize the difficulties connected with Gilson's method – such as the time-consuming step 1. However, I do not see this as a counterargument. As we can see not every philosophical study must be based on the comments of the works which have already been published, or on typical *Begriffsphilosophie*.

My aim in this article was to draw the attention of the reader to the fact that a certain area of research on Wojtyła's philosophy has been neglected. Therefore, my purpose was to contribute to further research regarding Wojtyła's archival materials and their influence on understanding the whole philosophy of the author of *Person and Act*.

In this article, I presented the possibilities of making use of the latest archival discoveries as well as their significance in terms of further research in the philosophical work of Wojtyła.

Apart from presenting the discovery, the author wanted to initiate or revive, trends of thought in the studies of Karol Wojtyła's philosophy. The future will show whether this aim has been achieved.

I hope that my (this) article – apart from exhibiting certain possibilities of examination as well as the discovery of some significance, will be a gloss which will practically impact, at least to some extent, the studies of the work of Karol Wojtyła and others.

## Archival material

### Archives of the Metropolitan Curia in Cracow

AKKW CII-9/110 [sheets: 192]

AKKW CII-9/110 [sheets: 182]

AKKW CII-9/110a

AKKW CII-9/110b

AKKW CII-24/232

BKKW 84

## Bibliography

- Andrzejuk A., *Gilsonian method of the history of philosophy*, "Rocznik Tomistyczny" 9 (2020) No. 2, pp. 133–144.
- Andrzejuk A., *Koncepcja filozofii średniowiecznej jako filozofii chrześcijańskiej i niektóre jej konsekwencje w ujęciu Etienne Gilsona*, in: *Etienne Gilson. Filozofia i mediewistyka*, ed. T. Klimski, Warszawa 2007, pp. 49–56, publ. Wydawnictwo UKSW.
- Aristotle, *Etyka Nikomachejska*, Kraków 1956, publ. PWN.
- Czerkawski J., *Gilsonowska koncepcja historii filozofii*, "Roczniki Filozoficzne" 13 (1965) No. 1, pp. 61–72.
- Gilson E., *Doctrinal History and its Interpretation*, 'Speculum' Vol. 24, No. 4, Oct. 1949, pp. 483–492.
- Gilson E., *Jedność doświadczenia filozoficznego*, Warszawa 1968, publ. PAX.
- Gilson E., *The Unity of Philosophical Experience*, New York 1937, publ. Scribner's Sons.
- Gogacz M., *O pojęciu i metodzie historii filozofii*, "Ruch Filozoficzny" 25 (1966) No. 1/2, pp. 76–80.
- Gogacz M., *Rola historii filozofii w filozofii Boga*, "Studia z filozofii Boga", ed. B. Bejze, Vol. 3, Warszawa 1977, pp. 365–413, publ. ATK.
- Gogacz M., *W sprawie koncepcji historii filozofii*, "Zeszyty Naukowe KUL" 7 (1964) No. 3, pp. 53–57.
- Ingarden R., *Wykłady i dyskusje z estetyki*, Warszawa 1981, publ. PWN.
- Inwentarz spuścizny Karola Wojtyły w archiwum Kurii Metropolitalnej w Krakowie, t. I, Akta personalne i korespondencja (1920–1978)*, edited by A. Kędra and M. Makowska, Kraków 2020, Wydawnictwo św. Stanisława BM.
- Janeczek S., *Między filozoficzną historią filozofii a historią kultury. Z rozważań nad metodą historii filozofii w Polsce*, "Roczniki Filozoficzne" 55 (2007) No. 1, pp. 89–108.
- Judycka J., *Koncepcja historii filozofii Etienne'a Gilsona. (Główne tezy referatu wygłoszonego w ramach projektu "Historia filozofii jako problem filozoficzny" w dniu 17.02.2011)*, <https://studylibpl.com/doc/886752/historia-filozofii-w-uj%C4%99ciu-etienne-a-gilsona> (21.02.2022).
- Koneczny F., *Cywilizacja bizantyńska*, vol. I–II, Warszawa 2020, publ. Capital.
- Koneczny F., *Cywilizacja żydowska*, vol. I–III, Warszawa 2019, publ. Capital.
- Mączka J., *Joachima Metallmanna rozumienie prawdy*, "Studia z Filozofii Polskiej" 15 (2020), pp. 257–277.
- Milcarek P., *Rozumienie filozofii chrześcijańskiej przez Etienne Gilsona*, in: *Etienne Gilson. Filozofia i mediewistyka*, ed. T. Klimski, Warszawa 2007, pp. 37–48, publ. Wydawnictwo UKSW.
- Scheler M., *Der Formalismus in der Ethik und die materiale Wertethik*, Halle a.d.S. 1921, publ. Max Niemeyer.

- Wojtyła K., (Rec.) Cz. Znamierowski, *Zasady i kierunki etyki*, Warszawa 1958, “Zeszyty Naukowe KUL” 1 (1958) No. 1, pp. 76–78.
- Wojtyła K., (Rec.) F. Bednarski, *Przedmiot etyki w świetle zasad św. Tomasza z Akwinu*, Lublin 1956, “Roczniki Filozoficzne KUL” 6 (1958) No. 2, pp. 133–136.
- Wojtyła K., *Ewangeliczna zasada naśladowania. Nauka źródeł Objawienia a system filozoficzny Maxa Schelera*, “Ateneum Kapłańskie” 55 (1957) No. 1, pp. 57–67.
- Wojtyła K., *O metafizycznej i fenomenologicznej podstawie normy moralnej (w oparciu o koncepcje św. Tomasza z Akwinu oraz Maksa Schelera)*, “Roczniki Teologiczno-Kanoniczne” 6 (1959) No. 1–2, pp. 99–124.
- Wojtyła K., *Ocena możliwości zbudowania etyki chrześcijańskiej przy założeniach systemu Maxa Schelera*, in: Karol Wojtyła, *Zagadnienie podmiotu moralności*, eds. T. Styczeń, J. W. Gałkowski, A. Rodziński, A. Szostek, series *Źródła i monografie* No. 119 (*Człowiek i moralność*), Lublin 1991, publ. Wydawnictwo Towarzystwa Naukowego Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego, pp. 11–128.
- Wojtyła K., *Problem oderwania przeżycia od aktu w etyce na tle poglądów Kanta i Schelera (Studium)*, “Roczniki Filozoficzne” 5 (1955–57) No. 3, pp. 113–140.

### Websites

- <https://idmjp2.pl/category/projekty/krytyczne-wydanie/> (28.02.2023).
- <https://studylibpl.com/doc/886752/historia-filozofii-w-uj%C4%99ciu-etienne-a-gilsona> (21.02.2022).