



# The Reception of Vaticanum II in the Apologetics of Józef Myśków (1927–1988)

PRZEMYSŁAW ARTEMIUK 

Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University, p.artemiuk@uksw.edu.pl

**Abstract:** The aim of this article is to present the reception of Vatican II teachings in the apologetics of Józef Myśków (1927–1988), a theologian and apologist associated with the Warsaw School of Apologetics, which conducted research and teaching at the Faculty of Theology of the Academy of Catholic Theology in Warsaw from 1956 to 1992. With the conclusion of the Second Vatican Council and the publication of the council's documents, a shift can be observed in Myśków's scholarly reflections. The Warsaw apologist, keenly interested in Vatican II, not only undertook analysis of key texts but, above all, rebuilt his own apologetic system to incorporate the thought of the latter council. Using an analytical method, the author of the article presents the debate on apologetics after the Second Vatican Council, as reflected in the writings of the Warsaw professor. The second part is devoted to Myśków's concept of ecumenical apologetics in its theoretical and practical dimensions. The analyses conducted allow us to conclude that, according to Myśków, apologetics after the last council is tenable, although it should be supplemented with selected issues proposed by the documents of Vatican II, both in terms of Christology and ecclesiology. Inspired by ecumenical ideas, Myśków proposes a new approach to apologetics, with a clear ecumenical slant. While he admits that it was not the council itself that gave rise to this idea, the council's teachings confirmed and strengthened his beliefs regarding the integration of apologetics and ecumenism. As a result, Myśków creates his own, original concept of apologetics, which is being called comparative. In addition to his theoretical efforts related to the new model of apologetics, the Warsaw professor undertakes practical activities, promoting doctoral theses with a clear apologetic-ecumenical profile and preparing scholarly articles based on the methodology he has developed.

**Keywords:** Józef Myśków, apologetics, Warsaw Apologetic School, Second Vatican Council, ecumenism

Józef Myśków (1927–1988) was a theologian (see Myśków 1959, 1960) and an apologist (see Myśków 1965, 1973, 1986) associated with the Warsaw School of Apologetics (WSA), which pursued scientific and teaching activities at the Faculty of Theology of the Catholic Theology Academy in Warsaw in the years 1956–1992 (see Kwiatkowski 1965, 5–17). With the end of the Second Vatican Council and the publication of the conciliar documents, a shift can be observed in his academic reflections. Myśków became keenly interested in Vatican II. Not only does he analyze key texts, but above all, he reconstructs his own apologetic system so that the ideas of the last council are present in it (see Myśków 1968b).

The aim of this article is to show the reception of Vatican II in Myśków's apologetics. Using an analytical method, in the first part I will present the debate on apologetics after the council as it appears in the writings of the Warsaw professor. The second part will be devoted to Myśków's concept of ecumenical apologetics in its

theoretical and practical dimensions. At each stage of the article, I will refer mainly to Myśków's writings, which will be the primary sources analyzed, as well as to the texts of other Warsaw apologists.

When examining the *status quaestionis* of the title issue, two older studies should be mentioned, namely the article by Tadeusz Gogolewski (1991) and the work by Ewa Korbut (2003), as well as two new texts by Przemysław Artemiuk (2025a, 2025b). In characterizing Myśków's academic achievements, Gogolewski adopts a chronological approach and points to the key themes of his work, namely his interest in dogmatics, especially Christology, his transition to apologetics, his description of its methodology, and the development of his own concept with an ecumenical and then religious studies inclination (see Gogolewski 1991). Korbut, in turn, in a short monograph devoted to Myśków's apologetics, deals with the conditions of his apologetic thought, the structure of ecumenical apologetics, and his achievements in its practice (see Korbut 2003). Two new texts on Myśków attempt to approach his apologetics from a historical-synthetic (Artemiuk 2025a) and an ecumenical (Artemiuk 2025b) perspective.

## 1. The Situation of Apologetics After Second Vatican Council

Myśków, dealing with the thought of the Council and undertaking editorial work on theological texts concerning Vatican II, is aware of the rise of fundamental theology at that time. Therefore, he questions the place of apologetics in the ecclesial space (see Myśków 1969, 1970a, 1970c). He begins with a definition and then points to the reasons for addressing the pronouncements of the Church's Magisterium (see Myśków 1973, 1986). He understands scientific apologetics as

a field of religious studies that systematically and critically examines the self-defense of the historical foundations of the Christian religion from an axiological point of view. Admittedly, the subject of scientific apologetics is the apologetics of all religions, not just the apologetics of the Christian religion, and therefore, in relation to the latter, the term "scientific apologetics as applied to the Christian religion (applied apologetics)" should be used, but we agree that in our article the term "scientific apologetics" will have a narrower meaning. (Myśków 1969, 17)<sup>1</sup>

According to Myśków, the rulings of the *Magisterium Ecclesiae* are the sources for scientific apologetics, which is why, from the perspective of the last council, we should ask: "how should the internal structure of this science be shaped in the face

---

<sup>1</sup> All translations from Polish into English are the author's own.

of the resolutions of the Second Vatican Council.” (Myśków 1969, 18) The Warsaw apologist admits that apologetics was not discussed during the council deliberations and is difficult to find in the published documents, but, according to Myśków, they show a connection with “the subject of scientific apologetics, both in terms of Christological and ecclesiological facts.” (Myśków 1969, 18)

To justify this claim, the apologist refers to Polish post-conciliar literature and undertakes its analysis, taking into account its usefulness for scientific apologetics. He points out that apologists from the WSA at the Academy of Catholic Theology present a different perspective from that of theologians from the Catholic University of Lublin. As far as the WSA is concerned, we are dealing with apologetics understood as an independent science, taking on the character of religious studies. In the case of Lublin researchers, we are dealing with apologetics practiced in a theological manner and defined as fundamental theology. “This direction makes the internal structure of this science dependent mainly on the development of the proper concept of Revelation, credibility, and miracle.” (Myśków 1969, 19) Myśków notes that Warsaw apologetics does not show any particular interest in Christological topics. Apologists from the Warsaw School of Theology deal with the historical value of the Gospel as a source enabling access to the historical figure of Jesus, as well as the defense of the religion he preached. In particular, they undertake a critical analysis of the historical-morphological method presented by Rudolf Bultmann and the researchers who formed his school (see Myśków 1969, 19; 1967, 1968a, 1972). What topics present in Polish theological literature dealing with conciliar themes can apologetics draw on? The apologist lists the following: the historical nature of the Gospel sources (the “history” of the Gospels, positive and negative elements of the historical-morphological method, Jesus of history and Christ of kerygma, the Gospels as sources of kerygmatic history, the evangelists as authors and editors); the concept and methods of transmitting Revelation (the concept of Revelation, the transmission of Revelation, Scripture and Tradition, the Magisterium of the Church and Revelation). In Polish theological circles, it is emphasized that the Second Vatican Council presents the above topics in a progressive and ecumenical spirit of openness. When it comes to progressiveness, Polish theologians emphasize the possibilities that arise from learning about and taking into account contemporary theology. This may contribute to the creation of a fuller and broader vision of the issues discussed. In addition, they emphasize that the conciliar resolutions contain new elements (Myśków 1969, 40). Ecumenical issues should be recognized in the statements of the Council Fathers concerning Christian revelation. Their presence creates space for dialogue with separated brethren.

According to Myśków, the subject matter of applied apologetics demands confrontation with the resolutions of Vatican II. The Warsaw apologist is primarily interested in the hypothetical correlation between the teachings of the Second Vatican Council and contemporary applied apologetics (see Myśków 1970a, 133). Myśków

addresses this issue, starting with the Christological fact. In his opinion, the Council's statements on the nature of the Gospel as "sources enabling objective knowledge of the activities of Jesus of Nazareth and His defense of the Christian religion" remain crucial (Myśków 1970a, 133). According to the Warsaw professor, the Council's position on this issue is crucial for apologetics. Myśków emphasizes that a positive solution to this problem determines the further directions of apologetic research and also influences the scientific status of theoretical and applied apologetics. Apologetics can continue its research on Christian apologies, especially the classical ones presented by Jesus of Nazareth, only if the works containing these apologies are genuine historical sources (see Myśków 1970a, 133–34). As far as the sources, i.e., the Gospels, are concerned, the key statements of the Council are contained in the Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation *Dei Verbum*. According to Myśków, the Council applied the principle of the "golden mean" to the dispute between liberal theologians, who saw the Gospels as merely kerygmatic texts, and conservative theologians, for whom they were strictly historical texts. While defending the absolute historical truth contained in the Gospels, the Council also acknowledged that they are not strictly historical works, but also have a kerygmatic character. In other words, according to *Dei verbum*, the Gospels are historical-kerygmatic in nature, i.e., they contain history that has been subjected to kerygmaticization (see Myśków 1970a, 135). The Warsaw professor emphasizes that from the perspective of his discipline, it is important to confirm in the conciliar resolutions the "scientific status of apologetics" developed by the creator of total apologetics (Wincenty Kwiatkowski) and the WSA. According to the Constitution on Revelation, the four-fold Gospel, while retaining the form of preaching, conveys as the foundation of faith "the sincere truth about Jesus." (Myśków 1970a, 135) Furthermore, the council rejected the questioning of the authenticity of studies critically discussing the apology of the Christian religion contained in the Gospels, and also pointed to the need for an open and positive attitude towards the contemporary direction of exegetical research, to which *Dei verbum* owes its form to a large extent. Apologists should be less critical of their opponents and at the same time be cautious in using certain Gospel and biblical texts, taking into account their kerygmatic character (see Myśków 1970a, 135–36).

In the context of ecclesiology, the task of apologetics remains to comprehensively illuminate the very fact of the Church, according to the method it has adopted. Theologians, in turn, should address ecclesiological issues from a non-empirical perspective (see Myśków 1970a, 136). Myśków believes that every theological study should be preceded by an apologetic one. The essence of the Church can only be revealed once the fact of its existence as a religious community established by Jesus of Nazareth has been justified. Before a theological answer to the question "What is the Church?" can be given, the apologist should first explain: "Does the Church exist and where is it located?" (Myśków 1970a, 136–37) The Warsaw professor notes that the conciliar documents contribute significant themes to ecclesiological fact, especially

in places where they draw attention to the issue of the Church as the People of God, the collegiality of authority in the Church, and Tradition as an expression of revealed teaching. These issues are found in the second and third chapters of the Dogmatic Constitution on the Church *Lumen Gentium*, as well as in the Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation *Dei Verbum*, the Decree on Ecumenism *Unitatis Redintegratio*, and the Declaration on the Relationship of the Church to Non-Christian Religions *Nostra Aetate*. In summary, Myśków notes that a comparison of the material subject of applied apologetics with the thinking of Vatican II reveals the need for an integral approach to apologetic material and the inclusion of conciliar thinking, especially ecumenical themes. A positive view of the research conducted by Protestant and Orthodox scholars, followed by the systematization of research in the field of “ecumenical apologetics,” as well as taking into account the role of the lay faithful in the teaching and pastoral authority that was handed down by Christ to the Apostles, are areas of scientific interest for apologists (see Myśków 1970a, 143).

The year 1970 brought a discussion about *Ratio studiorum* in Higher Theological Seminaries. In this context, the question of the meaning of teaching apologetics in them also arose (see Myśków 1970b). Myśków spoke out, proposing total apologetics instead of pre-conciliar textbooks (see Myśków 1970b, 52). According to the Warsaw professor, the system created by Kwiatkowski, i.e., total apologetics, in contrast to intellectualist and voluntarist approaches, and in opposition to integral apologetics and all approaches defined as fundamental theology, combines the material and formal subject into one and adheres to the methodology appropriate for this type of research. The author of the system explains this tendency by the introduction, through total apologetics, of the implicative integration of various parts of the material subject, which appeared in previous apologetic works in associative connections, referred to as *demonstratio Christiana* and *demonstratio catholica*. In addition, total apologetics undertakes the task of implicitly integrating the formal subject, which from now on is the whole Christ (together with His Church) as an absolute religious value and the whole human being as a subject committed to this value (*Sanctum*). In view of the comprehensive approach to the material subject and due to the development of religious studies, total apologetics omits the study of religion from its research. Based on the implication of the correlation between Christ and the Church, it speaks in both its parts about the single consciousness of Jesus of Nazareth, once in the religious-individual aspect, once in the religious-social aspect. Taking as its material subject the apology of the Christian religion, especially in its classical form, it examines axiologically the two-stage structure of the self-defense of the Christian religion carried out by Jesus of Nazareth, covering both His declarations and their justification (see Myśków 1970b, 52–53). Myśków, in view of the essence of total apologetics outlined above, asks about its place in seminary studies. In his response, he gives three opposing reasons. First, the new post-conciliar study program does not devote much space to apologetics. Second, Kwiatkowski’s system does not

take the form of a textbook for students. Total apologetics is a scientific work, and therefore a specialized one, which can help researchers much more than alumni. It is written in scientific and at the same time sophisticated language. Third, unlike total apologetics, the Second Vatican Council places different emphases on certain issues. The lecture would therefore need to be significantly expanded, supplemented, and reformulated in some areas, especially with regard to ecclesiological themes. Taking these reasons into account, the system of total apologetics could be applied, assuming the necessary conditions. Myśków, aware of both the objections raised against total apologetics and the proposals and solutions of the Council, corrects Kwiatkowski's system, suggesting necessary changes (see Myśków 1970b, 57–64). The conclusions he draws from his analyses are as follows: the system of total apologetics has a wealth of data that can form the basis for lectures in seminaries, even in the post-conciliar era. The reservations raised are more formal than substantive in nature, as they do not affect the structure of the system itself, but only point to the need to adapt the material taught to the specific conditions of the seminary and to the need for certain additions. Thus, the question raised in this topic, whether the system of total apologetics can and should be taught in seminaries, receives a positive solution (see Myśków 1970b, 64).

## 2. The Ecumenical Profile of Apologetics

As an apologist, Myśków actively participated in the post-conciliar theological debate by organizing a scientific apologetic seminar with a distinct ecumenical orientation. His goal was to develop a model of apologetics that would take on an interdenominational form (see Myśków 1976).

According to the Warsaw professor, apologetics and ecumenism, although they seem to be completely opposite terms that are difficult to combine, in fact turn out to be only an apparent contradiction. The relationship between apologetics and ecumenism can take on a completely different form when we properly define the former. Myśków begins his development of a new concept of apologetics by responding to Kwiatkowski's total apologetics (see Kwiatkowski 1959; Wilemski 1967), and then broadens his perspective. In his opinion, like the founder of the WSA, apologetics is a non-theological science that belongs to the disciplines of religious studies. Referring to Kwiatkowski, Myśków starts from the fact that there is an apologetic feature in religions, consisting in the unshakable conviction of their followers about the truth of their religion. Apologetics in this context deals with justifying the adopted religious attitude (see Myśków 1976, 54). The Warsaw apologist then notes that, from a scientific point of view, there is a need to undertake critical research on the objective value of the phenomenon of religious apologetics. Myśków emphasizes that

the axiological aspect of apologetics is not the subject of any theological or religious studies discipline. Therefore, this creates the basis for organizing an independent science with such a profile. It would include, first, the material subject—all religious apologetics; secondly, the formal subject—their objective value, i.e., the axiological aspect; thirdly, the method—a set of non-theological methods specific to religious studies, including the historical-critical method as the leading one (see Myśków 1976, 54). Myśków notes that Kwiatkowski originally intended to cover the entire religious reality with apologetics. Ultimately, he limited his idea to one religion, namely Christianity, which he identified with Catholicism.

Inspired by total apologetics, Myśków interprets Kwiatkowski's original assumptions, proposing a new model of apologetics with a clear ecumenical orientation. According to the Warsaw professor, the original methodological assumptions adopted for total apologetics imply its ecumenical dimension to such an extent that they constitute an indispensable basis for the creation of this discipline as ecumenical apologetics. According to Myśków, the implication applied indicates that the ecumenical character is contained in the very structure of apologetics understood as a religious science—more precisely, in apologetics dealing with the systematic and critical understanding of the self-defense of Christianity from an axiological point of view. This type of apologetics subjects the apologetic material contained in Christianity to critical analysis (see Myśków 1976, 55). Myśków is of the opinion that Kwiatkowski ultimately did not take this implication into account. He omitted it because he simplified apologetics, depriving it of its ecumenical character. The Warsaw apologist, presenting his project, first criticizes the simplifying measure and only then presents the material subject of ecumenical apologetics.

In view of the simplification, which limits apologetic research to the apology of one religion, Myśków proposes the following steps (see Myśków 1976, 56). The first issue is a radical expansion of the research material. This means that the material subject of apologetics becomes the apologies of all religions. Naturally, the subject of total apologetics could be narrowed down to Christianity alone. However, in that case, the name would have to be changed to applied apologetics, which would mean “applying the principles adopted by a given type of apologetics to the study of a specific apology of religion, not necessarily Christian.” (Myśków 1976, 56–57) Myśków's suggestion leads to a division between general apologetics and applied apologetics. The former deals with the apologies of religion in general, while the latter deals with the apology of one religion, namely Christianity. At this stage, it would also be necessary to specify which religion's apology is meant. According to the Warsaw professor, the new name of the subject in its full form could be as follows: applied apologetics—Christianism or apologetics of Christianity (see Myśków 1976, 57).

The second issue concerns narrowing apologetic research to the classical apologetics of the Christian religion. Myśków first explains Kwiatkowski's approach and then expands on it. He suggests, in accordance with the accepted methodology, that

research on the apology of Christianity should first focus on the original, classical apology, which comes from the Founder of the Christian religion. It is authentic and authoritative. However, one cannot limit oneself to it exclusively. Although it is possible to achieve the goal, i.e., to establish the personal dignity of Jesus of Nazareth and the Church as the religious community he founded, with such a narrow subject of research, this nevertheless leads to a failure to realize the formal subject of apologetics. And let us remember that it consists in confrontation with existing ecclesial structures. Therefore, in order to fully realize the formal subject of apologetics, it is necessary to examine the classical apologetics of the Christian religion in its axiological aspect. Myśków explains that this involves finding what derives from the authentic kerygma of Jesus and His will as recorded in the Gospels, and what has remained in the Churches that recognize Christ. According to the Warsaw apologist, examining only classical apologetics does not yield complete results and does not allow for the realization of the formal subject of apologetics; in addition, the narrowed goal leaves the research suspended in a vacuum (see Myśków 1976, 57–58). Myśków therefore suggests broadening the field of research to include, in addition to classical apologetics, secondary or derivative apologetics, i.e., Orthodox and Protestant apologetics. This will avoid the inconsistencies pointed out and ensure that the formal subject is fully realized.

The third issue concerns the limitation made by Kwiatkowski, who equated classical apologetics with Catholic apologetics (see Myśków 1976, 58). In this case, Myśków suggests defining classical apologetics in its Catholic version as derivative or secondary, similar to Orthodox or Protestant apologetics. This would change the very subject of apologetics. It would no longer be “a systematic and critical exposition of the self-defense of Christianity, both in its oldest form, i.e., Catholic, and in its later forms: Orthodox or Protestant,” but “both in its oldest form and in its later forms: Catholic, Orthodox, or Protestant.” (Myśków 1976, 59–60) This change is significant, and it is not just a matter of replacing the adjective “Catholic.” Myśków proposes a restructuring of

the subject of apologetics both in the sense of respecting the distinction between the apology carried out by Jesus of Nazareth and its Catholic form, as well as the resulting necessity to confront them in order to also implement in this section of the subject of formal apologetics, i.e., the axiological aspect of the apology of Christianity. (Myśków 1976, 60)

The apologist explains that the change in the subject of apologetics is not about a confrontation between classical apologetics and its Orthodox and Protestant forms. What is at stake here is an approach to the material subject of applied apologetics that would encompass both classical apologetics and its three variants, while the formal subject would be realized through a three-way confrontation between secondary apologetics and classical apologetics. The Warsaw apologist notes that the material

subject of apologetics, viewed from this perspective, approaches the adjective “ecumenical.” Therefore, Myśków suggests that apologetics understood in this way should no longer be called applied, but ecumenical. According to the apologist, the formal subject should also have this character, because the axiological aspect of the apology of the Christian religion boils down to those elements in all apologies of Christianity whose author is Jesus of Nazareth. In Myśków’s proposal, the formal subject would be ecumenical in nature, as the goal of apologetics would be to identify those elements that are common to both Jesus’ apology and its three Christian variants. The formal subject of apologetics understood in this way would be the ecumenical (rather than axiological) aspect of Christian apologetics, provided that all subjectivity or bias is eliminated from the adjective “ecumenical.” According to Myśków, the ecumenical nature of apologetics has its source in the internal structure of the discipline itself and exists independently of the ecumenical nature of the Second Vatican Council and post-conciliar theological reflection. Certainly, such an approach to apologetics can help in the implementation of the resolutions of Vatican II concerning ecumenical dialogue (see Myśków 1976, 60).

The conclusion, as Myśków deduces, is as follows: apologetics, which is not a theological science but a religious science, “as an independent discipline, inspired not by the Council but by its very nature, can and should be ecumenical to such an extent that, in the case of the apology of Christianity, it is justified, given its material and formal subject matter, to refer to it as ‘ecumenical apologetics.’” (Myśków 1976, 61)

The Warsaw apologist thus divides apologetics into classical Christian apologetics and secondary or derivative apologetics. The original, classical apology of Christianity contains Jesus’ statements about both himself and the religious community he established, called the Church. It includes the declarations of the Master of Nazareth, testifying to his messianic and filial consciousness, as well as the motivation present in them. This apologetics also includes Jesus’ statements referring to the structure of the community He established, including primacy and apostolate (see Myśków 1976, 61). Although these elements, as Myśków emphasizes, were already present in total apologetics, from the perspective of the latest research and the teachings of Vatican II, they require a new approach. This concerns primarily the issue raised in *Dei verbum* (the concept of revelation, Christological themes) and elements relating to authority in the Church (collegiality, primacy) present in *Lumen gentium* (see Myśków 1976, 61). Myśków gives a positive assessment of the system of total apologetics. He points out that, in critically examining classical Christian apologetics, he wanted it to be, by definition, an open system that took into account the latest achievements in biblical studies. According to the Warsaw apologist, this is a specific difficulty of ecumenical apologetics, for which the findings of classical apologetics are the starting point. In addition, the new vision of apologetics requires parallel research into all four apologies of Christianity, namely classical, Catholic, Orthodox,

and Protestant. Myśków is convinced that the proposal of ecumenical apologetics will prove to be creative and adequate for post-conciliar times (see Myśków 1976, 62).

Secondary apologies, i.e., Catholic, Orthodox, and Protestant, need to be brought out, appreciated, and shown in their originality. The first of these should be treated today not as a classical apology of the Christian religion, but as a secondary one. It should be divided and the classical elements, i.e., the original ones, should be separated from the Catholic ones, which remain secondary. This is evident in the concept of the Church of Christ, but also where the issue of collegiality arises, which is also present in the conciliar documents. The Orthodox apology, in turn, contains, like the classical apology, basic statements about the individual consciousness of Jesus. The differences between it and the Catholic apology appear in ecclesiological themes (the social consciousness of Jesus). The two secondary apologies also differ on the question of the primacy of authority, the issue of conciliarity (collegiality in the Catholic Church), and the charism of the Church's infallibility. Protestant thought, from the perspective of ecumenical apologetics, also shows common elements (see Myśków 1976, 65). Myśków first draws attention to research on the historicity of the Gospels. He then emphasizes Protestant interest in Christological titles (see Myśków 1976, 66). Also important is the motivational awareness of Jesus, signifying His miraculous activity, as well as the fact of the resurrection. These topics are also taken up by Protestant scholars (see Myśków 1976, 67). In addition, the issue of the kerygma about the Kingdom of God, examined from a Protestant and Catholic perspective, proves valuable for the classical apologetics of Jesus (see Myśków 1976, 67). Protestant thought also contributes to research on primacy (see Myśków 1976, 68) and apostolate (see Myśków 1976, 68).

Myśków's reflection on the ecumenical nature of apologetics, undertaken in the perspective of the Second Vatican Council, leads him to the following conclusion:

It is methodologically correct to refer to this discipline as ecumenical apologetics. Its material subject matter is both the classical apology of the Christian religion and its three varieties: Catholic, Orthodox, and Protestant, while its formal subject matter is the ecumenical aspect of these apologies realized in a three-way confrontation between secondary apologies and the classical one. (Myśków 1976, 69)

Research on ecumenical apologetics has found its application. First, in doctoral dissertations written at a scientific seminar led by Myśków: "Ustrój hierarchiczny Kościoła według Sergiusza Bułgakowa i jego zwolenników" [The Hierarchical Structure of the Church According to Sergiusz Bulgakov and His Followers] (Ireneusz Wrzesiński); "Podmiot i przedmiot nieomylności w Kościele według A.S. Chomjakowa i jego szkoły" [The Subject and Object of Infallibility in the Church According to A. S. Komyakov and His School] (Mieczysław Wójtowicz); "Pneumatyczno-charyzmatyczny charakter Kościoła w prawosławnej eklezjologii eucharystycznej"

[The Pneumatic-Charismatic Character of the Church in Orthodox Eucharistic Ecclesiology] (Jan Jarek); and “Przekazy biblijne o chrystofaniach” [Biblical Accounts of Christophanies] (Z. Proczek) (see Gogolewski 1991, 8) and, subsequently, in scientific articles written in the spirit of the developed apologetic model (see Myśków 1979, 1980).

## Conclusion

The aim of this article was to show the reception of Vatican II in Myśków’s apologetics. Using an analytical method, in the first part I presented the debate on apologetics after the Council as presented in the writings of the Warsaw professor. The second part was devoted to Myśków’s concept of ecumenical apologetics in its theoretical and practical dimensions. At each stage of the article, I mainly used Myśków’s writings, which were the primary sources analyzed, and I also referred to the texts of other Warsaw apologists.

To conclude the analysis, I would like to formulate the most important conclusions. Firstly, according to Myśków, post-conciliar apologetics is still valid, although it should be supplemented with selected issues proposed by the documents of Vatican II, both in terms of Christological and ecclesiological facts.

Secondly, inspired by the ecumenical ideas proclaimed by the Council, but also referring to his own scientific research and intuition, Myśków proposes a new approach to apologetics with a clear ecumenical inclination. He admits that it was not the Council itself that gave him this idea, but that the Councils teaching confirmed and strengthened his convictions regarding the combination of apologetics and ecumenism. As a result, Myśków created his own original concept of apologetics, which became known as comparative apologetics.

Thirdly, in addition to his theoretical efforts related to the new model of apologetics, Myśków took practical action. This took two forms. At the academic seminar under his supervision, works with a clear apologetic-ecumenical profile were created, while the Warsaw apologist himself prepared academic articles using the methodology he had developed.

## FUNDING

Publication co-financed from the state budget under the Ministry of Science and Higher Education program entitled “National Program for the Development of Humanities”; title: “Pillars of Polish Apologetics and Fundamental Theology”; project no. NPRH/DN/SP/0009/2023/12; amount of funding PLN 446,868.00; total value of the project PLN 446,868.00.

## Bibliography

- Artemiuk, Przemysław. 2025a. "Apologetyka w ujęciu Józefa Myśkowa (1927–1988)." *Studia Warmińskie*, no. 62, 181–201. <https://doi.org/10.31648/sw.11252>.
- Artemiuk, Przemysław. 2025b. "Ekumeniczne zainteresowania warszawskich apologetyków." *Studia Oecumenica*, no. 25, 43–61. <https://doi.org/10.25167/so.5989>.
- Gogolewski, Tadeusz. 1991. "Wspomnienie o ks. prof. Józefie Myśkowie." *Studia Theologica Varsaviensia* 29 (1): 5–18.
- Korbut, Ewa. 2003. *Koncepcja apologetyki ekumenicznej w ujęciu ks. Józefa Myśkowa (1927–1988)*. Olsztyn: Warmińskie Wydawnictwo Diecezjalne.
- Kwiatkowski, Wincenty. 1959. "Przedmiot apologetyki naukowej." *Collectanea Theologica* 30 (1–4): 10–19.
- Kwiatkowski, Wincenty. 1965. "Początki i rozwój warszawskiej szkoły apologetycznej." *Studia Theologica Varsaviensia* 3 (1): 5–17.
- Myśków, Józef. 1959. "Ludzkie psychiczne 'Ja' jako ośrodek psychicznej jedności Chrystusa." *Roczniki Teologiczno-Kanoniczne* 6 (4): 36–59.
- Myśków, Józef. 1960. "O ludzkim psychicznym 'Ja' Chrystusa." *Homo Dei* 29 (2): 226–38.
- Myśków, Józef. 1965. "Apologetyka a teologia." *Studia Warmińskie* 2:171–204.
- Myśków, Józef. 1967. "Przedmiot materialny apologetyki naukowej wobec historyczno-morfologicznych badań R. Bultmanna i jego szkoły." *Studia Warmińskie* 4:161–286.
- Myśków, Józef. 1968a. "Egzystencjalny agnostycyzm metodyczny względem najstarszej apologii chrześcijaństwa: Studium z zakresu teorii apologetyki stosowanej." *Studia Warmińskie* 5:241–74.
- Myśków, Józef. 1968b. "Problematyka soborowa w *Collectanea Theologica*." *Collectanea Theologica* 38 (4): 171–73.
- Myśków, Józef. 1969. "Niektóre elementy apologetyki naukowej w polskiej literaturze posoborowej." In *Posoborowe publikacje teologiczne w Polsce*, edited by Józef Myśków and Bernard Przybyszewski, 17–40. Warszawa: Akademia Teologii Katolickiej.
- Myśków, Józef. 1970a. "Przedmiot materialny apologetyki stosowanej wobec uchwał Soboru Watykańskiego II." In *Mysł posoborowa w Polsce*, edited by Józef Myśków, 132–43. Warszawa: Akademia Teologii Katolickiej.
- Myśków, Józef. 1970b. "System apologetyki totalnej jako przedmiot wykładów w wyższych seminariach duchownych." *Studia Theologica Varsaviensia* 8 (1): 51–65.
- Myśków, Józef. 1970c. "W sprawie doktrynalnych konsekwencji Soboru Watykańskiego II w zakresie apologetyki." In *Mysł posoborowa w Polsce*, edited by Józef Myśków, 331–39. Warszawa: Akademia Teologii Katolickiej.
- Myśków, Józef. 1972. "Egzystencjalna interpretacja teologiczna i jej krytyka." *Studia Theologica Varsaviensia* 19 (1): 17–29.
- Myśków, Józef. 1973. *Apologetyka stosowana w zarysie: Jezus z Nazaretu w swej świadomości religijnej*. Warszawa: Akademia Teologii Katolickiej.
- Myśków, Józef. 1976. "Apologetyka a ekumenizm." *Collectanea Theologica* 46 (2): 53–69.
- Myśków, Józef. 1979. "Teksty prymacjalne w interpretacji współczesnych teologów prawosławnych." *Collectanea Theologica* 49 (3): 23–50.
- Myśków, Józef. 1980. "Ewangelicka teologia fundamentalna." *Studia Theologica Varsaviensia* 18 (2): 83–101.
- Myśków, Józef. 1986. *Zagadnienia apologetyczne*. Warszawa: Akademia Teologii Katolickiej.
- Wilemski, Edmund. 1967. "Struktura apologetyki totalnej." *Roczniki Teologiczno-Kanoniczne* 14 (2): 107–19.