

KAZIMIERZ MAREK WOLSZA

Uniwersytet Opolski, Wydział Teologiczny

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5352-9678>

Ecumenical issues in Józef Herbut's philosophy of religion

Abstract

The philosophy of religion constituted one of the main fields of research by Prof. Józef Herbut. He created an original version of the analytical philosophy of religion. With the use of logical means, he analysed various dimensions of religion, primarily religious language. During the last period of his work, Herbut included ecumenical issues in his philosophical research. His research on these issues consisted of two stages. During the first stage, Herbut tried to create a specific logic of ecumenism. He hypothesised that the reason for the crisis of ecumenical dialogue consists in the lack of a clearly defined goal. Using the logical set theory, Herbut constructed possible models of doctrinal unity of different denominations. These models were constructed *a priori*, without reference to actual dialogues. During the second stage of his project, Herbut focused on the content of Catholic and Evangelical doctrines presented in catechisms. Here, he also put forward a research hypothesis that the languages of Catholic and Evangelical theology are different because they include different philosophical assumptions. These assumptions reach back to the medieval problem of universals. The language of Catholic theology is heavily influenced by moderate realism, and the language of Evangelical theology is influenced by moderate nominalism (these are two of the four standpoints in the problem of universals). Herbut's research project is original and innovative in terms of Polish philosophical and theological literature. However, in foreign language literature it is possible to find ones analogous to Herbut's project (József Fuisz, Charles Morerod).

Keywords: ecumenism, doctrinal dialogue, philosophy of religion, religious language, logic.

Zagadnienia ekumeniczne w filozofii religii Józefa Herbuta

Abstrakt

Filozofia religii była jednym z głównych nurtów badań prof. Józefa Herbuta. Stworzył on oryginalną odmianę analitycznej filozofii religii. Przy pomocy środków logicznych analizował w niej różne wymiary religii, przede wszystkim język religijny. W ostatnim okresie twórczości do swych badań filozoficznych Herbut włączył zagadnienia ekumeniczne. Jego badania tych zagadnień miały dwa etapy.

W pierwszym etapie Herbut próbował stworzyć specyficzną logikę ekumenizmu. Postawił on hipotezę, że przyczyną kryzysu dialogu ekumenicznego jest brak wyraźnie określonego celu. Wykorzystując logiczną teorię zbiorów, Herbut skonstruował możliwe modele jedności doktrynalnej różnych wyznań. Modele te zostały skonstruowane *a priori*, bez odwołania do faktycznie prowadzonych dialogów. W drugim etapie realizacji swego projektu Herbut

skupił się na treści doktryn katolickiej i ewangelickiej przedstawionych w katechizmach. Tu także postawił hipotezę badawczą, że języki teologii katolickiej i ewangelickiej są odmiennie, ponieważ mają różne założenia filozoficzne. Założenia te sięgają średniowiecznego sporu o uniwersalia. Język teologii katolickiej jest pod dużym wpływem realizmu umiarkowanego, a język teologii ewangelickiej – pod wpływem nominalizmu umiarkowanego (są to dwa z czterech stanowisk w sporze o uniwersalia). Projekt badawczy Herbuta jest oryginalny i nowatorski w polskiej literaturze filozoficznej i teologicznej. Natomiast w literaturze obcojęzycznej można spotkać projekty analogiczne do projektu Herbuta (József Fuisz, Charles Morerod).

Słowa kluczowe: ekumenizm, dialog doktrynalny, filozofia religii, język religijny, logika.

1. Philosophy of religion and ecumenism

The philosophy of religion constituted one of the main issues of scientific research by Prof. Józef Herbut (in addition to the methodology of science and ethics)¹. He began to deal with it systematically in 1970. At the time he published a short review article on religious hypothesis. The article includes some of the author's own remarks on the concept of the philosophy of religion. Herbut followed them in his later studies of religion². He most often referred to this research as the “logic of religious language”. He took this name (*Logik einer religiösen Sprache*) from the Austrian philosopher Anton Grabner-Haider, whose works in terms of philosophy he often referred to³. However, the name “logic of religious language” is too narrow

¹ Józef Herbut was born in 1933. In 1957 he became a priest of the Roman Catholic Church (diocese of Opole). In the years 1957–1962 he studied philosophy at the Catholic University of Lublin, where he obtained a doctorate, postdoctoral habilitation degree, and the title of professor. From 1962, he was a lecturer in philosophy at the seminary of the Opole diocese, and later at the Faculty of Philosophy of the Catholic University of Lublin and the Faculty of Theology at the University of Opole. In terms of scientific research, he dealt with methodology of sciences, philosophy of science, philosophy of religion, and ethics. His book publications include, for example: Józef Herbut. 1978. *Hipoteza w filozofii bytu*. Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego; Józef Herbut. 1987. *Metoda transcendentálna w metafizyce* (Rozprawy i Opracowania, 2). Opole: Wydawnictwo Świętego Krzyża; Józef Herbut. 2004 (2007²). *Elementy metodologii filozofii*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL; Józef Herbut. 2008. *Artykuły i szkice. Z metodologii i teorii metafizyki, filozoficznej analizy języka religii oraz etyki i metaetyki* (Opolska Biblioteka Teologiczna, 106). Opole: Redakcja Wydawnictw Wydziału Teologicznego Uniwersytetu Opolskiego. He died in Nysa in 2018. His philosophical and theological views are discussed by: Jan Cichoń. 2014. *Metodologia poznania teologicznego w pismach Księdza Profesora Józefa Herbuta*. In *W trosce o kulturę logiczną. Prace dedykowane księdzu profesorowi Józefowi Herbutowi z okazji osiemdziesiątej rocznicy urodzin* (Opolska Biblioteka Teologiczna, 140). Ed. Kazimierz M. Wolsza, 75–97. Opole: Wydawnictw Wydziału Teologicznego Uniwersytetu Opolskiego; Kazimierz M. Wolsza. 2014. *Filozoficzna twórczość Księdza Profesora Józefa Herbuta*. In *W trosce o kulturę logiczną*, 13–51; Kazimierz M. Wolsza. 2018. “We własnych żeglował łodziach. Wspomnienie o ks. prof. Józefie Herbutcie (1933–2018)”. *Studia z Filozofii Polskiej* 13: 111–128; Marcin Dolak. 2012. *Józefa Herbuta semiotyczna charakterystyka języka religijnego*. Lublin: Wydział Filozofii Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego Jana Pawła II (BA thesis at the Faculty of Philosophy of the Catholic University of Lublin).

² Józef Herbut. 1970. “Pojęcie hipotezy religijnej i jej rola w uracjonalnianiu wiary religijnej”. *Studia Philosophiae Christianae* 6 (2): 265–273.

³ Anton Grabner-Haider. 1978. *Vernunft und Religion. Ansätze einer analytischen Religionsphilosophie*. Graz – Wien – Köln: Verlag Styria, 95–111.

when applied to all of Herbut's works concerning the philosophy of religion. First of all, he also used other methods of analysis, not just logic; and secondly, he did not limit his research to religious language, although such research dominated in his philosophy of religion. He also dealt with issues such as the justification of religious beliefs, the possibility of a miracle occurring and being recognised, as well as the religious justification of moral norms. Therefore, Herbut's research should rather be considered as a kind of analytical philosophy of religion, in which the elements are logic (as a method) and religious language (as an object). This is in accordance with the account of analytical philosophy proposed by Józef M. Bocheński (1902–1995). According to him, analytical philosophy possesses four distinctive features: analysis, language, logic and objectivity⁴. Herbut's philosophy of religion meets these criteria of analytical philosophy. Herbut himself probably realised that the name "logic of religious language" used by himself had become too narrow to describe his study of religion. In a collection of his works published in 2008, he wrote not about a "logical" but about a "philosophical" analysis of the language of religion⁵.

Herbut's philosophy of religion is scattered across many short articles from 1970–2018. The author did not include his achievements in a comprehensive monograph devoted to the philosophy of religion. Two papers include a certain synthesis of his views: a comprehensive article *Logiczna charakterystyka języka religijnego* (*Logical characteristics of the religious language*) and the second part of the book *Artykuły i szkice – Filozoficzna analiza języka religii* (*Articles and sketches – Philosophical analysis of the language of religion*)⁶. General and methodological reflections on the philosophy of religion (including the one personally practised) can be found in the article *Filozofia religii: jej problematyka i jej odmiany* (*Philosophy of religion: its problems and its variants*)⁷. Here, the author writes that the philosophy of religion wants to perform "a modest service in theology"⁸. This is of course not the only function of the philosophy of religion. However, the quoted words indicate the possible connections between the philosophy of religion and theology, which are of particular interest to us today.

Herbut's philosophy of religion possesses several distinctive features. The following are the most important. First, it is characterised by philosophical mini-

⁴ Józef Bocheński. 1987. "O filozofii analitycznej". *Roczniki Filozoficzne* 35 (1): 137–146.

⁵ Herbut. 2008. *Artykuły i szkice*.

⁶ Józef Herbut. 1992. *Logiczna charakterystyka języka religijnego. Przyczynek do dyskusji między chrześcijanami a marksistami*. In *Oblicza dialogu. Z dziejów i teorii dialogu: chrześcijaństwo – marksizm w Polsce*. Ed. Antoni B. Stępień, Tadeusz Szubka, 33–62. Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego; Herbut. 2008. *Artykuły i szkice*, 203–356.

⁷ Józef Herbut. 2011. "Filozofia religii: jej problematyka i jej odmiany". *Filo-Sofija* 15 (4): 911–917.

⁸ Herbut. 2011. "Filozofia religii: jej problematyka i jej odmiany", 912.

malism, because the philosophy of religion can deal with a generally understood religion or a specific religion (or religious denomination)⁹. Within Herbut's scientific community, confined to the Faculty of Philosophy of the Catholic University of Lublin, the first approach dominated. The key work in philosophy of religion in this milieu was the book *Człowiek i religia (Human being and religion)* by Zofia J. Zdybicka. Zdybicka and her supporters consider the so-called "religious fact" as the subject of the philosophy of religion, and they refer their philosophical considerations to "religion as such"¹⁰. It is a maximalist concept, assuming that we possess a general definition of religion, and philosophical considerations concerning religion can be applied to any religion. However, Herbut believed that we do not have a definition of religion adequate for all religions known to ethnologists¹¹. That is why he preferred a minimalist approach in his research on the philosophy of religion. It consists in the fact that the subject of analysis consists of detailed issues related to a specific religion (religious denomination), and not a religion understood in abstract terms. Although Herbut drew inspiration for his research to a large extent from Anglican authors, including Ian Thomas Ramsey (1915–1972) and John Macquarrie (1917–2007), he referred his analyses primarily to the Catholic version of Christianity. He analysed issues such as the concept of religious mystery in Catholic theology¹², prayer texts from Catholic prayer books¹³, the relationship between Catholic theology and modern philosophy¹⁴, the rational nature of religious faith in Catholic terms¹⁵, and various methodological concepts of Catholic theology¹⁶.

Secondly, Herbut's philosophical reflection is focused on individual components of religion. According to him, religion is constituted by four important com-

⁹ Herbut. 1970. "Pojęcie hipotezy religijne i jej rola w uracjonalnianiu wiary religijnej", 272–273.

¹⁰ Zofia J. Zdybicka. 1993. *Człowiek i religia. Zarys filozofii religii*. Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego, 17.

¹¹ Józef Herbut. 1976. "Logika religii a teologia". *Collectanea Theologica* 46 (2): 73.

¹² Józef Herbut. 1974. "Pojęcie tajemnicy w teologii". *Studia Teologiczno-Historyczne Śląska Opolskiego* 4: 5–15; Józef Herbut. 1995. "O dwóch pojęciach tajemnicy stosowanych w teologii". *Zeszyty Naukowe KUL* 38 (3–4): 109–120.

¹³ Józef Herbut. 2003. "O semantycznych i pragmatycznych regułach tworzenia wypowiedzi modlitewnych". *Zeszyty Naukowe KUL* 46 (1–2): 63–72.

¹⁴ Józef Herbut. 1977. Współczesna teologia a filozofia. In *Chrystocentryzm w teologii*. Ed. Edward Kopeć, 147–156. Lublin: Katolicki Uniwersytet Lubelski.

¹⁵ Józef Herbut. 2008. "O uzasadnianiu przekonań religijnych". *Roczniki Filozoficzne* 56: 72–82.

¹⁶ Herbut. 1976. "Logika religii a teologia". 71–79; Józef Herbut. 1987. "Problemy teologii pojętej jako rewelacjonizacja naturalnej wiedzy o życiu chrześcijańskim". *Roczniki Filozoficzne* 35 (1): 293–307; Józef Herbut. 2010. Jaką nauką jest teologia katolicka? In *Tożsamość teologii (Wkład Chrześcijaństwa w Kulturę Polską)*. Ed. Andrzej Anderwald, Tadeusz Dola, Marian Ruścecki, 11–19. Opole: Redakcja Wydawnictw Wydziału Teologicznego Uniwersytetu Opolskiego; Józef Herbut. 2010. Teologia rewelacjonizacją naturalnej wiedzy o życiu chrześcijańskim? In *Metodologia. Tradycja i perspektywy*. Ed. Monika Walczak, 35–44. Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL.

ponents: (1) doctrine (beliefs concerning God and His relationship with the world and man), (2) a set of moral norms (ethical code), (3) a cult possessing its codified norms, (4) social persons and institutions that define and promote the indicated factors. Herbut believed that the first factor, doctrine, plays a decisive role in religion¹⁷. This is because doctrinal statements justify moral norms as well as cult activities and shape the content of prayers. For this reason, the analytical philosophy of religion usually focuses on religious doctrine, and especially on the language with which it is expressed. Such analyses also dominate in Herbut's research. However, we should add that he also dealt with the analysis of the language of moral norms (the second factor) as well as the prayers used in the liturgy and Catholic spirituality (the third factor)¹⁸. In his works on the logical theory of authority, it is also possible to find remarks on the subject of religious authority, to which religious persons and institutions are entitled (fourth factor)¹⁹.

Thirdly, a feature of Herbut's philosophy of religion is the use (wherever possible) of broadly understood logic (semiotics, formal logic, methodology of sciences), as well as the creation of new logical tools useful for analysing religion. Such tools are created by adapting the laws and rules of general ("pure") logic to the field of religion. The approach of logic to a certain dimension of religion can be twofold. It is possible to formulate an issue *a priori* (as a pure possibility) and then relate it to an actual religion. It is also possible to assume an empirical starting point, meaning focusing on an element occurring in a particular religion or denomination and analysing it with the use of logical means²⁰. It is easy to notice that the second approach dominates in most of Herbut's works. Rafał Paweł Wierchosławski and Tadeusz Szubka write that the analyses conducted by Herbut are empirical, not declarative. At the starting point, he adopts a specific religious issue that he explores using logic²¹. However, as we will see, the first (*a priori*) approach will also appear in the study of ecumenical issues.

Ecumenical issues appeared in Herbut's work quite late, only in 2002. The first work in which he undertook such issues was an article titled *Ruch ekumeniczny i jego możliwe cele (Ecumenical movement and its possible goals)*. In a slightly-changed form it was re-published under the title *O możliwych postaciach ekume-*

¹⁷ Herbut. 2011. "Filozofia religii: jej problematyka i odmiany", 913–914.

¹⁸ Józef Herbut. 1999. "Logiczne relacje między moralnymi kwalifikacjami czynów ludzkich ze względu na przykazania i rady". *Roczniki Filozoficzne* 47 (2): 137–143.

¹⁹ Józef Herbut. 1973. "Pojęcie autorytetu z logicznego punktu widzenia". *Studia Teologiczno-Historyczne Śląska Opolskiego* 3 : 229–239; Józef Herbut. 1974. "Autorytet rozkazodawcy". *Studia Teologiczno-Historyczne Śląska Opolskiego* 4: 69–77.

²⁰ Herbut. 1970. "Pojęcie hipotezy religijnej i jej rola w uracjonalnianiu wiary religijnej", 272–273.

²¹ Rafał Paweł Wierchosławski, Tadeusz Szubka. 2004. "Księdzu profesorowi Józefowi Herbutowi na siedemdziesięciolecie w darze". *Roczniki Filozoficzne* 52 (2): 9–10.

nizmu (*On possible forms of ecumenism*) in “Przegląd Filozoficzny” in 2006²². In 2010, during a conference on the structure and methods of theology, Herbut expressed the view that in Catholicism, Orthodoxy, and Protestantism different concepts of rationality of religious faith are adopted²³. However, he did not elaborate on this problem, and comments on this subject are scattered across his various texts in the field of philosophy of religion and in monographic lectures (a collection of his manuscripts has not yet been developed). In 2012, during an ecumenical meeting on the 80th anniversary of Archbishop Alfons Nossol and handing him a commemorative book *Człowiek dialogu (Man of dialogue)*, Herbut revealed that he is currently comparing selected Catholic and Evangelical beliefs in terms of their philosophical assumptions. At the time he put forward an initial hypothesis that the doctrinal languages of both denominations assume different approaches concerning the problem of universals. The language of Catholic doctrine is based on moderate conceptual realism, while the language of Evangelical doctrine is based on moderate nominalism. Herbut presented some of the results of his research in the last, unfinished article, which was published after his death, entitled *Odmienne języki teologiczne w dialogu katolicko-ewangelickim (Different theological languages in Catholic-Evangelical dialogue)*²⁴. The project of comparing religious doctrines and showing their philosophical assumptions (often different) has not been completed because it was interrupted by the author’s illness and death.

2. Conditions of ecumenical dialogue

The issue of dialogue is vividly present in modern philosophy. It constitutes a central issue of the philosophy of dialogue, which has had a great impact not only on contemporary philosophy, but also on pedagogy and theology²⁵. It is not surprising that the reflections on ecumenical and interreligious dialogue also take advantage of the achievements of the philosophy of dialogue. The conditions of dialogue, men-

²² Józef Herbut. 2002. Ruch ekumeniczny i jego możliwe cele. In *Ad plenam unitatem. Księga pamiątkowa dedykowana Księdzu Arcybiskupowi Alfonsowi Nossolowie, Wielkiemu Kanclerzowi Wydziału Teologicznego Uniwersytetu Opolskiego, z okazji 25-lecia święceń biskupich oraz 70. rocznicy urodzin* (Opolska Biblioteka Teologiczna, 55). Ed. Piotr Jaskóła, Rajmund Porada, 139–144. Opole: Redakcja Wydawnictw Wydziału Teologicznego Uniwersytetu Opolskiego; Józef Herbut. 2006. “O możliwych postaciach ekumenizmu”. *Przegląd Filozoficzny – Nowa Seria* 15 (1): 43–46.

²³ Herbut. 2010. Jaką nauką jest teologia katolicka?, 11.

²⁴ Józef Herbut. 2018. “Odmienne języki teologiczne w dialogu katolicko-ewangelickim”. *Studia Teologiczno-Historyczne Śląska Opolskiego* 38 (1): 301–332.

²⁵ Jarosław Gara. 2009. Wolność i odpowiedzialność. Egzystencjalne przesłanki dialogicznej filozofii człowieka i filozofii wychowania. In *Personalistyczny wymiar filozofii wychowania* (Biblioteka Katedry Filozofii Wychowania, 1). Ed. Anna Szudra, Katarzyna Uzar, 131–143. Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL.

tioned by the philosophy of dialogue, are referred to as the theory and practice of ecumenical dialogue²⁶. An interesting reflection on the dialogue was also proposed by the Swiss theologian and Dominican, Charles Morerod – former Secretary General of International Theological Commission, and now the Catholic bishop of the diocese of Lausanne, Geneva and Fribourg. He claims that in terms of ecumenical dialogue it is possible to take advantage of patterns taken from scientific dialogue. Morerod analyses the views of Karl R. Popper (1902–1994), Thomas Kuhn (1922–1996), and Paul Feyerabend (1924–1994) in the field of philosophy of science and applies some principles of scientific dialogue to ecumenical dialogue. Ecumenical and interreligious dialogue can then be presented as a comparison of different paradigms²⁷.

Herbut also mentions several necessary conditions for conducting ecumenical dialogue. However, he does not use the philosophy of dialogue or the works of Popper, Kuhn, and Feyerabend, to which Morerod refers. Already in his lectures on logic and in some publications (on logical culture, principles of team cooperation), Herbut dealt with the general principles of discussion and dialogue²⁸. In them, he developed the views of Polish philosophers and logicians: Władysław Witwicki (1878–1948), Tadeusz Czeżowski (1889–1981), Zygmunt Ziemiński (1920–1996), and Witold Marciszewski²⁹. Referring the general principles of discussion and dialogue to ecumenical dialogue conducted by representatives of various denominations, Herbut lists the following conditions that should be met at the starting point: (1) recognition of religious freedom; (2) assuming good will in the dialogue's partner; (3) recognition of the partner as a member of the Christian community; (4) emphasising elements connecting both parties and (5) jointly determined purpose of the dialogue³⁰. Conditions (1), (2), and (3) concern the general attitudes of the dialogue's partners. They constitute an adaptation to the situation

²⁶ See: Marek Szulakiewicz. 2015. "Filozofia dialogu a dialog ekumeniczny". *Litteraria Copernicana* 1: 11–26; Joachim Piecuch. 2019. "Myślenia dialogiczne. W polu gry o prawdę etyczną". *Studia Oecumenica* 19: 389–412.

²⁷ Charles Morerod. 2004. *Oecuménisme et philosophie. Questions philosophiques pour renouveler le dialogue*. Paris: Parole et Silence; I use the English translation: *Ecumenism & Philosophy. Philosophical questions for a renewal of dialogue*. Transl. Therese C. Scarpelli. Ann Arbor: Sapientia Press of Ave Maria University, 29–31 (paragraph: *Ecumenical and Interreligious Dialogue as a Comparison of Paradigms*).

²⁸ Józef Herbut. 1968. "Studia filozoficzne w wyższych seminariach duchownych w świetle soborowego Dekretu o formacji kapłańskiej". *Rocznik Teologiczny Śląska Opolskiego* 1: 75–86; Józef Herbut. 1970. "Kultura logiczna jako niezbędny składnik formacji intelektualnej Wyższych Seminariów Duchownych". *Rocznik Teologiczny Śląska Opolskiego* 2: 259–267; Józef Herbut. 1981. "O konfliktach między księżmi starszego i młodszego pokolenia". *Wiadomości Urzędowe Diecezji Opolskiej* 36 (4–5): 74–103.

²⁹ Władysław Witwicki. 1949. *Co to jest dyskusja i jak ją trzeba prowadzić* (Informacje i Wskazówki, 2). Łódź: Czytelnik; Tadeusz Czeżowski. 1958. O dyskusji i dyskutowaniu. In *Odczyty filozoficzne* (Prace Wydziału Filologiczno-Filozoficznego, 7/1), 280–288. Toruń: Towarzystwo Naukowe w Toruniu; Zygmunt Ziemiński. 1956. *Logika praktyczna*. Warszawa: PWN; ed. 26, 2019; Witold Marciszewski. 1969. *Sztuka dyskusowania*. Warszawa: Iskry.

³⁰ Herbut. 2002. Ruch ekumeniczny i jego możliwe cele, 139–140.

of ecumenical dialogue of loyalty attitudes. Witwicki wrote that every discussion should be marked by the loyalty of everyone to everyone. It includes, among other things, respecting the rights of the partner³¹. On the other hand, conditions (4) and (5) apply to the content of the dialogue. Herbut focuses on the doctrinal elements of ecumenical dialogue in his research. Therefore, he identifies this dialogue with doctrinal dialogue (however, this is not the only type of ecumenical dialogue)³². Regarding condition (4), Herbut writes that dialogue partners should determine what connects their denominations and what is the rank of these connecting elements. Therefore, he assumes here the principle of a hierarchy of truths, which is mentioned in the Decree on Ecumenism *Unitatis redintegratio* (UR 11) and contemporary ecumenical literature³³. The author adds that emphasising which divides creates distrust among the dialogue partners³⁴. Condition (5) – a jointly determined purpose of the dialogue – constitutes the main topic of the article *Ruch ekumeniczny i jego możliwe cele* as well as Herbut's following works.

A statement by Cardinal Walter Kasper constituted the inspiration for Herbut to take up the topic of the goals of the ecumenical movement. Kasper, at that time the president of the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity, said that the crisis of the ecumenical movement is due to, inter alia, lack of compliance in determining the objectives of the dialogue³⁵. Referring to Kasper's remark, Herbut writes that in numerous ecumenical publications, the unity of Christians is described vaguely and in a general manner³⁶. He believes that ecumenical dialogues

³¹ Witwicki. 1949. *Co to jest dyskusja i jak ją trzeba prowadzić*, 19; cf. Stanisław Celestyn Napiórkowski. 1995. U podstaw teorii ekumenizmu. In *Kościół czy Kościół. Wybrane zagadnienia z ekumenizmu*. Ed. Leonard Górka, Stanisław Celestyn Napiórkowski, 158–166. Warszawa: Verbinum; Waclaw Hryniewicz. 2012. Ku ekumenicznej kulturze dialogu. In *Człowiek dialogu. Księga pamiątkowa dedykowana księdzu arcybiskupowi Alfonsowi Nossolowi z okazji 80. rocznicy urodzin, 55. rocznicy święceń kapłańskich oraz 35. rocznicy święceń biskupich* (Opolska Biblioteka Teologiczna, 125). Ed. Zygfryd Glaeser, 371–388. Opole: Redakcja Wydawnictw Wydziału Teologicznego Uniwersytetu Opolskiego; Gesa Elsbeth Thiessen. 2009. Seeking unity: Reflecting on methods in contemporary ecumenical dialogue. In *Ecumenical ecclesiology: Unity, diversity and otherness in a fragmented world*. Ed. Gesa Elsbeth Thiessen, 35–48. London – New York: T&T Clark.

³² Piotr Jaskóła. 2001. *Zagadnienia ekumeniczne* (Podręczniki i Skrypty, 7). Opole: Redakcja Wydawnictw Wydziału Teologicznego Uniwersytetu Opolskiego, 52–53; Wojciech Hanc. 2018. Rzymokatolickie rozumienie dialogu doktrynalnego. In *Ekumenizm doktrynalny: schyłek czy nowy początek?* (Biblioteka Ekumenii i Dialogu, 40). Ed. Tadeusz Kałużny, Zdzisław J. Kijas, 25–27. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu Papieskiego Jana Pawła II.

³³ Jaskóła. 2001. *Zagadnienia ekumeniczne*, 42; Sławomir Pawłowski. 2005. "Hierarchia prawd w dekrecie «Unitatis redintegratio»". *Studia Theologica Varsoviensia* 43 (1): 173–182.

³⁴ Herbut. 2002. *Ruch ekumeniczny i jego możliwe cele*, 139–140. Herbut. 2018. "Odmienne języki w dialogu katolicko-ewangelickim", 302–303.

³⁵ Walter Kasper. 2005. "Ekumenizm przyszłości". Transl. Teresa Sotowska. *Więź* 48 (5): 47; cf. Walter Kasper. 2012. 50 Jahre Päpstlicher Rat zur Förderung der Einheit der Christen. In *Człowiek dialogu*, 317–318.

³⁶ Herbut. 2002. *Ruch ekumeniczny i jego możliwe cele*, 140; Herbut. 2006. "O możliwych postaciach ekumenizmu", 43–44; Herbut. 2018. "Odmienne języki w dialogu katolicko-ewangelickim", 301–303.

lack a clear definition of the main goal, which consists in the unity of Christian denominations. Interfaith dialogues pursue rather indirect goals: exchange of information concerning the dogmatic and moral doctrine as well as cult activities of denominations; a better understanding of one's own theology and other denominations; removing specific doctrinal differences; overcoming prejudices and discrimination; making efforts for social justice; joint concern for the weak and the poor³⁷. However, Herbut believes that one should not lose sight of the main goal, which is the jointly accepted vision of unity. Therefore, he proposes several possible models of doctrinal unity.

3. Models of unifying doctrines

When constructing models of the unity of doctrines of two Christian denominations, Herbut takes advantage of a different method than in all earlier works concerning the philosophy of religion. That is because, until now, the starting point for his philosophical considerations had an empirical character. The author built his concepts based on specific expressions of the religious language (biblical, theological and prayer texts). Currently, however, he constructs *a priori* models of unifying the doctrines of two separate denominations, for example the Catholic and Protestant doctrine. This way of constructing models resembles the method of ontological research by Roman Ingarden (1893–1970). This method consists of analysing pure possibilities, not facts from the real world³⁸. The basis for Herbut's models consists of operations used in the logical set theory. That is because every doctrine can be understood as a set of beliefs. Doctrines of two denominations, for example Catholic (*K*) and Protestant (*P*) are not identical in content. Herbut does not specify here what Protestant Church he has in mind. He merely states that he is referring to an organised reformed denomination, whose representatives can participate in the ecumenical dialogue and make decisions binding the followers³⁹. Taking into consideration the actions performed on sets, Herbut lists three models of unifying doctrines⁴⁰.

³⁷ Herbut. 2002. Ruch ekumeniczny i jego możliwe cele, 140; Herbut. 2006. "O możliwych postaciach ekumenizmu", 43; Herbut. 2018. "Odmienne języki w dialogu katolicko-ewangelickim", 302–304.

³⁸ Roman Ingarden. 1962. *Spór o istnienie świata*. Vol. 1. Warszawa: PWN, 50.

³⁹ Cf. Jaskóła. 2001. *Zagadnienia ekumeniczne*, 68–73; Jaskóła. 2008. *Wyznania chrześcijańskie bez jedności z Rzymem* (Podręczniki i Skrypty, 11). Opole: Redakcja Wydawnictw Wydziału Teologicznego Uniwersytetu Opolskiego, 57–90.

⁴⁰ Herbut. 2002. Ruch ekumeniczny i jego możliwe cele, 141–143; Herbut. 2006. „O możliwych postaciach ekumenizmu”, 45–46.

The first model is created when we combine sets K and P with a logical sum relation⁴¹. The sum of two sets includes all elements of set one and all elements of set two. Therefore, in our case these are all beliefs belonging to Catholic doctrine (K) and all beliefs belonging to the Protestant doctrine (P). Herbut writes that this is the most broad and loose form of unification. It assumes that in the unified Church the former Catholic and the former Protestant are allowed to accept: (1) beliefs that are common to both denominations; (2) beliefs that were previously accepted only in the Catholic Church and (3) beliefs that were previously accepted only in the Protestant church. Such a model raises a basic difficulty, because the doctrines of specific churches include beliefs that contradict each other. In order to accept them in a united community according to this model, additional interpretative actions, which may remove these contradictions, are necessary.

The basis of the second unification model lies in the operation of the intersection of two sets⁴². The product of sets, meaning their common part, includes those elements that belong to both sets at the same time. In our case, they are beliefs that at the same time belong to Catholic (K) and Protestant (P) doctrines. Herbut writes that this is a narrow form of union. Only common beliefs are chosen here (understood in the same way), while beliefs accepted only by one or the other denomination are rejected. Such a form of union leads to a significant reduction in the doctrines and other dimensions of religious life of individual denominations, as well as to abandoning a part of one's own tradition.

The third model of unification is formed due to the use – as Herbut writes – of the disjunction of sets K and P ⁴³. There is some logical difficulty here. The disjunction (the so-called Sheffer's stroke), to which Herbut refers here, belongs to the propositional calculus, and not to the set theory. The proposed unification model possesses the following properties. Only the Catholic doctrine (K), or only the Protestant doctrine (P) is chosen. Seemingly, this model corresponds to the situation of conversion from one religion to the other. However, that is not the case. The action on sets, which Herbut imprecisely calls here a disjunction, is rather a symmetric difference of sets⁴⁴. That is because the symmetric difference of sets contains elements that belong to one set and do not belong to the other⁴⁵. Therefore, the common part is excluded (the symmetric difference constitutes

⁴¹ $K \cup P$.

⁴² $K \cap P$.

⁴³ K / P .

⁴⁴ Jerzy Słupecki, Ludwik Borkowski. 1984. *Elementy logiki matematycznej i teorii mnogości*. Warszawa: PWN, 150.

⁴⁵ $K \div P = (K - P) \cup (P - K)$. See: Helena Rasiowa. 1984. *Wstęp do matematyki współczesnej* (Biblioteka Matematyczna, 30). Warszawa: PWN, 30.

a negation of the set product). Therefore, the model outlined here, besides logical inaccuracies, raises many difficulties of a theological and ecumenical nature. Because, excluding the common part of the collection means that the suggested model should reject common beliefs of the Catholic and Protestant doctrine. This is an impossible situation in terms of ecumenical dialogue. That is because it is difficult to imagine a unified Christian doctrine which gives up the fundamental truths adopted by various Christian denominations (the existence of one God, the Holy Trinity, the divinity of Christ, etc.). The examples used by Herbut to illustrate this model (common Bible translations, declaration of justification) seem unconvincing and misused.

The presented considerations concerning the models for unifying the doctrines are referred to by Herbut as “the logic of ecumenism”. Monika Walczak writes in the description of his work that he formulated preliminary analyses of the logic of ecumenism⁴⁶. Indeed, these are only preliminary analyses. Perhaps Herbut intended to develop them into a more complete logic of ecumenism, but he did not do it. He did not continue logical research on other aspects of ecumenical dialogue. His further works concerning ecumenical issues have a slightly different character. They are rather set in the history of philosophy and theology. The construction of theoretical models is one of the few situations in Herbut's work in which he uses the method *a priori* for the construction of pure possibilities. In other works, he always adopts an empirical starting point. However, Herbut is not consistent when it comes to the construction of unification models. He refers to actions taken from the set theory and propositional calculus. In terms of a more consistent approach, he should rather distinguish models based on actions used in the set theory: sum, product and difference. Even more doubts are raised by the reference of the proposed models to actual interfaith dialogues. The third model (based on the difference of sets) seems completely useless in determining the purpose of ecumenical dialogues. Therefore, it must be said that the logic of ecumenism in the proposed form has proven to be of little use to ecumenical theology. A different approach, such as that presented by the Hungarian Evangelical theologian, a former employee of the Faculty of Theology at the University of Zürich, József Fuisz, would be more effective. He also creates the logic of ecumenism – the logic of ecumenical decision-making processes (*Logik ökumenischer Entscheidungsfindungsprozesse*). However, its starting point exists in actual bilateral dialogues, including Anglican-Catholic, Anglican-Lutheran, Lutheran-Catholic, etc. Based on document analysis, using logical analyses, Fuisz discusses many models of unity, focused around three goals: consensus, compro-

⁴⁶ Monika Walczak. 2018. “Ks. prof. Józef Herbut (1933–2018)”. *Przegląd Uniwersytecki* 30 (2–3): 62.

mise, or convergence⁴⁷. The author carefully analyses these three categories (consensus, compromise, convergence) and refers them to real ecumenical dialogues. This work (and not only it) contradicts undocumented comments that, as repeated many times by Herbut, in ecumenical literature only a general concept of unity is adopted and the goals of dialogue are not precisely defined⁴⁸. Let us add here that Herbut's proposals have met with very little reception in ecumenical literature⁴⁹. So, his words that the proposed models could be used to better organise ecumenical thinking and action were rather not fulfilled⁵⁰.

4. Philosophical conditions of the doctrinal language

Herbut's considerations presented above, included in the logic of ecumenism, were purely formal. The author only marginally referred to the content of doctrines of individual denominations and to actual bilateral dialogues. His further research concerning ecumenical issues is focused on the content of selected doctrinal beliefs and their philosophical assumptions. Therefore, Herbut uses a different method: no longer logical analysis, but historical analysis – a method of studying the impact of philosophical ideas in history⁵¹.

One of the biggest philosophical disputes in the history of philosophy was the medieval problem of universals. It concerns the issue of what common terms appearing in our language refer to. This dispute affected various philosophical currents and, consequently, also theological ones. That is because theological claims are most often expressed in the language of some philosophy. As it is known, in the course of the problem of universals four positions emerged: (1) extreme

⁴⁷ József Fuisz. 2000. *Konsens, Kompromiss, Konvergenz in der ökumenischen Diskussion. Eine strukturanalytische Untersuchung der Logik ökumenischer Entscheidungsfindungsprozesse* (Studien zur systematischen Theologie und Ethik, 29). Münster – Hamburg – Berlin – London: Lit Verlag, 22–26, 11–119, 170–179.

⁴⁸ See: Stanisław Celestyn Napiórkowski. 1996. Modele jedności. In *Ku chrześcijaństwu jutra. Wprowadzenie do ekumenizmu* (Instytut Ekumeniczny KUL: Źródła i Monografie, 151). Ed. Wacław Hryniewicz, Jan Sergiusz Gajek, Stanisław Józef Koza, 497–502. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL; Andrzej A. Napiórkowski. 2011. *Teologia jedności chrześcijan. Podręcznik ekumenizmu*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Salwator, 196–201; Peter C. Bouteneff. 2009. „Ecumenical ecclesiology and the language of unity”. *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 44 (3): 352–359; Miriam Haar. 2009. The struggle for an organic, conciliar and diverse Church: Models of Church unity in earlier stager of the ecumenical dialogue. In *Ecumenical ecclesiology*, 35–48; Thiessen. 2009. Seeking unity: Reflecting on methods in contemporary ecumenical dialogue, 35–48; Rajmund Porada. 2014. Typologia uzgodnień ekumenicznych. In *W trosce o kulturę logiczną*, 426–442.

⁴⁹ Porada. 2014. Typologia uzgodnień ekumenicznych, 428.

⁵⁰ Herbut. 2002. Ruch ekumeniczny i jego możliwe cele, 143; Herbut. 2006. “O możliwych postaciach ekumenizmu”, 46.

⁵¹ Cf. Władysław Tatarkiewicz. 1971. O pisaniu historii filozofii. In *Droga do filozofii i inne rozprawy filozoficzne*. Vol. 1, 63–86. Warszawa: PWN.

realism (platonism), (2) moderate realism, (3) conceptualism (according to Herbut – this is moderate nominalism) and (4) extreme nominalism. The first three positions (extreme realism, moderate realism, and conceptualism) had a great impact on Christian theology and shaped different theological languages. Herbut hypothesises that the language of Catholic theology was shaped by moderate realism, while the language of Evangelical theology (especially Lutheran) – by moderate nominalism, or conceptualism. This is, in his opinion, the fundamental obstacle that hinders effective ecumenical dialogue to this day⁵². According to Herbut, negating the existence of species of objects in nominalism leads to the rejection of a vast amount of logical (reliable) reasoning and the exclusion of the possibility of classification. These activities (reliable reasoning, classifications) play a large role in the practice of Catholic theology.

To confirm the hypothesis, Herbut compares some beliefs found in official German-language catechisms for adults: Catholic (developed by the German episcopal conference) and Evangelical (developed by the commission of the German Lutheran Church)⁵³. The question of why the author chooses catechism texts for his analyses may arise. An indirect answer can be found in Herbut's article on the methodological specificity of theology. He writes that various academic disciplines usually go through three stages of development. The first stage consists of the emergence of the discipline, the second in organising its achievements (systematic development), and the third in adapting it to teaching purposes. This also applies to the theologies of various denominations. In this case, catechisms, textbooks and other syntheses useful in practice are created during the third stage. Systematic theology (second stage) provides models for an orthodox and communicative lecture of doctrine in catechisms⁵⁴. That is why the doctrines of individual denominations presented in catechisms can be considered as proper material for comparative research.

Herbut selects five doctrinal beliefs for his analysis and compares the Catholic and Evangelical approach. These are statements concerning: the possibility of knowing God, understanding original sin and its inheritance, the nature of the Church, the origin of the sacraments, and life in the future world⁵⁵. The author does not explain why he chooses such a set of beliefs. Perhaps he believed that with these examples it is best to illustrate the differences in content between the

⁵² Herbut. 2018. "Odmienne języki w dialogu katolicko-ewangelickim", 301–306.

⁵³ Katholischer Erwachsenen-Katechismus. Das Glaubensbekenntnis der Kirche. 1985–1995. Ed. Deutsche Bischofskonferenz. Vol. 1–2. Freiburg – Basel – Wien: Verlag Herder; Evangelischer Erwachsenenkatechismus. Kursbuch des Glaubens. Ed. Katechismuskommission der Vereinigten Evangelisch-Lutherischen Kirche Deutschlands. Gütersloh: Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn.

⁵⁴ Herbut. 2010. Jaka nauką jest teologia katolicka?, 12–13.

⁵⁵ Herbut. 2018. "Odmienne języki w dialogu katolicko-ewangelickim", 319–329.

two doctrines. I will now present Herbut's reflections on the first belief – concerning the possibility of man getting to know God⁵⁶.

In the Catholic catechism, there are arguments for the existence of God that man can benefit from getting to know God. These arguments, of a philosophical nature, are not a substitute for faith, but rather an invitation to it. In the Catholic tradition, some value is assigned to philosophical arguments for the existence of God. They show people different ways of thinking about God. Older versions of the arguments for God's existence sought the basis of all reality in Him, the newer ones rather refer to man's existential questions. Alternatively, the Evangelical catechism emphasises that faith in the words of the Bible is of fundamental importance in getting to know God (*sola Scriptura*). While reading the Bible, human life experiences may be partially explained. Faith always takes precedence over all philosophical arguments for God's existence. They are mostly rejected and criticised in evangelical theology. It is alleged that God, understood as the basis of the world, becomes part of the world.

Herbut writes that arguments for the existence of God, accepted in the Catholic catechism, would be impossible without adopting common concepts and necessary relations (which rejects nominalism). However, apart from this remark, it is difficult to find in Herbut's text the justification for the hypothesis that the basis for the different approach to the problem of understanding God consists in realism or conceptual nominalism. Similar doubts arise when reading the remaining comparisons. The differences in views themselves are presented fairly here. However, it is difficult to see in the author's reflections the impact that the problem of universals has on these differences (moderate realism versus moderate nominalism). However, it is worth remembering that Herbut's latest article on different theological languages is unfinished. It was published posthumously based on the latest version found on his computer. Therefore, it is possible that in following planned analyses, the author intended to show more clearly the impact of the problem of universals on the content of the discussed doctrinal beliefs.

5. Conclusions

Józef Herbut's research project to analyse selected ecumenical issues with logical and philosophical methods is original in contemporary Polish philosophy of religion. This project includes two stages that differ in terms of methodology. The first stage is dominated by a formal approach to ecumenical issues, and the

⁵⁶ Katholischer Erwachsenen-Katechismus, 25–32; Evangelischer Erwachsenekatechismus, 141–145.

author uses the method of logical analysis. In the second stage, a content-based approach takes place in which Herbut uses a method of historical analysis of the impact of philosophical ideas.

Herbut formulated two research hypotheses in his studies, which he verified only partially. The first hypothesis states that the main reason for the crisis of the ecumenical movement exists in the lack of clearly formulated goals accepted by both parties of a bilateral dialogue, whereas the second hypothesis states that the fundamental reason for the low efficiency of dialogues consists in different theological languages shaped by various philosophical currents (moderate realism and moderate nominalism). I believe that both hypotheses are interesting, but they were not sufficiently justified in Herbut's research. In his works, Herbut proved to be a very critical author and a "born skeptic" (according to Wierzchosławski and Szubka)⁵⁷. Therefore, it is a big surprise that he based the first part of his project (and in part the second) on one sentence by Walter Kasper included in a journalistic text: "The current crisis [of the ecumenical movement] consists in the fact that we are not unanimous in defining goals"⁵⁸. This sentence in Herbut's research became an axiom. He never asked critical questions about it: Does this diagnosis correspond to the truth? How can it be documented? What are the manifestations of the alleged crisis of the ecumenical movement? Are the aims of ecumenical dialogues formulated only vaguely and in a general manner? Is Kasper's approach position shared by other theologians and participants of ecumenical dialogue? Opening up to such questions, as well as to wider ecumenical literature, could create a broader perspective for Herbut's research. His historical analyses (in the second stage of the project) are also quite casual, based on textbook studies. The author does not recreate or document the source of a long process of idea development, which in his opinion went from nominalism, through Martin Luther's theology, Lutheran theology, to contemporary catechisms.

Herbut almost does not include ecumenical literature in his research. It is a serious flaw of his project. Apart from two articles by Walter Kasper (both have a journalistic character) and a few entries from theological dictionaries, he does not quote any other works. A critical reader (and Herbut himself encouraged such criticism on multiple occasions) must ask oneself about the credibility of some opinions repeated many times over a period of several years. The author most often repeats his view concerning the general characteristics of Christian unity, which allegedly "usually" appear in "numerous ecumeni-

⁵⁷ Wierzchosławski, Szubka. 2004. "Księdzu profesorowi Józefowi Herbutowi na siedemdziesięciolecie w darze", 9.

⁵⁸ Kasper. 2005. "Ekumenizm przyszłości", 47; cf. Kasper. 2012. 50 Jahre Päpstlicher Rat zur Förderung der Einheit der Christen, 317–318.

cal publications” (for example?), and “in books” (in which?)⁵⁹. Unfortunately, these statements were not documented by any reference to literature. However, in this literature it is possible to indicate examples of specific and precise definitions of unity⁶⁰.

Being more open to the already published works would allow Herbut to avoid some shortcomings, improve his own methods, and also take advantage of the results achieved by other authors. It is worth noticing the two already-cited monographs. The work of József Fuisz, *Konsens, Kompromiss, Konvergenz in der ökumenischen Diskussion*, is methodologically close to the first (formal) stage of Herbut’s research. It is also a specific version of the logic of ecumenism. It shows that using language logic methods is effective in studying ecumenical issues. The advantage of this work is in its rich documentation derived from specific doctrinal dialogues. The second work is a monograph by Charles Morerod *Oecuménisme et philosophie. Questions philosophiques pour renouveler le dialogue* (English translation: *Ecumenism & Philosophy: Philosophical Questions for a Renewal of Dialogue*). The author describes the directions of his research as follows: “I will briefly introduce the following four points: (1) Fundamental differences in ecumenical dialogue; (2) The existence of philosophical factors in ecumenical dialogue; (3) The conception of dialogue; (4) The relationship between God and man at the heart of Catholicism and Protestantism from the Reformation to our own times”⁶¹. This program is surprisingly convergent with Herbut’s second (content) stage of research. Both research projects (by Herbut and Morerod) were formulated independently of each other. Taking advantage of both makes it possible to look at ecumenical issues in a broad philosophical perspective.

Both Herbut and Morerod used the differences, and not the common points of Catholic and Evangelical doctrine, as their starting point. This contradicts Herbut’s postulate to emphasise connecting elements in the ecumenical dialogue (see point 2 of this study). Additionally, this structure of considerations resembles the so-called controversial theology, an old form of comparative theology in which the differences between denominations are exposed and analysed. On March 23, 2003, in an interview for “Katolicka Agencja Informacyjna” Archbishop Alfons Nossol said that controversial theology begins to return, as elements that differ Christians of different denominations are emphasised more often than those that

⁵⁹ Herbut. 2002. Ruch ekumeniczny i jego możliwe cele, 140; Herbut. 2006. “O możliwych postaciach ekumenizmu”, 43–44; Herbut. 2018. “Odmiennie języki w dialogu katolicko-ewangelickim”, 301, 303.

⁶⁰ See footnote 48.

⁶¹ Morerod. 2006. *Ecumenism & Philosophy* P. XIV; cf. Morerod. 2010. “Thomism and Ecumenism”. *Nova et Vetera (English Edition)* 8 (4): 839–851; Michael Root. 2008. “Ecumenism and Philosophy”. *Modern Theology* 24 (3): 505–508.

connect them⁶². Controversial theology, which was born after the Reformation, was still practiced in the first half of the 20th century⁶³. The well-known ecumenical journal “Catholica” in the years 1932–1968 included “quarterly of controversial theology” (*Vierteljahrschrift für Kontroverstheologie*) under the title, and it was not until 1968 that it was changed to “quarterly of ecumenical theology” (*Vierteljahrschrift für Ökumenische Theologie*). The comparative works of the German Jesuit of Silesian origin, Erich Przywara (1889–1972), are considered to be controversial theology. His biographer writes that he practiced more controversial than ecumenical theology⁶⁴. In the case of Herbut's writings, one may actually assume that by strongly exposing the differences between the doctrines of various denominations, he returns to the position of controversial theology. However, it can also be assumed that focusing on differences was supposed to constitute only the first – negative – stage of research, followed by a positive stage. Once again, it should be emphasised that Herbut did not complete his studies, because they were interrupted by his illness and death in 2018.

Herbut's philosophical work concerning ecumenical issues has not yet been analysed in either philosophical or ecumenical literature. Despite the doubts and critical comments expressed here, this project deserves recognition. It is innovative in terms of contemporary Polish philosophy on religion. It also constitutes an original fragment of Herbut's philosophical research, which has not yet been included in the studies of his work. This project is consistent with his concept of the philosophy of religion outlined already in 1970, later developed and subjected to methodological reflection. By creating and developing this unfinished project, the author showed new possibilities of conducting research in the field of “ecumenism & philosophy”.

References

- Bocheński Józef. 1987. “O filozofii analitycznej”. *Roczniki Filozoficzne* 35 (1): 137–146.
- Bouteneff Peter C. 2009. “Ecumenical ecclesiology and the language of unity”. *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 44 (3): 352–359.

⁶² Alfons Nossol. 2003. *Teologia kontrowersyjna czy ekumeniczna?* (10.02.2020). <https://info.wiara.pl/doc/146752.Teologia-kontrowersyjna-czy-ekumeniczna>.

⁶³ Vinzenz Pfnür. 2008. *Teologia kontrowersyjna. Struktura, technika i wpływ modelu “disputatio”*. In *Historia teologii*. Vol. 4: *Epoka nowożytna*. Ed. Giuseppe Angelini, Giuseppe Colombo, Marco Vergottini. Transl. Wiesław Szymona, 121–195. Kraków: Wydawnictwo “M”; Leonard Górka. 2002. *Kontrowersyjna teologia*. In *Encyklopedia katolicka*. Vol. 9, 764–765. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL.

⁶⁴ Benjamin Dahlke. 2010. *Przywara Erich*. In *Personenlexikon Ökumene. Im Auftrag des Johann-Adam-Möhler Instituts für Ökumenik*. Ed. Jörg Ernesti, Wolfgang Thönissen, 183–184. Freiburg – Basel – Wien: Verlag Herder.

- Cichoń Jan. 2014. Metodologia poznania teologicznego w pismach Księdza Profesora Józefa Herbuta. In *W trosce o kulturę logiczną. Prace dedykowane księdzu profesorowi Józefowi Herbutowi z okazji osiemdziesiątej rocznicy urodzin* (Opolska Biblioteka Teologiczna, 140). Ed. Kazimierz M. Wolsza, 75–97. Opole: Redakcja Wydawnictw Wydziału Teologicznego Uniwersytetu Opolskiego.
- Czeżowski Tadeusz. 1958. O dyskusji i dyskutowaniu. In *Odczyty filozoficzne* (Prace Wydziału Filologiczno-Filozoficznego, 7/1), 280–288. Toruń: Towarzystwo Naukowe w Toruniu.
- Dahlke Benjamin. 2010. Przywara Erich. In *Personenlexikon Ökumene. Im Auftrag des Johann-Adam-Möhler Instituts für Ökumenik*. Ed. Jörg Ernesti, Wolfgang Thönissen, 183–184. Freiburg – Basel – Wien: Verlag Herder.
- Dolak Marcin. 2012. *Józefa Herbuta semiotyczna charakterystyka języka religijnego*. Lublin: Wydział Filozofii Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego Jana Pawła II (BA thesis).
- Evangelischer Erwachsenenkatechismus. Kursbuch des Glaubens. Ed. Katechismuskommission der Vereinigten Evangelisch-Lutherischen Kirche Deutschlands. Gütersloh: Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn.
- Fuisz József. 2000. *Konsens, Kompromiss, Konvergenz in der ökumenischen Diskussion. Eine strukturanalytische Untersuchung der Logik ökumenischer Entscheidungsfindungsprozesse* (Studien zur systematischen Theologie und Ethik, 29). Münster – Hamburg – Berlin – London: Lit Verlag.
- Gara Jarosław. 2009. Wolność i odpowiedzialność. Egzystencjalne przesłanki dialogicznej filozofii człowieka i filozofii wychowania. In *Personalistyczny wymiar filozofii wychowania* (Biblioteka Katedry Filozofii Wychowania, 1). Ed. Anna Szudra, Katarzyna Uzar, 131–143. Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL.
- Górka Leonard. 2002. Kontrowersyjna teologia. In *Encyklopedia katolicka*. Vol. 9, 764–765. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL.
- Grabner-Haider Anton. 1978. *Vernunft und Religion. Ansätze einer analytischen Religionsphilosophie*. Graz – Wien – Köln: Verlag Styria.
- Haar Miriam. 2009. The struggle for an organic, conciliar and diverse Church: Models of Church unity in earlier stager of the ecumenical dialogue. In *Ecumenical ecclesiology: Unity, diversity and otherness in a fragmented world*. Ed. Gesa Elsbeth Thiessen, 49–61. London – New York: T&T Clark.
- Hanc Wojciech. 2018. Rzymskokatolickie rozumienie dialogu doktrynalnego. In *Ekumenizm doktrynalny: schyłek czy nowy początek?* (Biblioteka Ekumenii i Dialogu, 40). Ed. Tadeusz Kałużny, Zdzisław J. Kijas, 11–46. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu Papieskiego Jana Pawła II.
- Herbut Józef. 1968. “Studia filozoficzne w wyższych seminariach duchownych w świetle soborowego Dekretu o formacji kapłańskiej”. *Rocznik Teologiczny Śląska Opolskiego* 1: 75–86.
- Herbut Józef. 1970. “Kultura logiczna jako niezbędny składnik formacji intelektualnej Wyższych Seminariów Duchownych”. *Rocznik Teologiczny Śląska Opolskiego* 2: 259–267.

- Herbut Józef. 1970. "Pojęcie hipotezy religijnej i jej rola w uracjonalnianiu wiary religijnej". *Studia Philosophiae Christianae* 6 (2): 265–273.
- Herbut Józef. 1973. "Pojęcie autorytetu z logicznego punktu widzenia". *Studia Teologiczno-Historyczne Śląska Opolskiego* 3: 229–239.
- Herbut Józef. 1974. "Autorytet rozkazodawcy". *Studia Teologiczno-Historyczne Śląska Opolskiego* 4: 69–77.
- Herbut Józef. 1974. "Pojęcie tajemnicy w teologii". *Studia Teologiczno-Historyczne Śląska Opolskiego* 4: 5–15.
- Herbut Józef. 1976. "Logika religii a teologia". *Collectanea Theologica* 46 (2): 71–79.
- Herbut Józef. 1977. Współczesna teologia a filozofia. In *Chrystocentryzm w teologii*. Ed. Edward Kopeć, 147–156. Lublin: Katolicki Uniwersytet Lubelski.
- Józef Herbut. 1978. *Hipoteza w filozofii bytu*. Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego.
- Herbut Józef. 1981. "O konfliktach między księżmi starszego i młodszego pokolenia". *Wiadomości Urzędowe Diecezji Opolskiej* 36 (4–5): 74–103.
- Herbut Józef. 1987. *Metoda transcendentálna w metafizyce* (Rozprawy i Opracowania, 2). Opole: Wydawnictwo Świętego Krzyża.
- Herbut Józef. 1987. "Problemy teologii pojętej jako rewelacjonizacja naturalnej wiedzy o życiu chrześcijańskim". *Roczniki Filozoficzne* 35 (1): 293–307.
- Herbut Józef. 1992. Logiczna charakterystyka języka religijnego. Przyczynek do dyskusji między chrześcijanami a marksistami. In *Oblicza dialogu. Z dziejów i teorii dialogu: chrześcijaństwo – marksizm w Polsce*. Ed. Antoni B. Stępień, Tadeusz Szubka, 33–62. Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego.
- Herbut Józef. 1995. "O dwóch pojęciach tajemnicy stosowanych w teologii". *Zeszyty Naukowe KUL* 38 (3–4): 109–120.
- Herbut Józef. 1999. "Logiczne relacje między moralnymi kwalifikacjami czynów ludzkich ze względu na przykazania i rady". *Roczniki Filozoficzne* 47 (2): 137–143.
- Herbut Józef. 2002. Ruch ekumeniczny i jego możliwe cele. In *Ad plenam unitatem. Księga pamiątkowa dedykowana Księdzu Arcybiskupowi Alfonsowi Nossolowie, Wielkiemu Kanclerzowi Wydziału Teologicznego Uniwersytetu Opolskiego, z okazji 25-lecia święceń biskupich oraz 70. rocznicy urodzin* (Opolska Biblioteka Teologiczna, 55). Ed. Piotr Jaskóła, Rajmund Porada, 139–144. Opole: Redakcja Wydawnictw Wydziału Teologicznego Uniwersytetu Opolskiego.
- Herbut Józef. 2003. "O semantycznych i pragmatycznych regułach tworzenia wypowiedzi modlitewnych". *Zeszyty Naukowe KUL* 46 (1–2): 63–72.
- Herbut Józef. 2004. *Elementy metodologii filozofii*. Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL; ed. 2, 2007.
- Herbut Józef. 2006. "O możliwych postaciach ekumenizmu". *Przegląd Filozoficzny – Nowa Seria* 15 (1): 43–46.

- Herbut Józef. 2008. *Artykuły i szkice. Z metodologii i teorii metafizyki, filozoficznej analizy języka religii oraz etyki i metaetyki* (Opolska Biblioteka Teologiczna, 106). Opole: Redakcja Wydawnictw Wydziału Teologicznego Uniwersytetu Opolskiego.
- Herbut Józef. 2008. "O uzasadnianiu przekonań religijnych". *Roczniki Filozoficzne* 56 (2008): 72–82.
- Herbut Józef. 2010. Jaką nauką jest teologia katolicka? In *Tożsamość teologii* (Wkład Chrześcijaństwa w Kulturę Polską). Ed. Andrzej Anderwald, Tadeusz Dola, Marian Rusecki, 11–19. Opole: Redakcja Wydawnictw Wydziału Teologicznego Uniwersytetu Opolskiego.
- Herbut Józef. 2010. Teologia rewelacjonizacją naturalnej wiedzy o życiu chrześcijańskim? In *Metodologia. Tradycja i perspektywy*. Ed. Monika Walczak, 35–44. Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL.
- Herbut Józef. 2011. "Filozofia religii: jej problematyka i jej odmiany". *Filo-Sofija* 15 (4): 911–917.
- Herbut Józef. 2018. "Odmienne języki teologiczne w dialogu katolicko-ewangelickim". *Studia Teologiczno-Historyczne Śląska Opolskiego* 38 (1): 301–332.
- Hryniewicz Waław. 2012. Ku ekumenicznej kulturze dialogu. In *Człowiek dialogu. Księga pamiątkowa dedykowana księdzu arcybiskupowi Alfonsowi Nossolowi z okazji 80. rocznicy urodzin, 55. rocznicy święceń kapłańskich oraz 35. rocznicy święceń biskupich* (Opolska Biblioteka Teologiczna, 125). Ed. Zygfryd Glaeser, 371–388. Opole: Redakcja Wydawnictw Wydziału Teologicznego Uniwersytetu Opolskiego.
- Ingarden Roman. 1962. *Spór o istnienie świata*. Vol. 1. Warszawa: PWN.
- Jaskóła Piotr. 2001. *Zagadnienia ekumeniczne* (Podręczniki i Skrypty, 7). Opole: Redakcja Wydawnictw Wydziału Teologicznego Uniwersytetu Opolskiego.
- Jaskóła Piotr. 2008. *Wyznania chrześcijańskie bez jedności z Rzymem* (Podręczniki i Skrypty, 11). Opole: Redakcja Wydawnictw Wydziału Teologicznego Uniwersytetu Opolskiego.
- Kasper Walter. 2012. 50 Jahre Päpstlicher Rat zur Förderung der Einheit der Christen. In *Człowiek dialogu. Księga pamiątkowa dedykowana księdzu arcybiskupowi Alfonsowi Nossolowi z okazji 80. rocznicy urodzin, 55. rocznicy święceń kapłańskich oraz 35. rocznicy święceń biskupich* (Opolska Biblioteka Teologiczna, 125). Ed. Zygfryd Glaeser, 311–321. Opole: Redakcja Wydawnictw Wydziału Teologicznego Uniwersytetu Opolskiego.
- Kasper Walter. 2005. "Ekumenizm przyszłości". Transl. Teresa Sotowska. *Więź* 48 (5): 46–51.
- Katholischer Erwachsenen-Katechismus. Das Glaubensbekenntnis der Kirche. 1985–1995. Ed. Deutsche Bischofskonferenz. Vol. 1–2. Freiburg – Basel – Wien: Verlag Herder
- Marciszewski Witold. 1969. *Sztuka dyskusowania*. Warszawa: Iskry.
- Morerod Charles. 2006. *Ecumenism & Philosophy. Philosophical questions for a renewal of dialogue*. Transl. Therese C. Scarpelli. Ann Arbor: Sapientia Press of Ave Maria University.
- Morerod Charles. 2010. "Thomism and Ecumenism". *Nova et Vetera (English Edition)* 8 (4): 839–851.
- Napiórkowski Andrzej A. 2011. *Teologia jedności chrześcijan. Podręcznik ekumenizmu*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Salwator.
- Napiórkowski Stanisław Celestyn. 1996. Modele jedności. In *Ku chrześcijaństwu jutra. Wprowadzenie do ekumenizmu* (Instytut Ekumeniczny KUL: Źródła i Monografie, 151). Ed. Wac-

- ław Hryniewicz, Jan Sergiusz Gajek, Stanisław Józef Koza, 497–502. Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe KUL.
- Napiórkowski Stanisław Celestyn. 1995. U podstaw teorii ekumenizmu. In *Kościół czy Kościoł. Wybrane zagadnienia z ekumenizmu*. Ed. Leonard Górka, Stanisław Celestyn Napiórkowski, 149–200. Warszawa: Verbinum.
- Nossol Alfons. 2003. Teologia kontrowersyjna czy ekumeniczna? (10.02.2020). <https://info.wiara.pl/doc/146752.Teologia-kontrowersyjna-czy-ekumeniczna>.
- Pawłowski Sławomir. 2005. "Hierarchia prawd w dekrecie «Unitatis redintegratio»". *Studia Theologica Varsaviensia* 43 (1): 173–182.
- Pfnür Vinzenz. 2008. Teologia kontrowersyjna. Struktura, technika i wpływ modelu "disputatio". In *Historia teologii*. Vol 4: *Epoka nowożytna*. Ed. Giuseppe Angelini, Giuseppe Colombo, Marco Vergottini. Transl. Wiesław Szymona, 121–195. Kraków: Wydawnictwo "M".
- Piecuch Joachim. 2019. „Myślenia dialogiczne. W polu gry o prawdę etyczną”. *Studia Oecumenica* 19: 389–412.
- Porada Rajmund. 2014. Typologia uzgodnień ekumenicznych. In *W trosce o kulturę logiczną. Prace dedykowane księdzu profesorowi Józefowi Herbutowi z okazji osiemdziesiątej rocznicy urodzin* (Opolska Biblioteka Teologiczna, 140). Ed. Kazimierz M. Wolsza, 426–442. Opole: Redakcja Wydawnictw Wydziału Teologicznego Uniwersytetu Opolskiego.
- Rasiowa Helena. 1984. *Wstęp do matematyki współczesnej* (Biblioteka Matematyczna, 30). Warszawa: PWN.
- Root Michael. 2008. "Ecumenism and Philosophy". *Modern Theology* 24 (3): 505–508.
- Słupecki Jerzy, Borkowski Ludwik. 1984. *Elementy logiki matematycznej i teorii mnogości*. Warszawa: PWN.
- Szulakiewicz Marek. 2015. "Filozofia dialogu a dialog ekumeniczny". *Litteraria Copernicana* 1: 11–26.
- Tatarkiewicz Władysław. 1971. O pisaniu historii filozofii. In *Droga do filozofii i inne rozprawy filozoficzne*. Vol. 1, 63–86. Warszawa: PWN.
- Thiessen Gesa Elsbeth. 2009. Seeking unity: Reflecting on methods in contemporary ecumenical dialogue. In *Ecumenical ecclesiology: Unity, diversity and otherness in a fragmented world*. Ed. Gesa Elsbeth Thiessen, 35–48. London – New York: T&T Clark.
- Walczak Monika. 2018. "Ks. prof. Józef Herbut (1933–2018)". *Przegląd Uniwersytecki* 30 (2–3): 61–62.
- Wierchosławski Rafał Paweł, Szubka Tadeusz. 2004. "Księdzu profesorowi Józefowi Herbutowi na siedemdziesięciolecie w darze". *Roczniki Filozoficzne* 52 (2): 5–11.
- Witwicki Władysław. 1949. *Co to jest dyskusja i jak ją trzeba prowadzić* (Informacje i Wskazówki, 2). Łódź: Czytelnik.
- Wolsza Kazimierz M. 2014. Filozoficzna twórczość Księdza Profesora Józefa Herbuta. In *W trosce o kulturę logiczną. Prace dedykowane księdzu profesorowi Józefowi Herbutowi z okazji osiemdziesiątej rocznicy urodzin* (Opolska Biblioteka Teologiczna, 140). Ed. Kazimierz M. Wolsza, 13–51. Opole: Redakcja Wydawnictw Wydziału Teologicznego Uniwersytetu Opolskiego.

-
- Wolsza Kazimierz M. 2018. "We własnych żeglował łodziach. Wspomnienie o ks. prof. Józefie Herbucie (1933–2018)". *Studia z Filozofii Polskiej* 13: 111–128.
- Zdybicka Zofia J. 1993. *Człowiek i religia. Zarys filozofii religii*. Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego.
- Ziemiński Zygmunt. 1956. *Logika praktyczna*. Warszawa: PWN; ed. 26, 2019.