

Enrique Alarcón (ed.)

# Thomistica 2006

# QUAESTIONES THOMISTICAE

herausgegeben von

ENRIQUE ALARCÓN, LEO J. ELDERS  
MANFRED HAUKE, WILLIAM J. HOYE

Vol. II

# Thomistica 2006

An International Yearbook of Thomistic Bibliography

edited by  
Enrique Alarcón

with the collaboration of

Mark Johnson  
Charles Morerod OP  
Rolf Schönberger  
Luc-Thomas Somme OP  
Jörgen Vijgen

nova & vetera

Enrique Alarcón (ed.)  
Thomistica 2006

Bonn, Verlag Nova et Vetera 2007  
ISBN: 978-3-936741-53-7

Please address all correspondence to:

Prof. Dr. Enrique Alarcón  
Departamento de Filosofía  
Universidad de Navarra  
E-31080 Pamplona, Spain

e-mail address: [ealarcon@unav.es](mailto:ealarcon@unav.es)

Copyright © 2007 of the printed edition by Verlag nova & vetera, Bonn  
All rights reserved  
[www.novaetvetera.de](http://www.novaetvetera.de)

EDITORIAL BOARD AND COLLABORATORS  
OF THOMISTICA 2006

EDITORIAL BOARD

**Editor:**

Enrique Alarcón, Universidad de Navarra, Pamplona

**Assistant Editors:**

Mark Johnson, Marquette University, Milwaukee

Charles Morerod OP, Pont. Università S. Tommaso *Angelicum*, Roma

Rolf Schönberger, Universität Regensburg

Luc-Thomas Somme OP, Université de Fribourg

Jörgen Vijgen, Grootseminarie Het Willibrordhuis, Rolduc

COLLABORATORS:

Giuseppe Abbà, Università Pontificia Salesiana, Roma

Ariberto Acerbi, Pontificia Università della Santa Croce, Roma

Henryk Anzulewicz, Albertus-Magnus-Institut Bonn

Jorge M. Ayala Martínez, Universidad de Zaragoza

Hug Banyeres, Instituto Santo Tomás de Balmesiana, Barcelona

José María Barrio Maestre, Universidad Complutense, Madrid

Louis-Jacques Bataillon OP, Commissio Leonina, Paris

David Berger, Jahrbuch «Doctor Angelicus», Köln

Enrico Berti, Università di Padova

Magdalena Börsig-Hover, Kleinweil

Jean Cachia, Lycée Thiers, Marseille

Jean-Yves Calvez, Centre Sèvres, Paris

Francisco Carpintero, Universidad de Cádiz, Jerez

Laura E. Corso de Estrada, Universidad Católica Argentina

Bruno Couillaud, IPC, Paris

Günter Dehnert, Universität Regensburg

Jason T. Eberl, Indiana University-Purdue University, Indianapolis

Agustín I. Echavarría, Universidad de Navarra, Pamplona  
Martín Echavarría, Universitat Abat Oliba-CEU, Barcelona  
Mark J. Edwards, Christ Church College, Oxford University  
Leo J. Elders SVD, Grootseminarie Het Willibrordhuis, Rolduc  
Gilles Emery OP, Université de Fribourg  
Paulo S. Faitanin, Universidade Federal Fluminense, Rio de Janeiro  
Ignasi Fuster i Camp, Universitat Ramon Llull, Barcelona  
José Ángel García Cuadrado, Universidad de Navarra, Pamplona  
Juan A. García González, Universidad de Málaga  
Anto Gavrić OP, Université de Fribourg  
Donald Goodman III, Goretti Publications  
Harm J. M. J. Goris, Katholieke Theologische Universiteit te Utrecht  
John J. Haldane, University of St. Andrews  
Görge Hasselhoff, Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität Bonn  
Paul D. Hellmeier OP, Universität Regensburg  
Frank Hentschel, Freie Universität Berlin  
Ramón Hernández Martín OP, Salamanca  
Juan José Herrera OP, Institut Catholique de Toulouse  
Lu Jiang, Universität Regensburg  
Maarten J. F. M. Hoenen, Albert Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg  
Rollen Edward Houser, Center for Thomistic Studies, Houston  
John Inglis, University of Dayton  
Isabel Iribarren, Université Marc Bloch de Strasbourg  
Ignacio Jericó Bermejo, Tudela  
Sofya Kopelyan, Russian State University for the Humanities, Moscow  
Georg Koridze, Eberhard Karls Universität Tübingen  
María Antonia Labrada, Universidad de Navarra, Pamplona  
Manuel Lázaro Pulido, Instituto Teológico de Cáceres  
Abelardo Lobato OP, Lugano – Madrid - Roma  
Nicholas Lobkowitz, Katholische Universität Eichstätt  
Mauro Mantovani, Università Pontificia Salesiana, Roma  
Gabriel Martí Andrés, Universidad de Málaga  
Bruno Niederbacher SJ, Universität Innsbruck  
Klaus Obenauer, Universität Trier  
Michal Paluch OP, Instytut Tomistyczny, Warszawa

Michela Pereira, Università di Siena  
Ignacio Pérez Constanzó, Universidad de Navarra, Pamplona  
Juan José Pérez-Soba, Facultad de Teología San Dámaso, Madrid  
Elisabeth Reinhardt, Universidad de Navarra, Pamplona  
Andrea A. Robiglio, Albert-Ludwigs Universität Freiburg  
Luis Romera, Pontificia Università della Santa Croce, Roma  
Mercedes Rubio, Jerusalem  
Patricia Santos, Universidad San Pablo-CEU, Madrid  
Stefan Schick, Universität Regensburg  
David C. Schindler, Villanova University  
Henk J. M. Schoot, Universiteit van Tilburg  
Mario Šilar, Universidad de Navarra, Pamplona  
Tiziana Suarez-Nani, Université de Fribourg  
Richard C. Taylor, Marquette University, Milwaukee  
Craig St. Titus, Institute for the Psychological Sciences, Arlington  
Aldo Vendemiati, Università Pontificia Salesiana, Roma  
Jesús Villagrasa LC, Ateneo Pontificio Regina Apostolorum, Roma  
Thomas G. Weinandy OFM Cap., Capuchin College, Washington  
Idoya Zorroza, Universidad de Navarra, Pamplona

Aristotelico-Thomism-Thomistic philosophy as the organic development of the thought of Aristotle. —Ralph McInerney is Michael P. Grace Professor of Medieval Studies in the Department of Philosophy at the University of Notre Dame. He is cofounder of *Crisis* magazine and author of several books published by CUA Press, namely, the bestselling *Ethica Thomistica*, *The Question of Christian Ethics*, *Aquinas on Human Action*, and *Boethius and Aquinas*. Winner of the 2007 Charles Cardinal Journet Prize awarded by The Aquinas Center for Theological Renewal at Ave Maria University [to the best Thomistic book of the year 2006.]»

**688.** CACHIA, J., *Le Créateur de l'univers* (F. X. de Guibert, Paris, 2006) 236 pp. [Rev. : Nodé-Langlois, M. : *Revue Thomiste* 106/3 (2006) 466-470]. *SUMMARY*: «Cet ouvrage aborde le problème philosophique de l'existence de Dieu dans tous ses aspects. Il part d'une étude complète des notions de causalité et de mouvement. La critique kantienne des preuves de l'existence de Dieu fait ensuite l'objet d'une analyse et d'une discussion approfondies. Un examen de la pensée de Heidegger permet une réflexion sur le but de l'existence humaine. Ainsi passe-t-on de la question de Dieu comme cause de l'univers à celle de Dieu comme fin de l'homme. Enfin l'ouvrage se termine par une réflexion sur les attributs de Dieu et sur la notion de création proprement dite, mettant en jeu la liberté de Dieu et celle de l'homme.»

**689.** HEMMING, L. P., *Giving a Good Account of God : Is Theology Ever Matematical?* «*The Thomist*» 70/3 (2006) 367-393.

**690.** HARRISON, P., *Miracles, Early Modern Science, and Rational Religion*. «*Church History*» 75/3 (2006) 493-510.

**691.** OPFY, G. R., *Arguing about Gods* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge — New York, 2006) XIX, 449 [espec. 98-107] pp. (ISBN : 0521863864). *REVIEW*: As the author defines it in the Introduction, "it is a book about arguments about orthodoxly conceived monotheistic gods," which focuses on "the kinds of arguments that contemporary Christian philosophers of religion typically give when they give arguments on behalf of the claim that the orthodoxly conceived god in which they happen to believe exists." — The thesis that he chooses to defend is that "there are no *successful* arguments" about their existence. In his view, a successful argument is such that it "ought to persuade those who have reasonable views about the existence of orthodoxly conceived monotheistic gods to change their minds." Thus, his stated goal is that "if the argument of my book is successful, then at least some of those philosophers will be led to change their minds about some things" (p. 1). As for the author's notion of rationality, he claims that "I can see no reason at all for thinking that there is a unique set of *priors* that any reasonable person must have on pain of conviction of



irrationality," and that "I see no reason at all why it could not be that a single piece of evidence leads you to believe that  $p$  and me to believe that not  $p$ , even though we both act with perfect rationality" (p. 8). — Beliefs, on the other hand, are in his view "merely caused" by one's upbringing and other "environmental influences." To acknowledge that — he concludes — "one must already have reached a state in which one is giving them up." Moreover, "I may be perfectly well entitled, or even obliged, to judge that some of your beliefs are merely *caused*, particularly if they manifest a sufficiently deeply rooted disagreement between us" (p. 9). — With these premises the author: (a) denies in practice any possible common ground for a rational discussion, since a common set of *priors*, i.e. of principles of knowledge, is the very foundation and condition of possibility for such an exchange of ideas; (b) and turns himself into the measure of all of his interlocutors' beliefs, as he dismisses *a priori* all the ones that he does not share with them from the start. Within these narrow and misguided definitions of rationality and belief, which are useless for any true dialogue, he undertakes an examination of a wide variety of arguments for the existence of God, most of them contemporary. — This preamble already anticipates what would happen if the author had indeed discussed Aquinas' Five Ways for the knowledge of the existence of God. However, for some reason he has confined himself to discussing only the three first, which belong to an earlier tradition and are not of his exclusive making, while he does not confront the Fourth and the Fifth, which are originally his — particularly the Fourth—. Moreover, he inexplicably modifies the original arguments in a substantial way (even though he asserts that he does so "with very little alteration to standard translations"). For instance, when expounding the Second Way he eliminates from it the notion of order in the universe —hierarchy of beings— as well as Aquinas' meaning of the relation cause-effect. It is therefore not surprising when he concludes that "the most obvious difficulty with this argument is that it is invalid" (p. 99). Then, he proceeds to "better reformulate" the argument, in a way that is actually closer to Aquinas' own original formulation, and considers it valid but with reservations. With this Way, as with the other two, he tends to lose the focus of the unity of the argument by dissecting the premises and discussing them separately, with excursus that do not contribute to clarify the explanations. — To sum up, Oppy's contribution to the scholarly discussion on the historical arguments for the knowledge of the existence of God in general is compromised by his stated departure point of radical relativism, and his input to a discussion on Aquinas' Ways in particular is doubtful due also to the lack of fidelity to the original texts. *Mercedes Rubio*.