

# Review of: "Formal Theology"

Franco Jaroslav<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Palacký University Olomouc

**Potential competing interests:** No potential competing interests to declare.

In this article, the author delves into the intricate relationship between ontology and theology, challenging the prevailing assumption in contemporary science that attributes causal closure to the physical universe. The author argues that the strict adherence to causal closure limits the role of God or any non-physical cause in influencing the physical universe.

The article explores various aspects of formal theology in light of this redefined ontology. The author examines God as the first cause, God as omniscient, and God as omnipresent. The argument is structured, presenting the idea that formal theology and science can share a common ontological base if God is considered the first cause within the framework of interfaces.

The author challenges traditional ontology by introducing the concept of interfaces, providing a theoretical framework for the integration of God or non-physical causes into our understanding of the universe. While acknowledging the high conceptual price of such views, the article emphasizes the importance of considering a first cause and leaving room for the definition of God within this context.

The article is well-structured, presenting a clear line of argumentation and thoughtfully addressing the implications of redefining causal closure. However, the complexity of the subject matter might require further exploration and scrutiny by the academic community. The absence of peer reviews at the time of writing leaves room for future discussions and critiques that could enhance the robustness of the proposed ideas.

While the article presents a fascinating exploration of the interface between ontology and theology, there are a few potential weaknesses. First of all the article relies heavily on theoretical concepts and philosophical reasoning, but it lacks empirical support or concrete examples. Incorporating real-world examples or empirical evidence could strengthen the author's arguments and make them more applicable to a broader audience. Besides that, the article introduces several complex concepts, such as interfaces, causal closure, and the nature of God, without providing clear definitions or illustrations. This might make it challenging for readers who are not well-introduced in metaphysics or theology to grasp the author's arguments fully. A more accessible language or the inclusion of explanatory examples could improve clarity. And above all there is also a lack of discussion on potential criticisms. That means that the article does not thoroughly address potential criticisms or alternative perspectives. And the last point comes to the moment of the implications of redefining causal closure and introducing interfaces are profound, touching upon fundamental concepts in science and theology. The article could benefit from a more thorough exploration of the broader implications of these ideas and their potential impact on existing scientific and theological frameworks.

Addressing these weaknesses could strengthen the article and make it more accessible and compelling to a wider audience.