

# Review of: "Formal Theology"

Rosemary Sage<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University

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

*No competing interested declared by the reviewer*

This well-structured article examines the relationship between ontology (*state of being*) and theology (*study of the nature of God and religious belief*). It is a subject that concerns all humanity. However, it challenges the assumption in modern scientific thinking that attributes causal closure to the physical universe. Thus, a more detailed examination of the concepts of ontology and theology would be necessary. The review argues that adherence to closure limits the role of God or any non-physical cause in influencing the physical universe.

Aspects of formal theology, in the view of the author's defined ontology, are presented. The author examines God as the cause and as all powerful and every present. The argument is clearly made, suggesting that formal theology and science can share a common ontological base, if God is considered paramount within the interfaces.

By introducing the concept of "interfaces", the author challenges traditional ontology, with a theoretical framework for the integration of God or non-physical causes into our grasp of the universe. Traditional ontology asks, "*Why is there anything*", whereas Heidegger's fundamental ontology asks, "*What does it mean for something to be?*," says Taylor Carman (2003). The article emphasises the importance of considering a first cause and leaving room for the definition of God within this context.

The article clearly addresses the vast implications of redefining causal closure. Nevertheless, the complexity of the topic might does imply further exploration and review by the academic community. The topic certainly promotes and encourages future discussions that could enhance the ideas presented in this text.

Thus, while the review is an interesting exploration of ontology and theology, there are areas that need critique. It relies heavily on theoretical concepts and philosophical reasoning, but lacks scientific support and examples that would give it strength and meaning. Including actual examples or empirical evidence could strengthen arguments and make them more meaningful and relevant to readers. The article introduces complex concepts - *interfaces, causal closure, and the nature of God*, without clear definitions, explanations or illustrations. This makes it challenging for readers, with interest in the subject but not having a background in metaphysics or theology to fully grasp arguments.

Also, the language is sometimes obtuse, so explanatory examples would improve clarity. There is a lack of critical discussion that is needed to broaden and deepen thinking. This means that the review does not fully address other perspectives or possible criticisms of the presentation. The implications of redefining *causal closure* and introducing

*interfaces* touch upon basic concepts in science and theology, so this broader context is essential. Thus, the review would be enhanced by a deeper exploration of the wide implications of these ideas and their potential impact on existing scientific and theological frameworks.