

The Newsletter of the  
INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY OF  
CHRISTIAN  
APOLOGETICS



Keeping ISCA Members Informed on All Things Apologetic

Fall 2017-02

## 2018 ISCA Conference!

The 2018 Conference of the International Society of Christian Apologetics will be held April 6-7 on the campus of Southern Evangelical Seminary near Charlotte, NC.

The conference theme is "The Centrality of Christ in Apologetics" which focuses on confronting myths about Christ in atheism and culture and false perceptions of Jesus in American evangelical mysticism. Everyone is welcome to attend. See details in the FAQ section on p. 3.

There are several options for hotel reservations. See the listings below. Many thanks to Program Chairman Jason Crowder for his hard work in organizing the conference.

**Southern Evangelical Seminary  
Charlotte, NC**



## Hotel Options for the 2018 ISCA Conference

### Best Western

2501 Sardis Road N, Charlotte, NC  
704-845-2810 / [Website](#)

### Quality Inn, Carolina Place Mall

9840 Pineville-Matthews  
Rd, Pineville, NC 704-889-7095 / [Website](#)

### Comfort Suites-Pineville

10415 Centrum Pkwy, Pineville, NC  
480-719-3013 / [Website](#)

### Springhill Suites by Marriott, Ballantyne

12325 Johnston Road Charlotte NC  
704-817-1500 / [Website](#)



### Four Points by Sheraton

9705 Leitner Dr, Pineville, NC 28134  
704-540-8500 / [Website](#)

### Holiday Inn Express

9825 Leitner Dr, Pineville, NC  
704-341-1190 / [Website](#)

### Residence Inn by Marriott, Piper Glen

5115 Piper Station Dr, Charlotte, NC  
704-319-3900 / [Website](#)

### Courtyard by Marriott, Ballantyne

15635 Don Lochman Lane Charlotte, NC  
704-341-0041 / [Website](#)

### Hampton Inn

401 Towne Centre Blvd., Pineville, NC  
704-889-2700 / [Website](#)

## In This Issue . . .

- 2018 Annual Conference FAQ
- 2018 Annual Conference Hotel Information
- "ISCA Intelligence Report" What Your Fellow ISCA Members Are Up To
- "Apologetic Drive-In!" What's Happening in the World of Apologetics
- "Want to Get Published?" Information on the ISCA Journal
- "What's on Your Nightstand?" Resources your fellow apologists are reading
- "Howe About That!" Musings from ISCA President Richard G. Howe



# ISCA Intelligence Report:

## What Your Fellow ISCA Members are Doing



**Scarlett Clay, student, Biola University.** National Conference on Christian Apologetics, Oct. 13-14, 2017, Charlotte, NC, <http://conference.ses.edu/>; "Arts and Entertainment" student track at the up-coming Ratio Christi Annual Symposium and Student Apologetics Weekend, Fort Mill, SC, <https://ratiochristi.org/news-events/event/2017-ratio-christi-symposium-and-student-retreat/5410>; Women in Apologetics Conference, Jan. 19-20, 2018, Biola University.

**Richard G. Howe, Southern Evangelical Seminary, ISCA.** Sep. 22, 2017, Ratio Christi, Carnegie Mellon University. Panel discussion "Faith and Reason, Enemies?" with Prof. Andrew Norman; Sep. 26, 2017, Ratio Christi, University of North Georgia, Dahlonega, GA; Oct. 7, 2017, Defending the Faith Apologetics Conference, Mount Airy Baptist Church, Mount Airy, MD; Oct. 13-14, 2017, National Conference on Christian

Apologetics, Charlotte, NC. Debate with Dan Barker "Is There a God Who Speaks?"; Dialogue with Ken Ham "God's Word or Man's Word: Where Should Apologetics Begin?"; Jan. 8-12, 2018, Defend Apologetics Conference, New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, New Orleans, LA, <http://richardghowe.com/speaking.htm>

**Randy Hroziencik.** Breakout session, Intelligent Faith Conference, Quad Cities in northwest Illinois and southeast Iowa.

**Don Veinot, Midwest Christian Outreach.** Oct. 6-8, 2017, Witnesses Now for Jesus Convention (convention of former Jehovah's Witnesses), New Ringgold, PA, <http://wnfj-v2.com/>; Midwest Christian Outreach You Tube channel, [https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCK4TLxG\\_1ZabHloT-FRLE7g](https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCK4TLxG_1ZabHloT-FRLE7g).

**Bill Roach, VP, ISCA.** Sep. 9-16, 2017, teaching an apologetics course at Neuva Providencia

.....

**Scarlett Clay, student, Biola University.** "Kicked Out of Church: How God Brought Me Home," <http://www.desiringgod.org/articles/kicked-out-of-church>; "Christ Is Lord of the Arts" Ratio Christi TV interview <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KjISII4rTsw&list=PLmcvkSe5v1KGvZUBK0KZZI8A5xRCkjB5C&index=2>.

**David Deane, Australia.** Article(s) in forthcoming *Harvest Handbook of Christian Apologetics*.

**Christopher Haun.** With Norman L. Geisler, *Is Man the Measure? An Evaluation of Contemporary Humanism and Transhumanism*. Bastion Books, 2018; article in forthcoming *Harvest Handbook of Christian Apologetics*.

**Richard G. Howe, President, ISCA.** Articles in forthcoming *Harvest Handbook of Christian Apologetics*.

**Randy Hroziencik.** *Worldviews in Collision: Building the Case for Christianity*, forthcoming.

**Nicholas Kye James, Toccoa Falls College.** "The False Dichotomy of the Laity: Rejuvenating Evangelicalism with Jonathan Edwards' Doctrine of the Priesthood of All Believers" *The Journal of Contemporary Theological Studies*. Vol. 3, <http://www.journalcts.com/wp-content/uploads/TheFalseDichotomyOfTheLaity.pdf>.

**Don Veinot.** Midwest Christian Outreach blog, "Moral Fluidity," <http://midwestoutreach.org/2017/08/10/moral-fluidity/>; "There is No Goddess but Gaia," <http://midwestoutreach.org/2017/06/08/there-is-no-goddess-but-gaia/>.

**Donald Williams, Toccoa Falls College.** Review of *Bandersnatch*, by Diana Pavlac Glyer, in *CSL: The Bulletin of the New York C. S. Lewis Society*, 48:4 (July/Aug. 2017): 15; "An Encouraging Book: How Tolkien's Lord of the Rings Saved Me," *Touchstone: A Journal of Mere Christianity* 30:5 (Sept./Oct., 2017): 30-34; "Apostolic Delivery," *Touchstone: A Journal of Mere Christianity* 30:5 (Sept./Oct., 2017): 6.







**Oct. 6-8, 2017.** Witnesses Now for Jesus Convention (convention of former Jehovah's Witnesses) (<http://wnfj-v2.com/>)

**Oct. 13-14, 2017.** National Conference on Christian Apologetics "Pursuing a Faith that Thinks." Sponsored by Southern Evangelical Seminary and the American Family Association. On the campus of Calvary Church. (<http://conference.ses.edu/>)

**Oct. 14-15, 2017.** Ratio Christi Symposium and Student Apologetics Weekend, Fort Mill, SC (<https://ratiochristi.org/news-events/event/2017-ratio-christi-symposium-and-student-retreat/5410>)

**Oct. 27-28, 2017.** Veritas Evangelical Seminary 9th Annual National Apologetics Conference "In Defense of the Sanctity of Human Life" (<http://conference.ves.edu/>)

**Nov. 4, 2017.** Women's Apologetic Conference (<http://www.nopatanswers.com/womens-apologetics-conference.html>)

**Nov. 11, 2017.** Intelligent Faith Conference, Quad Cities in northwest Illinois and southeast Iowa. Details forthcoming.

**April 27-28, 2018.** Evangelical Ministries to New Religious Movements Convention, New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary, NO, LA. (<http://www.emnr.org/>)

# Want to Get Published?

*The Journal of the International Society of Christian Apologetics* is receiving article submissions through November 1, 2017 for publication in the next issue due out in 2018.

For submission of prospective manuscripts or for inquiries concerning content or policies of the journal, contact Doug Potter at [dpotter@ses.edu](mailto:dpotter@ses.edu). Please conform manuscripts to the Chicago Manual of Style. See [www.chicagomanualofstyle.org/tools\\_citationguide.html](http://www.chicagomanualofstyle.org/tools_citationguide.html)

Journal of International Society of Christian Apologetics		
Vol. 10 No. 1 March 2017		
An Answer for Orual: CS. Lewis as Defender of the Faith <i>Donald T. Williams</i>		5
Quantum Physics and Its Alleged Threat to the Principle of Sufficient Reason <i>John C. Wingard, Jr.</i>		21
On the Textual History of the Qur'an <i>Jeroen H. C. Tempelman</i>		30
A Potential Problem with Presuppositional Apologetics <i>David Haines</i>		44
John Frame's Contribution to Presuppositional Apologetics <i>H.G. Stoker &amp; J.J. Barber</i>		67
Justification by Faith in Christ Apart from Works of the Law: Galatians 2:16 <i>William C. Roach</i>		89
The Eight Spectres of Karl Marx in the 21st Century <i>Christopher T. Hann</i>		105
A Critical Review of Michael R. Licona's <i>Why Are There Differences in the Gospels?</i> <i>F. David Farnell</i>		148

## About the Journal

*The Journal of the International Society of Christian Apologetics* is a peer-reviewed journal published annually with the support of the International Society of Christian Apologetics to foster scholarly discussion of ideas among evangelical scholars relevant to the defense of the Christian Faith. It includes articles from a wide variety of apologetically relevant fields, including philosophy, ethics, theology, biblical studies, history, and missions.

## What's On Your Nightstand?



What Your Fellow ISCA Members Are Reading

Mackenzie.

**David Dean.** *God in Modern Philosophy* by James D. Collins; *The Idea of Freedom* by Mortimer J. Adler.

**Christopher Haun.** *Panentheism: The Other God of the Philosophers: From Plato to the Present* by John W. Cooper; *The Making of the New Spirituality: The Eclipse of the Western Religious Tradition* by James A. Herrick;

**Scarlett Clay.** *Civil Government: A Biblical View* by Robert D. Culver; *Roman Catholics and Evangelicals: Agreements and Differences* by Norman Geisler and Ralph

*Scientific Mythologies: How Science and Science Fiction Forge New Religious Beliefs* by James A. Herrick.

**Richard G. Howe.** *All That Is in God: Evangelical Theology and the Challenge of Classical Christian Theism* by James E. Dolezal; *Five Proofs of the Existence of God* by Edward Feser; *Summa Contra Gentiles* by Thomas Aquinas.

**Randy Hroziencik.** *The Problem of God* by Mark Clark; *The Apostles and Their Times* by Mike Aquilina;

**Ed Payne.** *Why Should I Believe Christianity?* by James Anderson; *The Big Lie: Exposing the Nazi Roots of the American Left* by Dinesh D'Souza.

**Mark Tabladillo.** *Jesus Bible* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2017)

## 2018 ISCA Conference FAQ

### When and where will the ISCA conference be held?

The 2018 ISCA conference will be held April 6-7, 2018 on the campus of Southern Evangelical Seminary near Charlotte, NC. located at 3000 Tilley Morris Rd. Matthews, NC 28105 (<https://ses.edu/>).



### Does one have to be a member of ISCA to attend the conference?

No. We welcome non-members and encourage them to consider joining ISCA.

### Does one have to be a member of ISCA to be a break-out presenter at the conference?

Only members with dues current will be allowed to present at the conference.

### How can I be considered to be a presenter at the conference?

In order to be considered to be a presenter, you need to submit a presentation proposal. Your proposal should consist of a paragraph or two summarizing the thesis of the presentation.

### When is the presentation proposal due?

Presentation proposals should be submitted before the end of Dec. 1, 2017.

### How do I submit my presentation proposal?

You can email your presentation proposal to ISCA Vice President Bill Roach at [roawil@gmail.com](mailto:roawil@gmail.com)

### When will I know if my proposal is accepted?

Decisions will be made by Jan. 1, 2018. We will email everyone who sent in proposals as to whether the proposal was accepted or not.

### What is the conference theme?

The conference theme is "The Centrality of Christ in Apologetics." Presentations do not necessarily have to be on the conference theme.

### What is the conference schedule?

The conference schedule has not been finalized yet. When it is, it will be posted on the ISCA website at <http://www.isca-apologetics.org/>.



## Your Inimitable ISCA Leaders

### Richard G. Howe, President, Newsletter Editor

Ph.D., University of Arkansas  
Emeritus Professor of Philosophy and Apologetics, Southern Evangelical Seminary, Charlotte, NC  
Personal Website: [richardghowe.com](http://richardghowe.com)

### William C. Roach, Vice President

Ph.D., Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary  
Adjunct Professor, The College at Southeastern; Capital Theological Seminary, Columbia Evangelical Seminary; Hannibal-LaGrange University

### Dan Guinn, Treasurer

Founder and owner, Francis Schaeffer Studies: [francisschaefferstudies.org](http://francisschaefferstudies.org)  
Personal Website: [danguinn.com](http://danguinn.com)

### Douglas Potter, Journal Editor

D.Min., Southern Evangelical Seminary  
Registrar, Director of D.Min. Program, Assistant Professor of Apologetics and Theology, Southern Evangelical Seminary  
Charlotte, NC

### Jason D. Crowder, Program Chairman (Conference Coordinator)

D.T.S., Columbia Evangelical Seminary, Longview, WA  
Ph. D. (candidate), University of the Free State, Bloemfontein, South Africa  
Adjunct Instructor, Butler Community College  
Adjunct Professor, Columbia Evangelical Seminary  
Personal website: [profjasondcrowder.com](http://profjasondcrowder.com)

### Tim Adkisson, Secretary / Webmaster

Software Engineer

## “Howe About That!”

*Musings from ISCA President Richard G. Howe, Ph.D.*



Theistic arguments have played a central role in Christian apologetics for centuries. Throughout those centuries, different theistic arguments have taken center stage at different times. With the rise of the natural sciences, we have come to believe as a matter of scientific findings two aspects of the physical universe that have lent themselves to two of the types of theistic arguments. Many if not most astronomers have now concluded (though not completely without their detractors within the scientific community) that the universe began to exist a finite time ago. This scientific conclusion gives credence to the Kalam Cosmological Argument. Further, many chemists, biologists, and mathematicians have come to realize that the biological world displays an astounding level of information, design, and complexity. These scientific conclusions give credence to the design argument in the vein of William Paley.

In our last ISCA newsletter, I discussed what I characterized as "weaknesses" of these types of arguments. I suggested then that the term 'weakness' might be too strong. Perhaps 'limits' or 'challenges' would be more fitting. Whatever term one might use, the first of the weaknesses (in case I was not clear enough last time) is not so much a weakness of the arguments themselves as it is a weakness of me personally as one who might seek to advance these arguments. Because these arguments utilize such advanced science, the degree to which the one giving the argument is not a scientist, is the degree to which one is hampered in defending the premises. This is certainly I.

I went on to point out other limits of these arguments which included (1) that the arguments in and of themselves do not demonstrate that the cause of the universe still exists; and (2) that the arguments do not demonstrate that the cause of the universe has the attributes of God that classical theism claims.

I should like now to talk some about how the philosophical arguments in the vein of the thinking of Aristotle and Aquinas compensate for these limits. While I clearly do not have the space to rehearse the metaphysics of these two philosophers (and perhaps do not need to do so with this august readership), I do want to highlight a few of the metaphysical doctrines that are more relevant (for my purposes) to the question of the existence and attributes of God.

It would only be fair for me to acknowledge the weaknesses, challenges, or limits that Thomistic arguments themselves have. Aquinas's arguments are built upon a metaphysical system (largely Aristotelian) which itself has to be defended. As such, parts of the Thomistic arguments do not

lend themselves to a "marketplace" type of theistic argumentation which, to the extent that it traffics in any metaphysics at all, does so with concepts and categories much more palatable to contemporary thinking. As an extension of this point, because Aquinas's arguments stand outside (and in some ways stand against) the current scientific mindset, they are unable to take advantage of the intellectual and social clout that contemporary science affords. Last, (and this is not really a fault of the arguments themselves) because these arguments were first formulated by Aristotle and Aquinas with illustrations from an (in most people's opinion) discredited science, the arguments are often regarded by contemporary readers as either guilty by association (if he could not get his physics right, why should I trust his metaphysics) or, more seriously, guilty of factually false metaphysics precisely because of the faulty physics. In other words, some critics of the ancient and medieval philosophers mistakenly think that any given metaphysical point arises only because of the given physics used to illustrate the philosophical point. Thus (the critic thinks), since we know that rocks fall down because of gravity and not because they are trying to seek their natural place, then the metaphysics of teleology (final causality) is wrong.

With that out of the way, I want to briefly iterate several philosophical notions that are important for the formulation and understanding of Aquinas's arguments. I will not necessarily defend any of these notions and I will run the risk of oversimplifying some or all of them at certain points.

Southern Evangelical Seminary has recently produced a t-shirt touting the first of *The 24 Thomistic Theses* which says "Potency and act divide being in such a way that whatever is, is either pure act or of necessity it is composed of potency and act." What is going on here? The categories of act (or actuality) and potency (or potentiality) were employed by Aristotle in his response to the challenge of Parmenides. Parmenides had argued that there is only one thing, that it is eternal, and that it does not change. In Parmenides's thinking, two things could only differ by either being or non-being. Two things could not differ by being since being was the one respect in which they were the same. But they could not differ by non-being since to differ by non-being is not to differ at all.

Aristotle responded by arguing that there was a middle category between being and absolute non-being. That middle category was potency. To illustrate, consider a human being who is sitting down. This human is not actually standing. His standing, if you will, is not actual, which is to say, that it does not have being, for to be actual is to have being. Nevertheless, the "non-standing" in the sitting human is not absolutely non-being. Why? Contrast the non-existing of the standing in a



sitting human with the non-existing of the standing in a rock. While both are not standing, the human nevertheless has the potency (or potential) to stand. This potency, though not fully actual, is nevertheless a real aspect of the human in a way in which it is not at all real in the rock; not even potentially.

Act and potency serve as the foundation of much of what goes on elsewhere in Aristotle's (and later, Aquinas's) metaphysics. Among other things, act and potency inform the notions of causality. A robust accounting of causality along the lines of act and potency is entirely immune to the criticisms of causality for which David Hume was famous.<sup>1</sup> One can perhaps begin to see how this figures into a theistic argument. Nothing can actualize itself. Therefore, anything that is actual either is being made actual by something else that is itself actual or it must be an actuality that is itself unactualized. The question to ask, then, is this: what would be the nature and attributes of an actuality (i.e., a being) that is itself not made actual by anything else?

Another important philosophical doctrine is that of essence or nature. (In some contexts, there is a distinction to be drawn between a nature and an essence, but that does not concern us here.) The essence of a thing is that metaphysical aspect of a thing by virtue of which it is the kind of thing it is. The history of philosophy (at least into the modern period) was an on and off and sometimes intense discussion and dispute over what exactly is a nature.<sup>2</sup> Plato used the term 'Form'. Aristotle borrowed the same term, but modified its meaning considerably for his own purposes, adding to it the notion of matter to round out what he maintained was one of the failures in Plato's metaphysics to account for sensible objects. (How form and matter relate is extremely important as well, but I will forego a discussion of that here.)

The dispute over the "nature" of natures invariably involved philosophers in a dispute over universals. Philosophers were (and are) divided between the realists (who regard universals to be real in some sense) and anti-realists (who reject the reality of universals). Plato's extreme realism regarded universals (the Forms) as the ultimate constituents of reality. Particular things merely "participated" in their Form.

Aristotle's moderate realism maintained that the form was particular in any given sensible, natural object (a tree, a dog, a human) and was universal in the intellect of anyone who knew the sensible object. If you mention a tree in your yard, I know what you are talking about even though you said nothing particular about it—whether it is deciduous or evergreen, fruit bearing, flower bearing, or neither, tall or short, healthy or sickly, existing or no longer existing, and more. For Aristotle, if all human intellects disappeared, there would not be any universals.

Aquinas's scholastic realism agreed with Aristotle, except that it regarded the eternal repository of these natures or "kinds" to be "ideas" (by analogy) in the mind of God as their Creator and exemplar cause.<sup>3</sup> These three constitute the main options of realism.

On the other side of the divide were the anti-realists. Conceptualism (Ockham) maintains that universals are nothing more than concepts in the mind and have no real metaphysical cause in sensible objects that gives rise to the concepts. Last would be the nominalism of David Hume who denied even the existence of concepts and regarded universals as merely terms or names.<sup>4</sup>

At this point, I sometimes ask my students what is missing? Perhaps, if one thought about it, it might seem odd that, in the midst of all the arguments one finds today for and against the existence of God, seldom does anyone take the time to explain exactly what it means for something to exist. After all, if the debate is whether God exists or not, might it be helpful to give an account of this attribute or quality or property (or however else it can be characterized) called 'existence' that certain theists maintain God has while atheists deny that He does? What are we saying about anything when we say that it exists? Would it interest you to know that Aquinas actually denies that God has existence?

Interestingly, there does not seem to be any general notion of existence in ancient Greek philosophy.<sup>5</sup> You begin to see nascent aspects in neo-Platonism, but the fullest accounting of existence does not happen until Aquinas.<sup>6</sup>

Employing the categories of act and potency, Aquinas regarded existence as the act of an essence. In other words, just as form actualizes matter to make an essence (in the case of sensible, natural objects), existence actualizes essence to make a real being. This move Aristotle could not make since he had no category of existence beyond essence.

Doing justice to what Aquinas says about existence would take us into too much detail.<sup>7</sup> The following short summary will have to suffice, though it might create more questions that it answers.

To illustrate what Aquinas is getting at in maintaining that existence is an act, i.e., that which actualizes essence, consider (as an analogy) encountering a giant glass ball. You might ask how did the glass ball come to be. Upon hearing that it was made in a nearby factory, that answer might suffice. But suppose you were hearing music. Unlike how you inquired about the glass ball, you would not ask how the music came to be. Rather, you would ask what *is causing* the music to be right now. This is so because (continuing with the analogy) you realize that music only is music as long as it is being caused to

be music. As soon as the cause of the music stops causing the music, the music ceases to be.

In Aquinas's understanding, sensible creatures exist only because they are being caused to exist at every moment of their existence. If the cause of their existence stops causing their existence, they cease to exist.

But how does this figure into a theistic argument? The argument goes like this.<sup>8</sup> Whatever is true of a thing is true of it either because of its essence, that is, is true of it because of the kind of thing it is, or not. Consider yourself as a human being. The reason you have rationality is because of being a human. It is of the essence (or nature) of you as a human to be rational. Other things can be true of you that are not part of your essence. The fact that you are in a certain location is not because of your human nature. To say it another way, it is not part of your definition as a 'human' to be in a particular location, otherwise, anyone else not in that location would not be a human. But you can easily explain how it is that you are in a particular place even though being in that place is not due to your essence. You might be in that place because you caused yourself to be in that place.

So, what about your existing? Do you exist by virtue of your human nature? Is it part of your essence as a human to exist? The answer is clearly 'no' since there was a time that you did not exist. Further, there are humans who do not have existence, like Aragorn or Sherlock Holmes or other fictional characters. They have a human nature, but that nature only exists as a concept in the minds of existing humans. They are beings of reason.

If you exist and your existence is not due to your nature, could you be the cause of your own existence like you could be the cause of being in the particular place that you are? The answer, again, is clearly 'no'. This would require you to exist before you exist which is contradictory. Thus, if you exist but do not exist by virtue of your essence and also do not exist because you caused yourself to exist, then you must exist because you are being currently caused (like the music) to exist by something else. Something is actualizing your existence.

For reasons that we cannot get into here, it ends up that the only explanation for why you exist is because you are being caused to exist by something that exists by virtue of its essence. You are being caused to exist by something whose essence IS existence.

What happens next? Because we cannot get into the details, let it suffice to say that, in Aquinas's philosophy,

anything whose essence is its own existence, which is to say, anything whose essence is existence itself (*ipsum esse subsistens*—substantial existence itself) will have all the perfections of existence without limit. This is how we get the classical attributes—omnipotence, omniscience, omnipresence, timelessness, spacelessness, goodness, simplicity, immutability, impassibility, etc.

Why without limit? You and I possess all the perfections of existence up to the level of and according to the contours of the essence of human. A horse (as another example) would possess all the perfections of existence up to the level of and according to the contours of the essence of horse. But if a thing's essence just is existence itself, then that thing will possess all the perfections of existence without limit. Our existence is constrained by our form. A being for whom there is no distinction between its essence and its existence has no such constraints. As Aquinas describes it, "the perfections following from God to creatures ... pre-exist in God unitedly and simply, whereas in creatures they are received, divided and multiplied."<sup>9</sup> He summarizes, "It is evident, then, ... that it [the creature] holds its being from the first being, which is being in all its purity; and this is the first cause, God."<sup>10</sup> †

\*\*\*\*\*

<sup>1</sup>For a helpful discussion of this, see John Knasas, *Being and Some Twentieth-Century Thomists* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2003), 216-221.

<sup>2</sup>For an interesting reading on this see Henry Veatch, *Realism and Nominalism Revisited* (Milwaukee: Marquette University Press, 1954).

<sup>3</sup>For a helpful reading on this, see Gregory T. Doolan, *Aquinas on the Divine Ideas as Exemplar Causes* (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 2008).

<sup>4</sup>For a helpful reading on this, see Edward Feser, "Teleology: A Shopper's Guide," in *Neo-Scholastic Essays* (South Bend: St. Augustine's, 2015): 28-48. I owe to Feser's article my better understanding of these philosophical doctrines.

<sup>5</sup>See Charles H. Kahn, "Why Existence Does Not Emerge as a Distinct Concept in Greek Philosophy," in *Philosophies of Existence: Ancient and Medieval*, ed. Parviz Morewedge (New York: Fordham University Press, 1982).

<sup>6</sup>For an interesting reading on the Neo-Platonic influence on the thinking of Aquinas, see Fran O'Rourke, *Pseudo-Dionysius and the Metaphysics of Aquinas* (Notre Dame, University of Notre Dame Press, 2005).

<sup>7</sup>Aquinas's fundamental thinking here is in his *On Being and Essence* (*De Ente et Essentia*), available in English as *On Being and Essence*, trans. Armand Maurer (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1968).

<sup>8</sup>For a good reading on this argument, see Gaven Kerr, *Aquinas's Way to God: The Proof in De Ente et Essentia* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015). In fairness to Kerr, my thoughts here were formulated before I read his book. I do not want to imply that Kerr would necessarily agree with the way I lay out the argument here.

<sup>9</sup>*Summa Theologiae*, I, 13, 4. The translation is from *St. Thomas Aquinas Summa Theologica: Complete English Edition in Five Volumes*, translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province (Westminster, MD: Christian Classics, 1981), 63.

<sup>10</sup>*On Being and Essence*, IV, §7, trans. Maurer, 56-57.