

Book Reviews

Cosmology by Édouard Hugon, O.P., trans. Francisco J. Romero Carrasquillo (*Neunkirchen-Seelscheid, Germany: Editiones Scholasticæ, 2013*), 376 pp.

ÉDOUARD HUGON, O.P., taught at the Angelicum from 1909 to 1929, being a confrère of Réginald Garrigou-Lagrange, O.P., Pope John Paul II's thesis advisor. Hugon produced, with Garrigou-Lagrange's approbation, a six-volume scholastic manual entitled *Cursus Philosophiæ Thomisticæ*,¹ which Popes St. Pius X, Benedict XV, and Pius XI all heartily recommended. Pope St. Pius X said it contains "the unadulterated teaching of Saint Thomas." (2). He praised the "wealth and coherence of [Hugon's] arguments and the clarity of [his] style, . . . particularly for applying ancient scholastic principles to shed light on new advances in philosophy and to the judicious refutation of errors." (*ibid.*) Garrigou-Lagrange called Hugon the "*theologus communis*, the "faithful echo of the Common Doctor of the Church."²

Francisco J. Romero Carrasquillo of Opus Dei's Universidad Panamericana in Guadalajara, Mexico, has translated, in collaboration with the German publisher Editiones Scholasticæ, the *Cosmology* volume of Hugon's opus. Why translate the *Cosmology* volume first and not, say, the *Logic* or *Metaphysics* volumes? Carrasquillo has two aims: (1) to show that natural philosophy—not metaphysics, as Christian von Wolff et al. thought—must be taught before ethics, metaphysics, and theology,

¹ Édouard Hugon, O.P., *Cursus Philosophiæ Thomisticæ*, 6 vols. (Paris: Sumptibus P. Lethielleux, 1927), http://liberius.net/auteur.php?id_auth=25.

² Thomas Poinçoc, O.P., "Presentazione," in *Fuori della Chiesa non c'è salvezza*, ed. Édouard Hugon, O.P., trans. Claudio Fauci (Chieti: Edizioni Amicizia Cristiana, 2007), <http://www.edizioniamiciziacristiana.it/presfuoridellachiesa.htm>.

being their basis; and (2) to disprove those who think manuals neglected modern developments in the natural sciences.

The most important part of *Cosmology* is its prolegomena because this is where Hugon shows the necessity of studying natural philosophy, not just for further philosophical and theological studies, but also for modern science:

In modern times, however, the natural sciences having been wondrously developed, Philosophy was banished from Physics; hence it happens that scientists, in exploring facts or at least aiming at proximate causes, have neglected ultimate causes and first principles. For this reason, a philosophical regard in the study of nature is more than ever desired today. (34).

However, Hugon advocates a strict distinction between philosophy and modern science, saying that “many topics that today are taught in the physical sciences” are “outside of Philosophy.” Because of the importance of the prolegomena, Carrasquillo has added many of his own footnotes to help explain Hugon’s scholastic terminology for the beginning student. Thus it becomes clear why St. Thomas said boys must learn, in this order: logic, mathematics, the natural sciences, the moral sciences, and, lastly, the sapiential and divine sciences (theology).³

Hugon splits up the bulk of *Cosmology* into three treatises, according to Aristotle’s four causes:

1. On the World with Respect to Its Efficient Cause
2. On the World with Respect to Its Material and Formal Causes
3. On the World Insofar as It is Ordered to an End

The first treatise covers such questions as monism, the contingency of the world, pantheism, the author of the world, whether the world emanates from God, creation, and the eternity of the world. The third treatise covers such questions as nature, motion, art and violence, the laws of nature, miracles, the end of nature, and evolution. In all the questions Hugon treats, he employs clear, syllogistic proofs of every principle, the objections to which he distinguishes, concedes, denies, contradistinguishes, etc., in solid scholastic form.

³ Sententia Ethic., lib. 6 l. 7 no. 17 [1211.]

The second treatise is where scholastic natural philosophy meets modern science. It is where Hugon shows his more-than-superficial familiarity with the philosophy of physics of Pierre Duhem,⁴ especially where Hugon argues that modern science does not disprove hylemorphism, which avoids the pitfalls of both atomism and dynamism. Hylemorphism is a “stable notion” the Council of Trent “consecrated” in its teaching on justification.⁵ Hugon defends it against attacks from some scientists:

X. - DIFFICULTIES RESOLVED; WHETHER THERE IS A CONTRADICTION BETWEEN THE SCHOLASTICS AND THE SCIENTISTS. . . . 3rd Objection. Apart from the Scholastics who are ignorant of natural things, no one else professes hylemorphism. Therefore, it is prudent to mistrust this system. *Reply.* In this question we must believe the philosophers more so than the physicists and the chemists, as is evident from the previous reply [“the adversaries . . . think that the question of principles is a physical and experimental one, whereas it is really a properly philosophical one”]. Further, the greatest philosophers, Aristotle, St. Augustine, and St. Thomas, adhered to this system. Even today many outside of the Scholastics support it. Barthélemy Saint-Hilaire presents this testimony of the Aristotelian doctrine: “For me, I find it to be simple and true, and it does not have the fault of being obscure; at most, I will grant that it has a certain subtlety, without being in any way sophistical. Matter and form are the logical and real elements of being.” (*Préface de la Physique*, p. 28.). (173, 175-76).

One can only imagine what Hugon would have written had this book been published after the rise of quantum mechanics. It would further

⁴ Roger Ariew, *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* [online], s.v. “Pierre Duhem,” <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2011/entries/duhem/>. Hugon cites, e.g., Duhem’s *Mixture and Chemical Combination: And Related Essays*, trans. Paul Needham (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic, 2002), and *The Evolution of Mechanics*, trans. Michael Cole (Germantown, MD: Sijthoff & Noordhoff, 1980).

⁵ Réginald Garrigou-Lagrange, O.P., “Les Notions Consacrées par les Conciles,” *Angelicum* 24 (1947): 217–30, <http://bit.ly/YPIBff>.

confirm what Hugon cited of Duhem:

Meanwhile, let it be clear that scientists that are true to their name do not contradict hylemorphism: “Current physics tends to recover a certain form of peripateticism” [i.e., Aristotelianism] (P. Duhem, *Le mixte*,⁶ p. 200). (177).

Hugon shows that modern spectral analysis does not disprove hylemorphism:

Explanation of many things that are necessary for the complete understanding hylemorphism . . . III. - ON THE PERMANENCE OF ELEMENTS IN THE MIXTURE . . . 3rd Objection. From spectral analysis it has been established that in the composite there appear the colors of the simple elements. But this fact shows that the powers of elements remain in act in the composite. *Therefore. Reply. I distinguish the major.* That the colors of the elements appear in the composite while the composite remains at rest in the compound state, I deny; that these colors appear while the mixed body begins to be resolved through the action of light or heat, I concede. *I contradistinguish the minor:* that this fact shows that there are powers in act in the mixed body, if this happens in the compound state itself, I concede; but that this shows there are powers in act in the mixed body if this happens only when the mixed body begins to be resolved and destroyed, I deny. *And I deny the conclusion.* That only implies that the powers persist in similar entities. (209-10, 214).


Following this (215-16), Hugon admiringly cites Duhem,⁷ proving again his up-to-date knowledge of modern science. Praising Duhem, Hugon writes:

IV. - THE SCHOLASTIC SYSTEM IS SUBSTANTIALLY RETAINED TODAY . . . It is also appropriate to write the following testimony of the most learned P. Duhem: “Little by little, however, by the

⁶ Duhem, *Mixture and Chemical Combination*.

⁷ Duhem, *Mixture and Chemical Combination*, 115–16.

very effect of this development, mechanical hypotheses came up against obstacles on all sides which were more and more numerous and difficult to surmount. The atomic, Cartesian, and Newtonian systems gradually lost favour with physicists and made way for methods analogous to those advocated by Aristotle. Present-day physics is tending to return to a peripatetic form” (P. Duhem, *Le mixte*,⁸ p. 200). (225, 227).

This edition of Hugon’s *Cosmology* is a scholastic, logically sound work that will help philosophers and modern scientists better understand the relationship between philosophy and modern science, especially modern physics. Hugon upholds the Second Vatican Council’s call that “philosophical disciplines are to be taught in such a way that the students are first of all led to acquire a solid and coherent knowledge of man, the world, and of God, relying on a philosophical patrimony which is perennially valid” and that “account should also be taken of the more recent progress of the sciences.”⁹ Carrasquillo’s translation is the best English-language manual in print enabling beginning and advanced students alike to have “St. Thomas as a teacher.”¹⁰ 

Alan Aversa

Fisher More College
Fort Worth, Texas

Thomas Aquinas and the Philosophy of Punishment by Peter Karl Koritansky (*Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press, 2012*), ix + 209 pp.

PETER KORITANSKY’S “CENTRAL GOAL” is “a presentation of Aquinas’s theory of punishment as superior to that of utilitarianism and modern retributivism” (8). He makes real progress toward this, and even though *Thomas Aquinas and the Philosophy of Punishment* will appeal most to those already sympathetic to the Thomistic tradition, it provides

⁸ *Ibid.*, 119.

⁹ *Optatam Totius* §15

¹⁰ 1983 *Code of Canon Law* can. 252 §3.