

Concordia Theological Monthly



M A Y

1 9 5 1

The Principium Cognoscendi of Roman Catholic Theology

By F. E. MAYER

FOR a time it seemed that Rome made honest attempts to bring about a *rapprochement* to Protestantism and to remove as far as possible all obstacles in the way of a reunion of all Christian denominations. In the encyclical *Provida Matris* of May, 1895, the Pope suggested prayers for the reconciliation with the separated *brethren* (italics our own). In the encyclical *Mystici Corporis Christi* of 1943 and again in the Christmas message of 1949 the Roman pontiff seemingly welcomed discussions between Catholic and Protestant theologians. In the Christmas message the Pope did not seem to be averse in principle to a "brotherly" theological examination of that which separates Christian confessions. As a result, many Protestant theologians hoped that the papal Church would participate in the ecumenical movement, more specifically, send official representatives to the first meeting of the World Council of Churches at Amsterdam.¹ The *Una Sancta* movement, in which Protestant and Catholic theologians of Europe joined in Biblical, dogmatical, and historical studies, seemed to be a good omen and to indicate that Rome no longer held to its former position that it alone is the saving Church and that no Protestant denomination has any right of existence. Unfortunately, some Protestants actually believe that Rome is "merely a dissident sister church." This trend prompted Cardinal Spellman to say that the Catholic Church should not hurry to deal with the Protestants on the entire question of reunion, for within the next sixty years the "separated brethren" will return to Rome of their own accord.

Rome has not only not receded from its position that it cannot grant equal rights to Protestant denominations, but has reiterated its position that the Catholic Church is the only divinely recognized denomination and that reunion of Christendom can be brought about solely and alone through a return of Protestants

to the Catholic Church. Father Boyer says: "The Catholic Church is disposed to permit Protestant denominations to retain certain non-essential characteristics if they are willing to recognize certain dogmas which the Vatican holds as essential; for one, *obedience to the Pope* [italics our own]. In this regard Protestants generally do not understand how liberal the Catholic attitude is."²

All discussions with Rome which dodge the Roman Catholic *principium cognoscendi* are vain and futile. It is therefore highly significant that one understands clearly Rome's complete departure from historic Protestantism and from Lutheranism in particular. The issue really is *sola Scriptura* versus *solus papa*.

In the Fourth Session (April 8, 1546) the Council of Trent declared that the Gospel is

the fountain of all, both saving truth and moral discipline, [and that] this truth and discipline are contained in the written books and the unwritten traditions which, received by the Apostles from the mouth of Christ Himself or from the Apostles themselves, the Holy Ghost dictating, have come down even unto us, transmitted as it were from hand to hand . . . and preserved in the Catholic Church by a continuous succession.³

The Church, bound by this decree, teaches the dictation theory of inspiration and accepts the canonical writings as divinely inspired and therefore as God's message to man. In his Encyclical *Spiritus Paracletus* of 1920, Benedict XV not only encouraged the reading of the Bible by granting an indulgence of 300 days to the faithful who shall read the books of the Scripture for at least a quarter of an hour, but also stated that Scripture has "been bestowed upon the human race for their instruction in Divine things."⁴ This seems to be a radical departure from Rome's position prior to Trent. The fact is that Luther had so successfully defended the *Sola Scriptura* principle that the Council of Trent was compelled to modify its traditional position and to couch its formal principle in terminology which made Rome appear to champion the *Sola Scriptura* principle. But the formal principle of Rome has undergone no change and must still be summarized in the words of the Smalcald Articles:

The Papacy is nothing but sheer enthusiasm, by which the Pope boasts that all rights exist in the shrine of his heart, and what-

ever he decides and commands within his Church is spirit and right, even though it is above, and contrary to, Scripture and the spoken Word.⁵

Appealing to 1 Tim. 3:15, Rome claims that the *ecclesia docens*, i. e., the hierarchy, more specifically the Pope, is the infallible teacher in determining both the scope of the subject matter to be accepted and the sense in which this is to be believed. The Council of Trent states that the "Gospel" is contained in the written books (the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments) as well as in the unwritten traditions (the extra-Scriptural statements on faith and morals contained in the writings of the Fathers, the decrees of the Councils, and the official pronouncements of the papal See). It must be kept in mind, however, that both groups of writings come under the general heading of "tradition." Since the days of Bellarmine, Rome distinguished between "objective" or "material," and "formal" tradition. The former term denotes the subject matter transmitted, the latter the act of transmission. The Church "hands down" (Latin: *tradit*) the "Gospel" as it is allegedly contained either in the Scriptures or in the traditions. Neither the Scriptures nor the tradition, nor both, but the teaching office is the final source and norm of faith and discipline. As judge and interpreter of both, it is bound neither by traditions nor by Scripture. Anthony C. Cotter states that the ultimate explanation of the obscurity of the Bible is God Himself, whereby God purposed to make the *magisterium* the primary recipient of all revelation, the Bible included, so that the *magisterium* may properly be called the primary and even the only source of revelation.⁶ This is, as Luther called it, "sheer enthusiasm," fanaticism, *Schwaermerei*. And in the final analysis enthusiasm and rationalism always go hand in hand. Rome's formal principle therefore determines the place and significance which it ascribes (1) to Scripture, (2) to the traditions, and (3) to reason.

1

Rome claims that its high regard for the Bible is evidenced in the fact that most of the New Testament authors were members of the Catholic Church, that this Church has given the Bible to Christendom, and that it considers the Bible a precious storehouse of dogmatic and moral instruction. Rome nevertheless insists that

the Church has authority over the Scripture, and not the Bible over the Church.

a. Rome teaches that the Bible is inadequate and insufficient and needs the supplementation which the Church alone can provide. Bellarmine stated that the New Testament Epistles were written only to meet certain local conditions, and Andrada, the official interpreter of Trent, declared that the New Testament books served only as "notes" to aid the Apostles' memory. On the basis of Jer. 31:33 he argues that the chief difference between the two Testaments is that the Old was written on tablets of stone and paper, whereas the New was written almost entirely into the heart of the Church. The Roman apologists usually argue as follows:

Christ did not say, Sit down and write Bibles and let everyone judge for himself. That injunction was left for the 16th century, and we have seen the result of it in the founding of 500 religions all quarreling with one another about the interpretation of the Bible.⁷

Thomas F. Coakley writes:

The Catholic Church existed before the Bible; it is possible for the Catholic Church to exist without the Bible, for the Catholic Church is altogether independent of the Bible. The Bible does not give any systematic, complete, and exhaustive treatment of the doctrines of Christ. In many respects it is, like a stenographer's note book, partial and fragmentary, to be supplemented later on in more elaborate detail by other agencies. Christ never wrote a word of the Bible. One might naturally expect Him to have set the example by writing at least some portions of the Bible if He intended His followers to take their entire religion from it. Christ never ordered His apostles to write any part of the Bible. We might well expect such a command from Him if He desired the members of His Church to have recourse to the Bible for their religion. Christ could not have intended that the world should take its religion from the Bible, since so many millions of the human race today, to say nothing of the past, cannot read or write.⁸

b. The Roman Catholic Church claims the authority to determine the Scriptural canon and has decreed that the Vulgate is to "be held as authentic and that no one is to dare, or presume, to reject it under any pretext whatever."⁹ A number of significant Roman doctrines depend for proof on faulty Vulgate translations,

e. g., Gen. 3:17 (*ipsa tibi conteret caput*); Eph. 5:32 (the Greek word *mysterion* is rendered *sacramentum*); 1 Cor. 4:1 (*dispensatores sumus* has been used as an argument to prove that the hierarchy may dispense the laity from the cup).¹⁰ Furthermore, Trent decreed that the Apocrypha belong to the canon and must be accepted as inspired and dictated by the Holy Ghost. Some of the apocryphal writings are extremely valuable to Rome, inasmuch as they may be used to support such doctrines as the expiatory power of good works (Tob. 4:11 f.), the intercession of angels and saints (Tob. 12:12), intercessory prayers for the dead (2 Macc. 12:44 ff.).

c. Rome views the Bible and the traditions as the "law or constitution of the church" and therefore argues that as the Supreme Court must interpret the Federal Constitution, so there must be a living authority which determines the meaning of the Church's constitution. Appealing to 2 Pet. 1:20—but completely ignoring the context—Rome states that as little as any citizen may put his own construction on the law of the land, so little is a member of the Church permitted to exercise the right of "private interpretation." This is maintained in spite of the definite injunction (Acts 17:11) that Christians should on the basis of Scripture examine the doctrines presented to them. Rome's claim to be the official "supreme court" is a clear case of such "private interpretation" as is forbidden in 2 Pet. 1:20. Rome claims, furthermore, that the Bible is a dark book, hard to understand, and in need of official interpretation. Even if it is granted that the sections in Paul's Letters which St. Peter (2 Pet. 3:16) declared to be hard to understand contain doctrines which are essential to salvation, the Romanists overlook the fact that while Holy Writ contains passages difficult to understand, the saving truth is clearly set forth. According to the Tridentine profession, the right to judge the true sense and interpretation of the Scriptures belongs alone to the Church, and no layman nor theologian dare interpret them otherwise than in the sense which Mother Church has held and does hold.¹¹ "Mother Church," however, defies all hermeneutical principles. The Council of Trent proves the institution of the sacrament of penance with Luke 13:5; Acts 2:38; the cup under one kind is justified on the basis of 1 Cor. 4:1; 11:34; the daily Mass

as an unbloody sacrifice is supported with Mal. 1:11. The explanatory notes in the Douay Version show the arbitrary manner in which Rome employs Scriptures.¹²

d. Rome's attitude toward the Scripture can probably be gauged best by its regulations concerning the reading of the Bible by the laity. Rome denies the charges frequently made that it proscribes Bible reading by the laity, claiming, on the one hand, that the Church has never issued an absolute and categorical interdiction of Bible reading, and pointing, on the other hand, to the encyclicals of Leo XIII (*Spiritus Paracletus*) and of Pius XII (*Divino Afflante Spiritu*) which encourage Bible reading. Both claims must be carefully evaluated. In 1199, Innocent III declared that the desire to read the Bible is to be commended, but that the reading in "conventicles" (without the supervision of the duly appointed priest) is not to be tolerated, because the profundity of Scriptures is such that not only the unlearned, but also the *docti et prudentes* cannot grasp its meaning. By an allegorical interpretation of Ex. 19:13 (the animal which touched the Holy Mountain Sinai was to be stoned) they seek to prove that no unlearned person (*aliquis et indoctus*) dare presume to delve into the sublimity of the Scriptures and preach it to others.¹³ In 1229 the Synod of Toulouse decreed that the laity should not be permitted to have the books of the Old and New Testaments, with the exception of the Psalter, the breviary for the holy office, and *horas beatae Mariae*, for devotional purposes. In accord with the resolution of Trent that a commission be established to prepare an index of prohibited books, Pius IV in 1564 issued the bull *Dominici gregis custodiae*, in which he laid down ten rules to guide the *congregatio indicis* (now the Congregation of the Holy Office) in establishing the *index librorum prohibitorum et expurgandorum*. The fourth rule reads:

Since it is manifest by experience that if the Holy Bible in the vulgar tongue be suffered to be read everywhere without distinction, because of men's rashness (*temeritas*) more evil than good arises, let the judgment of the bishop or inquisitor stand in this respect, so that, after consulting with the parish priest or the confessor, they may grant permission to read translations of the Scriptures, made by Catholic writers, to those whom they understand to be able to receive no harm, but an increase of faith and

piety from such reading; which permit (*facultas*) let them have in writing. But whosoever shall presume to read these Bibles or have them in possession without such faculty shall not be capable of receiving absolution for their sins, unless they have first given up their Bibles to the ordinary (the bishop).¹⁴

Significant are the statements of the Constitution *Unigenitus*, in which Clement XI (1713) condemned the propositions of Quesnel that the Bible should be read by all and that the obscurity of the Bible does not exempt the laity from reading the Word of God. When the newly organized Bible Societies developed great activity at the beginning of the nineteenth century, the Popes in unmistakable language condemned them. Pius VII not only condemned the Protestant Bible Societies as a pestilence, a snare prepared for men's eternal ruin, tares sown by the adversaries, but also dissolved the Catholic Bible Societies. Leo XII spoke of the Bibles published by the Protestant Bible Societies as poisonous pastures. Pius IX in the Syllabus of 1864 condemned them as being on the same level with Communism, Socialism, secret societies; and Leo XIII in the index of 1897 proscribed all except officially approved and annotated versions. Thus, although Rome has never issued an absolute prohibition of Bible reading by the laity, it is equally true that the recent encouragements to read the Bible are restricted and qualified. The regulations of Pius IV in Rule Four still stand. Rome still claims that the reading of approved Bibles is not only unnecessary, but is in many instances pernicious. For, though the Bible is a precious treasure, it may be misused.¹⁵ Therefore the reading of the Bible is permitted only to such as have obtained a special "faculty" from the ordinary. Inasmuch as indulgences can be gained by the mere reading of the Bible, one is prompted to ask whether such reading is considered a work of supererogation. And one wonders why Rome should encourage the reading of the Bible, since the Church does not consider the Bible the source and norm of doctrine nor the power of God unto salvation.

2

Rome teaches that the "Gospel" is contained also in the "unwritten traditions," the writings of the Fathers, and the pronouncements of the Church through the centuries. The last verse of

John's Gospel teaches that not everything is set down in the Scriptures. Rome interprets this to mean that part of Christian doctrine must be sought elsewhere, namely, in the "traditions" (2 Thess. 2:14; Acts 2:42). These traditions (*traditio materialis*) were given to the Apostles and their rightful successors, deposited in the shrine of the Church, and are to be proclaimed by the infallible Church (*traditio formalis*) as the occasion demands. This explains the long list of new doctrines published throughout the centuries. Rome's doctrinal system is not yet complete, for there are such important doctrines as that of original sin on which there is no full agreement. Even its ecclesiology is, as Dominus Coster said in 1941, still in the "pre-theological state."¹⁶

To the Protestant this appears to be a clear case of development of doctrine. But Rome answers that it is impossible for her to proclaim new doctrines. "It can, however, develop more and more the truth entrusted to it, can define it more exactly, and can develop the entire wealth of revelation with increasing clarity. By this process not one of the dogmas previously held is rejected nor are any added which have not been previously taught implicitly."¹⁷ Francis J. Conell states: "Nothing can be added to the deposit of divine revelation since the death of the last apostle, because the truths proclaimed by Christ and the apostles were intended as the completion of the message of God to the human race." He continues to set forth that the Pope's infallibility does not imply the pronouncement of new doctrines. It extends to the explanation of the revealed truth and to those doctrines which are intimately connected with, though not actually contained in, "the deposit of truth."¹⁸ Rome says there can be no development of doctrine, for, according to John 16:12, all doctrines have always been believed implicitly, even though not taught explicitly. A view, held by only some in the Church, as a *pia sententia*, will not be elevated to an official doctrine until sufficient tradition has been found to support it. "The policy of the Church is to be cautious and slow in taking novel views, such as tend to shock and alarm the simple-minded, until such views have been firmly established by evidence." In defense of the new doctrine of papal infallibility Cardinal Gibbons stated:

The Council did not create a new creed, but rather confirmed

the old one. It formulated into an article of faith a truth which in every age had been accepted by the Catholic world because it had been *implicitly* [italics ours] contained in the deposit of revelation.¹⁹

Cardinal Newman in his essay on *The Development of Christian Doctrine* and Johann Moehler in his *Einheit in der Kirche* present virtually the same views in answering the charge of development. Moehler says:

The Divine Spirit, to whom is entrusted the guidance and vivification of the Church, becomes by His union with the human spirit in the Church a peculiarly Christian intuition, a deep sure guiding feeling, which, as it abides in truth, leads also into all truth . . . is not purely an internal act, but is always based on external testimony and outward authority, preceded by an outward certainty. . . . The Church, therefore, as representing Christ, is the living exposition of the divine revelation and thus invested with Christ's own authority and infallibility. . . . If the Church is not the authority representing Christ, then everything relapses into darkness, uncertainty, doubt, distraction, unbelief, and superstition. Revelation becomes null and void, fails in its real purpose and must henceforth be even called in question and finally denied. . . . All developments in dogma as well as in morality can be considered as resulting from formal acts of the whole community.²⁰

Thus Rome teaches that no new doctrine can be taught, while it is an historical fact that Rome has promulgated many new doctrines. This constitutes no contradiction for Roman theologians, who claim that the *ecclesia docens* is infallible and that all doctrines were deposited in the shrine of the Church and were implicitly held since the death of the last Apostle. The Vatican Council in the dogmatic decree on faith declares:

All those things are to be believed with divine and Catholic faith which are contained in the Word of God, written or handed down (*in verbo Dei scripto vel tradito*), and which the Church either by a solemn judgment or by her ordinary and universal magisterium proposes for belief as having been divinely revealed.²¹

This is "sheer enthusiasm" and grants the Church unlimited reign in promulgating "new doctrines." And that is the real meaning of *traditio*.

3

Finally, *reason* is considered a reliable source of religious knowledge. Following the example of the early Apologists (especially Justin Martyr and his *logos spermatikos* theory), the Scholastics maintained that both reason and revelation are divine gifts and can therefore never be at variance with each other.²² The earlier Scholastics leaned heavily on Plato with his emphasis on intuitive knowledge. Anselm's famous ontological argument for the existence of God is based on Platonic idealism (*universalia ante rem*). It runs something like this: We have the *idea* of an absolutely Perfect Being. To be perfect a being must have existence. Therefore an absolutely perfect being must exist.²³ The later Scholastics, especially Thomas Aquinas, introduced the empirical method and the inductive logic of Aristotle into the realm of theology (*universalia in re*). Thomas therefore alters Anselm's process completely and on the basis of Aristotelean dialectics employs the following four steps to prove the existence of God: (1) Demonstration by natural reason of the existence of God; (2) establishment by reason of the existence of freedom and immortality of the soul; (3) transition from reason to faith in revelation; and (4) recognition of the Church as the authoritative interpreter of the true revelation.²⁴ Catholic theologians maintain that human reason is competent up to a certain point and that it is also competent to determine where its competence ends. Otherwise it could not be competent anywhere. Thomas gave a high rank to reason and the intellect, and he is today the recognized teacher of Catholic theology.²⁵ It is therefore not surprising that the entire theology of Rome is supported by rationalistic arguments.

While Rome frequently claims that she employs logic primarily for apologetic reasons, a study of standard dogmatic works of Rome shows conclusively that throughout her theological system reason is considered a legitimate source of divine truths. This rationalistic principle becomes evident, not only in such points of doctrine as are accepted by all Christians, but especially in those Roman teachings which have been elevated from pious opinions to dogmas of the Church. A good case in point are the rational arguments for the dogma of the assumption of Mary, for which there are admittedly no historic evidences.²⁶ Another case in point is Rome's

approach to the doctrine of the Trinity. While the Bible-centered theologian believes the doctrine of the Trinity, though it is contrary to natural reason and above the enlightened reason, the Roman theologian argues as follows: It must be granted that this doctrine is not contrary to *divine* reason, and therefore cannot conflict with human reason. Since the doctrine is not contrary to divine reason, it cannot contain any contradiction; and since it actually does not contain any contradiction, human reason cannot find any contradiction where there is none.²⁷

Rome will probably never repeat the Galileo incident, since its rationalistic principle enables the Church today to adjust itself to current scientific claims and theories — but only in so far as there is no conflict with fixed dogmas of the Church. The Church will accept the findings of modern psychology so long as they are not contrary to its views concerning the freedom and immortality of the soul.²⁸ But while Rome insists on maintaining the supernatural origin of each soul (creationism), it holds that

the general theory of evolution is not only unobjectionable, it becomes a necessary conclusion from sound Catholic principles. Christian philosophy does not admit supernatural interference where the natural order suffices. . . . Man's *body* is the result of natural forces put into the world by God.²⁹

The various encyclicals on social and moral problems, on the relation of Church and State, on capitalism and labor, reflect throughout the rationalistic principle. If one grants the major premises, then one is compelled by cold logic to accept the inevitable conclusions.

A theology based on reason appeals to man, since it is on man's level. It is, as Ph. Melancthon points out, a theology of the law, a theology of the natural man.³⁰ At first glance a theology of reason should lead to certainty; in reality it is a theology of doubt. There are violent differences among leading theologians on important points of doctrine; there are even different schools of thought; and finally, Romanists expressly deny that a Christian can attain to absolute assurance in matters of faith. Roman dogmaticians usually speak of three types of assurance, metaphysical, theological, and absolute.³¹ Since no man can be certain that his reason and intellect have correctly interpreted the empirical the-

ological data, he is compelled to transfer to the Church the responsibility of rightly interpreting all religious facts.³²

Whether Rome appeals to the Scriptures, or to the traditions, or to reason as the source of doctrine, in the final analysis its formal principle is *sola ecclesia, solus papa*.

St. Louis, Mo.

FOOTNOTES

1. Rene Pache, "Rome and the Ecumenical Movement," *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Vol. 108, January issue, 1951. See also *Ecumenical Review*, Vol. I, 2, p. 200.
2. Pache, *loc. cit.*, p. 60.
3. Council of Trent, Sess. IV, Waterworth ed., 18; J. Neuner, S. J., und H. Roos, S. J., *Der Glaube der Kirche*, Regensburg, 1938, p. 64 f.
4. See Preface to New Testament, Paterson, St. Anthony Guild Press, 1941.
5. The Smalcald Articles, Part III, Art. VIII, 4.
6. "The Obscurity of the Bible," *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, Vol. IX (1947), 453—464. For a detailed presentation of the formal principle of Rome see W. Wilmers, *Lehrbuch der katholischen Religion*. Ein Handbuch zu De Harbes katholischem Katechismus. 4 vols., Muenster. The seventh edition was prepared by Jos. Hontheim, 1907, I, 171 ff. Neuner, *op. cit.*, p. 51.
7. Tract, *Truth About Catholics*, Los Angeles, Cath. Lit. Board, 1936, p. 2. See also James Cardinal Gibbons, *Faith of Our Fathers*, Baltimore, John Murphy Co., 1917, 77—94.
8. *Inside Facts About the Catholic Church*, 21 f.; quoted in *Popular Symbolics*, St. Louis, 1934, p. 155 f. Cf. F. E. Mayer, "Romanism, Calvinism, Lutheranism on Authority of the Bible," *CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY*, VIII, 260 ff.
9. Waterworth, *op. cit.*, 19. This position was reaffirmed in 1870; Neuner, *op. cit.*, p. 69 f. On the history of the Vulgate see *Realenzyklopaedie, s. v.*, "Bibeluebersetzung"; *Schaff-Herzog, s. v.*, "Bible Versions." The translation of the New Testament prepared in 1941 is based on the Vulgate. See Preface.
10. Geo. A. Vogel, "A Comparison of the King James and the Douay Version," *CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY*, VI, 18 and especially 102 ff.
11. Wilmers, *op. cit.*, 200 ff.; 217 ff. Gibbons, *op. cit.*, VIII, 77 ff. Neuner, *op. cit.*, p. 59 f.
12. Cf. Waterworth, *op. cit.*, 93; 141; 154.
13. Carl Mirbt, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Papsttums und des Roemischen Katholizismus*, 173.
14. *Ibid.*, 341.
15. Wilmers, *op. cit.*, I, 238 ff. Gibbons, *loc. cit.*; cf. Innocence III: *Quia multi defecerunt scrutantes scrutinio*. Mirbt, *op. cit.*, 173.
16. Edm. Schlink, "Die Kirche in Gottes Heilsplan," *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, November 1948, 646; republished in *The Ecumenical Review*, 1949, 150 ff. Even the papal encyclical *Mystici Corporis Christi*, 1943, need not be considered the final word on Rome's doctrine of the Church, since it is not as yet established whether this encyclical is infallible.
17. Wilmers, *op. cit.*, II, 694.

18. "Does Catholic Doctrine Change?" *American Ecclesiastical Review*, Vol. 117, 322 f. Wilmers, *op. cit.*, I, 127. J. A. Moehler, *Symbolism, or Exposition of the Doctrinal Differences between Catholics and Protestants*. Tr. by J. B. Robertson. London, 1906, p. 288 f.
19. Gibbons, *op. cit.*, 130.
20. Voss, Gustav, "Johann Adam Moehler and the Development of Dogmas," *Theological Studies*, September, 1943, 420—444.
21. Schaff, Philip. *Creeds of Christendom*. New York and London, Harper & Bros., II, 244 f.
22. The Vatican Council said: "Not only can faith and reason never be opposed to one another, but they are of mutual aid one to another." Schaff, *op. cit.*, II, 249. Edwin A. Burtt, *Types of Religious Philosophy*, Harper and Bros., New York, 1939, Ch. II, "The Catholic Philosophy of Religion." Cf. Neuner, *op. cit.*, p. 312 ff.
23. See A. C. Welch, *Anselm and His Work*, Edinburgh, T. & T., Clark, 1901, 72.
24. The fivefold argument for the first step is presented by Thomas in *Summa theologica*, I, Qu. 2, Art. 3.
25. Paul M. Bretscher, "Neo-Thomism," in CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY, April, 1950.
26. F. E. Mayer, "The Dogma of Mary's Assumption," CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY, 1950, p. 181 f.
27. Wilmers, *op. cit.*, I, 484.
28. M. Mahler, *Psychology: Empirical and Rational*, Longmans, Green & Co., Preface. Wm. A. Kelly, *Educational Psychology*, Milwaukee, Bruce Publ. Co., 1938, cf. the decision of the Bible Commission, 1909, on the historicity of Genesis, Neuner, *op. cit.*, p. 119.
29. W. A. Hauber, "Evolution and Catholic Thought," *Ecclesiastical Review*, March, 1942, 161—177.
30. The Apology of the Augsburg Confession, "*De Iustificatione*," 133.
31. On "certainty" see Pohle-Preuss, *Dogmatic Theology*, VII, 379 ff.; also George D. Smith, *The Teaching of the Catholic Church*, I, New York, Macmillan and Co., 1949, 13 ff.
32. K. Adam, *The Spirit of Catholicism*, 24; 32 f.; 42 ff.; 224 ff.