

# Prompta Bibliotheca Canonica, Iuridica, Moralis, Theologica, Tomus Sextus P-R (*Concise Canonical, Juridical, Moral, and Theological Library, Volume 6 Letters P-R*)

by Rev. Louis Farris Ferraris (Rev. Louis Ferraris), 1772

[Online Location of Text Here](#)

- OCR of the original text by AI (*claude-3-7-sonnet-20250219*).
- Translation of the original text performed by AI (*claude-3-7-sonnet-20250219*).
- Last Edit: April 2, 2025.
- Version: 1.0
- Selection pages: 36-41

## “Papa” A. 2 n. 63–88

### Latin

**63** Probatur autem nostra Conclusio ex verbis a Christo dictis Divo Petro Lucae 22. ibi: Ego autem rogavi pro te, ut non deficiat Fides tua, & tu aliquando conversus confirma fratres tuos, quae verba non personaliter ad solum Petrum, sed ad omnes Successores in ejus Cathedra pertinere ostendimus supra a n. 44. Unde cum constet Petrum sic a Deo fuisse confirmatum, ut ejus Fides etiam personalis minime posset deficere, ut clare denotant illae particulae pro te, & tua, quas expendimus supra num. 43. idem dicendum est etiam de aliis Romanis Pontificibus ejus Successoribus. Ideo enim tale privilegium est illis impetratum, ut fratres suos in Fide confirmet; Sed quomodo confirmabunt, si sint ipsimet vel Haeretici, vel Infideles? An in aliis eam Fidem stabiliunt, quam ipsimet animo execrantur, & impugnant? Tum quia cum Pontifex sit viva Regula, quam omnes Fideles sequi, & prae oculis semper habere debent, oportet muniri singulari aliquo privilegio, quo ab errore in iis, quae sunt

### English

**63** Our Conclusion is proven from the words spoken by Christ to Saint Peter in Luke 22, where He says: “But I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not: and thou, being once converted, confirm thy brethren.” These words, as we have shown above from number 44, do not pertain personally to Peter alone, but to all his Successors in his Chair. Since it is established that Peter was thus confirmed by God, so that even his personal Faith could in no way fail, as is clearly denoted by those particles “for thee” and “thy,” which we examined above in number 43, the same must also be said concerning the other Roman Pontiffs, his Successors. Indeed, this privilege was obtained for them for this reason: that they might confirm their brethren in the Faith. But how will they confirm others if they themselves are either Heretics or Infidels? Will they establish in others that Faith which they themselves execrate and attack in their own minds? Furthermore, since the Pontiff is the living Rule whom all the Faithful must follow and always keep before their eyes, he ought to be

Fidei, non solum Sedes ipsa, sed etiam illius persona praeservetur; alias si & ipsum Papam in Haeresim labi, & a Fide deficere admittamus, quid aliud sperari poterit, nisi quod caecus ipse nos caecos simul in foveam trahat? juxta illud Matth. 15. num. 14. ibi: Caecus autem si caeco ducatum praestet, ambo in foveam cadunt: & Lucae 6. num. 39. ibi: Numquid potest caecus caecum ducere? non ne ambo in foveam cadunt: & cap. Cum sit ars artium i.q. de aetate, & qualitate, ibi: Quia si caecus caecum ducit, ambo in foveam dilabuntur.

**64** Hinc haec de Romana Ecclesia prae omnibus aliis praedicatur excellentia, & praerogativa singularis, quod omnes aliae principiores, & antiquiores Ecclesiae, non solum Haereticos, sed etiam Haeresiarchas habuerunt Episcopos: Antiochena videlicet Paulum Samosatenum; Alexandrina Dioscorum: Constantinopolitana Dioscorum, & Macedonium, & sic de reliquis, ut prosequitur Mendoza *in quaest. 4. Scholast. §. 4. arg. 7.* Ecclesia vero Romana numquam. Ex tot enim Romanis Pontificibus, quamvis aliquibus subinde moribus utcumque dyscolis, nemo unquam repertus fuit, qui in Haeresim, vel Apostasiam fuerit prolapsus, ut fuse demonstrant Bellarminus *de Pontifice lib. 4. cap. 8. & seq.* Laurea *de Fide disp. 8. art. 5. usque ad §. 11.* Albertus Pighius *de Ecclesiast. Hierarch. lib. 4. cap. 7.* Barbosa *lib. 1. Juris Ecclesiast. univers. cap. 2. a num. 52.* Mattheuucc. *loc. cit. Controvers. 6. cap. 4. & Controvers. 7. cap. 1.* & fatentur omnes alii, teste Fagnan. *in cap. Significasti 4. de electione num. 69.* Et expresse id testatur Agatho Papa in Epistol. ad Constantinum Imperatorem, quae lecta est *in VI. Synodo act. 4. & postea act. 8.* ab omnibus approbata. *Haec est*, inquit, *verae Fidei Regula, quam, & in prosperis, & in adversis vivaciter tenuit Apostolica Christi Ecclesia, quae per Dei gratiam a tramite Apostolicae traditionis numquam errasse probatur, nec haereticis novitatibus unquam depravata succubuit, quia dictum est Petro:*

fortified by some singular privilege, by which not only the See itself, but also the person holding it, is preserved from error in matters of Faith. Otherwise, if we admit that the Pope himself can fall into Heresy and defect from the Faith, what else could be expected but that he, being blind, would draw us who are also blind into the pit with him? This accords with Matthew 15, number 14, where it states: “And if the blind lead the blind, both will fall into the pit”; and Luke 6, number 39: “Can a blind man lead a blind man? Will they not both fall into a pit?”; and chapter “Cum sit ars artium” (On age and quality), where it says: “For if the blind lead the blind, both will fall into the pit.”

**64** Hence, concerning the Roman Church above all others, this unique excellence and singular prerogative is proclaimed: that all other principal and more ancient Churches had not only heretics but even heresiarchs as Bishops—namely, the Antiochene Church had Paul of Samosata; the Alexandrian Church had Dioscorus; the Constantinopolitan Church had Dioscorus and Macedonius, and so with the rest—as Mendoza pursues *in question 4, Scholastic, § 4, argument 7.* The Roman Church, however, never had such. For among so many Roman Pontiffs, although some occasionally had somewhat questionable morals, no one was ever found who fell into heresy or apostasy, as thoroughly demonstrated by Bellarmine *in On the Pontiff, book 4, chapter 8 and following*, Laurea *on Faith, disputation 8, article 5, up to § 11*, Albertus Pighius *on Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, book 4, chapter 7*, Barbosa *book 1 of Universal Ecclesiastical Law, chapter 2, from number 52*, Mattheucci *in the cited location, Controversy 6, chapter 4, and Controversy 7, chapter 1*, and all others acknowledge this, as witnessed by Fagnani *in chapter “Significasti” 4, on election, number 69.* And Pope Agatho expressly testifies to this in his Epistle to Emperor Constantine, which was read *in the Sixth Synod, act 4*, and afterwards *in act 8* approved by all. *This*, he says, *is the rule of true Faith, which the Apostolic Church of Christ has vigorously maintained both in prosperity and in adversity, which by God’s grace is proven never to*

*Simon, Simon ecce Satanas expetivit vos, ut cribraret sicut triticum; Ego autem rogavi pro te, ut non deficiat Fides tua, & tu aliquando conversus confirma fratres tuos: Hic Dominus Fidem Petri non defecturam promisit, & confirmare eum fratres suos admonuit, quod Apostolicos Pontifices meae exiguitatis praedecessores confidenter fecisse semper cunctis est agnitum; Vide etiam dicta supra numer. 48.*

Nec valet objicere, quod si omnis Papa, 65 ut S. Petrus, neque ut persona privata, posset in Haeresim incidere, & a Fide deficere, hoc esset de Fide, & consequenter essent Haeretici contrariam sententiam tenentes, quod non est dicendum, cum illam teneant clarissimi Doctores, tum Canonistae, tum Theologi, ut patet ex adductis supra n. 62. & notat Fagn. in cit. cap. *Significasti 4. de election. num. 68.* Non valet, inquam, quia etiamsi dicatur id esse de Fide, ut volunt aliqui, inter quos Matthaeucc. *l. c. Controvers. 7. c. 1. n. 7.* utpote revelatum saltem implicite, & virtualiter in illa propositione; *Ego rogavi pro te, ut non deficiat Fides tua*, adhuc tamen contrarium sentientes non essent Haeretici, quia propriam opinionem non sustinent cum pertinacia, ut requiretur ad Haeresim; sed parati sunt parere Ecclesiae definitioni<sup>[^1]</sup>.

**66** Nec etiam valet dicere; quod Sacri Canones supponunt, Papam ut personam privatam posse a Fide deficere, ut de facto supponitur in Canone *Si Papa d. dist. 40.* ubi statuitur Papam a nemine propter quodcumque crimen posse judicari : Nisi deprehendatur a Fide devians, adeoque Papa quo ad se, & ut persona privata potest in Haeresim incidere, & a Fide deficere. Non valet, inquam, quia textus ille non est alicujus Pontificis, aut Concilii Generalis, sed cujusdam Bonifacii Martyris Episcopi Moguntini, qui potuit illius esse opinionis, uti fuerunt, & sunt plures alii, & ideo nobis

*have strayed from the path of Apostolic tradition, nor has it ever succumbed to heretical innovations, because it was said to Peter: "Simon, Simon, behold Satan has desired to sift you like wheat; but I have prayed for you that your faith may not fail, and when you have turned back, strengthen your brothers." Here the Lord promised that Peter's faith would not fail, and admonished him to strengthen his brothers, which, as is known to all, the Apostolic Pontiffs, predecessors of my unworthiness, have confidently done; See also what was said above in number 48.*

Nor does it avail to object that if every Pope, 65 like St. Peter, could not even as a private person fall into Heresy and defect from the Faith, this would be a matter of Faith, and consequently those holding the contrary opinion would be Heretics—which cannot be maintained, since this opinion is held by most distinguished Doctors, both Canonists and Theologians, as is evident from those cited above in n. 62, and as Fagnani notes in the cited chapter *Significasti 4. de election. num. 68.* This objection, I say, is not valid, because even if it were said to be a matter of Faith, as some maintain, among whom is Matthaeuccius *l. c. Controversia 7. c. 1. n. 7.*, as being revealed at least implicitly and virtually in that proposition, *I have prayed for you that your faith may not fail*, nevertheless those holding the contrary opinion would not be Heretics, because they do not maintain their own opinion with pertinacity, as would be required for Heresy, but are prepared to submit to the definition of the Church<sup>[^1]</sup>.

**66** Nor is it valid to say that the Sacred Canons suppose that the Pope as a private person can defect from the Faith, as is indeed supposed in the Canon *Si Papa d. dist. 40*, where it is established that the Pope cannot be judged by anyone for any crime whatsoever, unless he is caught deviating from the Faith, and thus the Pope, as regards himself and as a private person, can fall into Heresy and defect from the Faith. This is not valid, I say, because that text is not from any Pontiff or General Council, but from a certain Boniface the Martyr, Bishop of Mainz, who could have held that opinion, as many others have held and still

utpote privati Doctoris vim non facit, cum nostra sententia majoribus sit suffulta auctoritatibus, & rationibus, adeont si not sit de Fide, est tamen cert certitudine infallibili infra Fidem.

**67.** De Fide est Benedictum XIV. v. g. legitime electum, & ut talem ab Ecclesia acceptatum, esse verum Papam. *Est Communis inter Catholicos.*

**68.** Probatur primo ex Concilio Constantiensi *sess. ultim.* ubi Martinus V. Const. incip. *Inter cunctos decernit*, ut ab iis, qui de Haeresi ad Fidem revertuntur, petatur inter alia *Utrum credant, quod Papa Canonice electus, qui pro tempore fuerit, ejus nomine proprio expresso, sit Successor B. Petri habens supremam auctoritatem in Ecclesia Dei?* adeoque supponit esse articulum Fidei, cum Haeresim abjurantes nonnisi de Fidei veritatibus interrogentur. Tum quia est Haeresis Lutheri, quod Papa non sit Vicarius Christi, cujus error 25. a Leone X. cum aliis proscriptus fuit Constitut. incip. *Exurge*, ibi: *Romanus Pontifex Petri Successor non est Christi Vicarius super omnes totius mundi Ecclesias ab ipso Christo in B. Petro constitutus.*

**69.** Probatur secundo. Illa conclusio est de Fide, cujus duae praemissae sunt de Fide; sed haec conclusio: *Benedictus XIV. est verus Papa* sequitur ex duabus praemissis de Fide, ergo est de Fide. Major est certissima; Probatur Minor, quia hae duae praemissae (ex quibus sequitur dicta conclusio) *omnis in Papam legitime electus, & ut talis ab Ecclesia acceptatus, est verus Papa; sed Benedictus XIV. est talis*, sunt de Fide, & quidem de Majori nulli Catholici dubitant, alias non esset de Fide legitimum Petri Successorem esse verum Papam. Minor quoque est certa, quia eo ipso, quod Ecclesia ipsum recipit, ut legitime electum, revelat Deus ipsius electionem esse legitimam, cum promiserit Christus numquam Ecclesiam suam erraturam in

hold. Therefore, it carries no force for us as coming from a private Doctor, since our position is supported by greater authorities and reasons, to the extent that if it is not a matter of Faith, it is nevertheless certain with an infallible certainty just short of Faith.

**67.** It is a matter of Faith that Benedict XIV, for example, legitimately elected and accepted as such by the Church, is the true Pope. *This is common teaching among Catholics.*

**68.** This is proven firstly from the Council of Constance, *final session*, where Martin V in his Constitution beginning *Inter cunctos decrees* that among other things, those who return to the Faith from Heresy should be asked: *“Whether they believe that the canonically elected Pope, whoever he may be at the time, with his proper name expressed, is the Successor of Blessed Peter, having supreme authority in the Church of God?”* Thus, it supposes this to be an article of Faith, since those abjuring Heresy are questioned only about the truths of Faith. Furthermore, it is a Heresy of Luther that the Pope is not the Vicar of Christ, whose 25th error was condemned along with others by Leo X in his Constitution beginning *Exurge*, wherein it states: *“The Roman Pontiff, Successor of Peter, is not the Vicar of Christ instituted by Christ himself in Blessed Peter over all the churches of the entire world.”*

**69.** It is proven secondly. That conclusion is of Faith, whose two premises are of Faith; but this conclusion: *Benedict XIV is the true Pope* follows from two premises of Faith, therefore it is of Faith. The major premise is most certain; The minor is proven, because these two premises (from which the said conclusion follows) *everyone legitimately elected as Pope, and as such accepted by the Church, is the true Pope; but Benedict XIV is such*, are of Faith, and indeed concerning the Major no Catholics doubt, otherwise it would not be of Faith that the legitimate Successor of Peter is the true Pope. The Minor is also certain, because by the very fact that the Church receives him as legitimately elected, God reveals that his election is legitimate, since Christ has promised that His Church would never err in matters of Faith, as is

materia Fidei, ut patet ex Evangelicis textibus adductis supra *a n. 42. ad 44.* erraret autem in tali Fidei materia, si non staret conclusio; Quandoquidem Ecclesia agnoscens electum, ut legitimum Papam, ipsum agnoscet, ut Fidei Regulam infallibilem, qui tunc esset fallibilis, adeoque &c. Tum quia Definitiones Bened. XIV. ex Cathedra loquentis sunt de Fide, sed non essent de Fide, nisi esset de Fide Benedictum XIV. esse verum Papam, ergo &c.

**70.** Nec valet objicere, quod non est de Fide, quod Benedictus XIV. sit valide baptizatus, & Canonice electus, cum id non sit revelatum, ergo neque de Fide est, quod sit verus Papa. Non valet, inquam, quia licet non sit revelatum explicite, est tamen revelatum implicite per pacificam Ecclesiae universalis acceptionem: eo enim ipso, quod Deus revelat esse legitimum Papam, etiam implicite revelat habere omnia ad Papatum necessario requisita.

**71.** Nec etiam valet objicere, quod licet sit de Fide, Christum esse in Eucharistia, non est tamen de Fide esse in hac numero Hostia, adeoque licet sit de Fide, verum Petri Successorem esse Papam, non est tamen de Fide hunc numero hominem esse Papam. Non valet, inquam, quia negatur consequentia, & paritas, & disparitas est, quia non est certum quod haec numero Hostia sit valide consecrata. Secus autem est de acceptione Papae, cum revelatum sit, hunc hominem esse Papam eo ipso, quod per Ecclesiam indefectibilem agnoscitur, & recipitur ut talis.

**72.** Primatus Ecclesiae universalis, seu Papatus est annexus Romano Episcopatu de Jure Divino. Sic tenet Abbas *in cap. Per venerabilem 13. Qui filii sint legitimi*; Joannes Andreas *in cap. Fundamenta, de election. in 6. ubi Ancharanus num. 12.* Card. Tuscus *Practic. concl. Juris tom. 3. conclus. 3. n. 10. & tom. 7. lit. R. conclus.*

evident from the Gospel texts adduced above *from n. 42 to 44.* But the Church would err in such a matter of Faith if the conclusion did not stand; Since the Church, acknowledging the elect as the legitimate Pope, acknowledges him as the infallible Rule of Faith, who would then be fallible, and therefore, etc. Furthermore, because the Definitions of Benedict XIV speaking ex Cathedra are of Faith, but they would not be of Faith unless it were of Faith that Benedict XIV is the true Pope, therefore, etc.

**70.** Nor is it valid to object that it is not a matter of Faith that Benedict XIV was validly baptized and canonically elected, since this has not been revealed, and therefore it is not a matter of Faith that he is the true Pope. This objection, I say, is invalid, because although it has not been explicitly revealed, it is nevertheless implicitly revealed through the peaceful acceptance of the universal Church: for by the very fact that God reveals someone to be the legitimate Pope, He also implicitly reveals that this person possesses all the necessary requirements for the Papacy.

**71.** Nor is it valid to object that although it is a matter of Faith that Christ is present in the Eucharist, it is not a matter of Faith that He is present in this particular Host, and therefore, although it is a matter of Faith that the true Successor of Peter is the Pope, it is not a matter of Faith that this particular man is the Pope. This objection, I say, is invalid, because the consequence and the parity are denied, and the disparity exists because it is not certain that this particular Host has been validly consecrated. But the case is different regarding the acceptance of the Pope, since it has been revealed that this man is the Pope by the very fact that he is acknowledged and received as such by the indefectible Church.

**72.** The primacy of the Universal Church, or the Papacy, is annexed to the Roman Episcopate by Divine Law. This position is held by Abbas *in chapter Per venerabilem 13. [On those] Who are legitimate children*; Johannes Andreas *in chapter Fundamenta, on election in [Book] 6* where Ancharanus *number 12*; Cardinal Tuscus *Practical conclusions of Law, volume 3, conclusion 3,*

373. Bellarmin. *tom. 1. de Romano Pontifice lib. 2. a princ. S. Antonin. p. 3. tit. 23. cap. 5. §. 7.* Cajetan. *tom. 1. Opusc. tract. 3. de Pontif. institut. cap. 13.* Canus *lib. 6. de loci Theolog. c. 4.* Turrecremata *de potest. Eccles. lib. 2. cap. 10. cum seq.* Jacobat. *de Concil. lib. 8. art. 6. & 7.* Alvar. Pelag. *de planctu Ecclesiae lib. 1. cap. 24.* Valentia *de Fide disp. 1. qu. 1. punct. 7. §. 36.* Guarnieti *de Cap. Militant. Eccles. discept. 5. sect. 4. n. 409.* Baronius *in addit. ad Martyrologium Romanum die 18. Januarii pag. 130.* Tirinus *in 2. Comment. in Scripturam in Summar. Controvers. Controvers. 6. num. 11.* Leytan *Synops. de Eccl. Militant. discept. 5. sect. 4. num. 409. cum pluribus ibi relatis.* Azorius *Instit. moral. p. 2. lib. 4. cap. 11. qu. 2.* Cordub. *in qu. 1. 4. quaest. 2. proposit. 8.* Alphons. Mendoza *in qu. Quodlibet. quaest. 4. Scholast. per tot. Matthaeuc. loc. e. controvers. 6. cap. 2. n. 2.* Barbosa *de Offic. & potest. Episcop. part. 1. tit. 3. c. 2. num. 12. & lib. 1. Juris Ecclesiastic. univ. cap. 1. n. 31. & 32. & alii passim.*

**73.** Probatur nostra Conclusio ex Sacris Canonibus, & Conciliis. Si enim Pelagius Papa *in cap. Quamvis 3. dist. 21.* omnibus Orthodoxis scribens sic expresse habet: Quamvis universa per Orbem Catholicae Ecclesiae unus thalamus Christi sint; Sancta tamen Romana Catholica, & Apostolica Ecclesia nullis Synodis constitutis, caeteris Ecclesiis praelata est, sed Evangelica voce Domini, & Salvatoris nostri primatum obtinuit. Nicolaos II. *in cap. Omnes 1. dist. 22.* Mediolanensibus scribit: Qui Romanae Ecclesiae privilegium ab ipso Summo omnium Ecclesiarum Capite traditum auferre conatur, hic procul dubio in Haeresim labitur. S. Anacletus Papa *in cap. Sacrosancta 2. dist. 22.* sic praecise habet: Sacrosancta Romana, & Apostolica Ecclesia, non ab Apostolis, sed ab ipso

number 10, and volume 7, letter R, conclusion 373; Bellarmine volume 1, on the Roman Pontiff, book 2, from the beginning; St. Antoninus part 3, title 23, chapter 5, §7; Cajetan volume 1, Opuscula, treatise 3, on the Institution of the Pontificate, chapter 13; Cano book 6, on Theological Places, chapter 4; Torquemada on Ecclesiastical Power, book 2, chapter 10, with what follows; Jacobatius on Councils, book 8, article 6 and 7; Alvarus Pelagius on the Lamentation of the Church, book 1, chapter 24; Valencia on Faith, disputation 1, question 1, point 7, §36; Guarnieti on the Head of the Church Militant, discussion 5, section 4, number 409; Baronius in additions to the Roman Martyrology, January 18, page 130; Tirinus in the 2nd Commentary on Scripture, in the Summary of Controversies, Controversy 6, number 11; Leytan Synopsis on the Church Militant, discussion 5, section 4, number 409, with many others referenced there; Azorius Moral Institutions, part 2, book 4, chapter 11, question 2; Corduba in question 1, 4, question 2, proposition 8; Alphonsus Mendoza in Quodlibetal Questions, question 4, Scholastic, throughout; Matthaeuccius in the place cited, controversy 6, chapter 2, number 2; Barbosa on the Office and Power of Bishops, part 1, title 3, chapter 2, number 12, and book 1, Universal Ecclesiastical Law, chapter 1, numbers 31 and 32; and others everywhere.

**73.** Our Conclusion is proven from the Sacred Canons and Councils. For indeed, Pope Pelagius in Chapter “*Quamvis*” 3, distinction 21, writing to all the Orthodox, expressly states: “Although throughout the world all Catholic Churches are one bridal chamber of Christ; nevertheless, the Holy Roman Catholic and Apostolic Church was placed above other Churches not by the decrees of any Synods, but obtained the primacy by the Gospel words of our Lord and Savior.” Nicholas II, in Chapter “*Omnes*” 1, distinction 22, writes to the Milanese: “Whoever attempts to take away the privilege of the Roman Church handed down by the Supreme Head of all Churches Himself, without doubt falls into Heresy.” St. Anacletus, Pope, in Chapter “*Sacrosancta*” 2, distinction 22, precisely states: “The Sacred Roman and Apostolic

Domino Salvatore nostro primatum obtinuit, & eminentiam potestatis super universas Ecclesias, ac totum populi gregem asserta est. S. Marcellus Papa in cap. Rogamus 15. caus. 25. quaest. 1. Episcopis per Provinciam Antiochiae constitutis scribit: Ejus enim (Petri) Sedes primitus apud vos fuit, quae postea jubente Domino, Romam translata est, cui, administrante gratia Divina, hodierna praesidemus die. Innocentius III. in c. Per venerabilem 13. Qui filii sint legitimi, sic habet: Locus enim, quem elegit Dominus, Apostolica Sedes esse cognoscitur; Cum enim Petrus, Urbem fugiens exivisset, volens eum Dominus ad locum, quem elegerat, revocare, interrogatus ab eo, Domine quo vadis? respondit, venio Romam iterum crucifigi. Quod intelligens pro se dictum, ad locum ipsum protinus est reversus. Bonifacius VIII. in cap. Unam Sanctam 1. de majoritat. & obedient. inter Communes sic praecise definivit: Unam Sanctam Ecclesiam Catholicam, & ipsam Apostolicam, urgente Fide, credere cogimur, & tenere; Nosque hanc firmiter credimus & simpliciter confitemur; extra quam nec salus est, nec remissio peccatorum, & ibi est sermo de sola Ecclesia Romana Catholica, ut expressis verbis ibidem in §. final. declaratur ibi: Porro subesse Romano Pontifici omnem humanam Creaturam, declaramus, dicimus, definimus, & pronunciamus omnino esse de necessitate salutis. Concilium Constantiense damnavit sequentem errorem Wicleffi in ordine 41. Non est de necessitate salutis credere, Romanam Ecclesiam esse supremam inter alias Ecclesias. Concilium Florentinum sub Eugenio IV. in Litteris unionis sic expresse definivit: Definimus Sanctam Apostolicam Sedem, & Romanum Pontificem in Universum Orbem tenere Primatum, & ipsum Pontificem Romanum Successorem esse B. Petri Principis Apostolorum, & verum Christi Vicarium, totiusque Ecclesiae Caput, & omnium Christianorum Patrem, ac Doctorem existere, & ipsi in B. Petro pascendi, regendi, & gubernandi Universalem Ecclesiam a Domino nostro Jesu Christo plenam potestatem traditam esse. Quae omnia, clarissime ostendunt,

Church obtained primacy not from the Apostles, but from the Lord our Savior Himself, and has been granted eminence of power over all churches and the entire flock of the people.” St. Marcellus, Pope, in Chapter “Rogamus” 15, cause 25, question 1, writes to the Bishops established in the Province of Antioch: “For his (Peter’s) See was first among you, which was afterward, by the Lord’s command, transferred to Rome, over which, by the administration of Divine grace, we preside today.” Innocent III, in Chapter “Per venerabilem” 13, “Which sons are legitimate,” states: “For the place which the Lord has chosen is recognized to be the Apostolic See; for when Peter was leaving the City in flight, the Lord, wishing to recall him to the place which He had chosen, was asked by him, ‘Lord, where are you going?’ He replied, ‘I am coming to Rome to be crucified again.’ Understanding this to be spoken for him, he immediately returned to that place.” Boniface VIII, in Chapter “Unam Sanctam” 1, “On majority and obedience” among the Common [Extravagantes], precisely defined: “By urgent Faith we are compelled to believe and hold One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church; and we firmly believe and simply confess this; outside of which there is neither salvation nor remission of sins,” and there the discourse is about the Roman Catholic Church alone, as is declared in express words in the same place in the final section: “Moreover, we declare, state, define, and pronounce that it is altogether necessary for salvation for every human creature to be subject to the Roman Pontiff.” The Council of Constance condemned the following error of Wycliffe, number 41 in order: “It is not necessary for salvation to believe that the Roman Church is supreme among other Churches.” The Council of Florence under Eugene IV, in the Letters of union, expressly defined thus: “We define that the Holy Apostolic See and the Roman Pontiff hold the primacy over the whole world, and that the Roman Pontiff himself is the successor of Blessed Peter, Prince of the Apostles, and the true Vicar of Christ, and the Head of the whole Church, and the Father and Teacher of all Christians, and that to

Primum Ecclesiae universalis esse annexum Episcopatu Romano ex institutione, & dispositione Christi, & sic de Jure Divino.

**74.** Nec valet objicere, quod Primatus Ecclesiae 74 ex prima sui a Christo facta institutione fuit personalis, hoc est, annexus, & connexus personae Petri; Matth. 16. Tu es Petrus, & super hanc Petram aedificabo Ecclesiam meam. Et tibi dabo Claves Regni Caelorum &c. & Joan. 21. Pasce oves meas, non vero affixus particulari loco, vel determinato Episcopatu: Nam Christus Petrum constituit Generalem totius Ecclesiae primum Episcopum, supremumque Pastorem, adaeque quod Primatus Ecclesiae sit Romano Episcopatu potius annexus, quam Viennensi, Parisiensi, Toletano, Mediolanensi, Neapolitano, vel Taurinensi non est ex Christi institutione, sed quia Petrus Romae sedem fixit, vel a Nicaena Synodo fuit sic ei annexus, & consequenter non ei annexus de Jure Divino.

**75.** Non valet, inquam, quia licet Primatus 75 Ecclesiae ex prima Christi institutione fuerit personalis, idest annexus personae Petri, non tamen ut Petrus erat persona privata, sed ut publica, ipsi nimirum collatus, & in ipso omnibus ejus legitimis Successoribus, & ex tunc fuit jussu Christi etiam localis, seu certo loco, Romanae Urbi nimirum affixus, non statim pro illo tunc, sed pro tempore subsequenti Petro a Christo, ut supra dictum est, significato; adeoque non ex voluntate Petri, sed ex voluntate, & jussu Christi fuit Primatus Ecclesiae annexus Episcopatu Romano; Et tanto minus dici potest, quod Primatus Ecclesiae fuerit unitus Romano Episcopatu a Concilio Nicaeno Canon. 6. ut falso volunt Graeci Schismatici, quia Sextus Canon Concilii Nicaeni sic expresse habet: Ecclesia Romana semper habuit Primum, ut notat Bail. summ. Concil. tom. 1. in Concilio Chalcedonensi ad Canon. 37. Cabassutius Notit. Ecclesiastic. ad d. Canon. 6. Nicaeni,

him, in Blessed Peter, was given by our Lord Jesus Christ the full power of feeding, ruling, and governing the Universal Church.” All of which most clearly show that the Primacy of the universal Church is annexed to the Roman Episcopate by the institution and disposition of Christ, and thus by Divine Law.

**74.** Nor is it valid to object that the Primacy of the Church, from its first institution by Christ, was personal, that is, annexed and connected to the person of Peter—as in Matthew 16: “You are Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church. And I will give to you the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, etc.” and in John 21: “Feed my sheep”—and was not affixed to a particular place or determined episcopate. For Christ constituted Peter as the first General Bishop of the entire Church and supreme Pastor; consequently, that the Primacy of the Church is annexed to the Roman Episcopate rather than to the Viennese, Parisian, Toledan, Milanese, Neapolitan, or Turinese See is not from Christ’s institution, but because Peter established his seat in Rome, or because it was thus annexed to it by the Nicene Synod, and consequently not annexed to it by Divine Law.

**75.** It is not valid, I say, because although the Primacy of the Church from Christ’s original institution was personal, that is, attached to the person of Peter, nevertheless it was not conferred upon Peter as a private person, but as a public figure, and in him to all his legitimate Successors. From that moment, by Christ’s command, it was also made local, that is, affixed to a certain place, namely to the City of Rome, not immediately at that time, but for the subsequent period indicated to Peter by Christ, as stated above. Therefore, the Primacy of the Church was annexed to the Roman Episcopate not by the will of Peter, but by the will and command of Christ. And even less can it be said that the Primacy of the Church was united to the Roman Episcopate by the Council of Nicaea in Canon 6, as the Greek Schismatics falsely claim, because the Sixth Canon of the Nicene Council expressly states: “The Roman Church has always held the Primacy,” as Bail notes in *Summa Conciliorum*, tome 1, on the Council of



& alii passim. Immo in praefatione dicti Concilii Nicaeni, teste Bail. loco citato expresse dicitur, quod Ecclesia Romana nullis Synodicis decretis praelata est caeteris Ecclesiis, sed Evangelica voce Domini, & Salvatoris nostri Primatum obtinuit.

**76.** Nec valet instare, quod hoc dato, de Fide tenendum esse Primatum Ecclesiae universalis esse annexum Episcopatu Romano, adeoque sententia contraria esset haeretica, & sic non posset a Catholicis Doctoribus defendi, prout a pluribus defenditur. Non valet, inquam, quia etiam dato, quod id de Fide tenendum esset, ut non deficiunt Doctores, qui id velint, inter quos Mattheucci *loc. cit. Controv. 6. cap. 2. num. 19.* adhuc tamen Doctores contrariam sententiam propugnantes, non essent Haeretici, quia non sunt contumaces, & propriam opinionem non sustinent cum pertinacia, ut requiritur ad Haeresim, sed parati sunt parere Ecclesiae definitioni.

**77.** Neque etiam valet instare, quod si Primatus Ecclesiae esset de Jure Divino annexus Romano Episcopatu, non possent ad invicem separari, quod est manifeste falsum, cum possint Pontifices ad aliam Civitatem transferre sedem Pontificiam, ut de facto fuit translata Avenionem, & per multum temporis ibi remansit; Vel possit funditus destrui Roma, & sic cessare Episcopatus Romanus.

**78.** Non valet, inquam, quia revera Primatus Ecclesiae nequit a Romano Episcopatu ulla humana potestate separari; cum, ut cum multis recte notat Barbosa *lib. 1. Juris Eccles. univers. c. 1. n. 32.* Sedes Pontificia ex necessitate Divini praecepti Romae remanere debeat, ac proinde e Roma contra Domini jussum alio transferri non possit, ut colligi etiam videtur ex Sacris Canonibus adductis supra *num. 73.* & aliis Juribus, & auctoritatibus relatis per Abbatem *in cap. Per venerabilem 14. Qui filii sint legitimi num. 18.* per Jacobat. *de Concil. lib. 8. art. 9.* per Alphons. Mendozam *in quaestion.*

Chalcedon, Canon 37; Cabassutius in *Notitia Ecclesiastica* on the said Canon 6 of Nicaea; and others commonly observe. Indeed, in the preface of the said Nicene Council, according to Bail in the cited place, it is expressly stated that the Roman Church was not elevated above other Churches by any Synodical decrees, but obtained the Primacy by the Evangelical voice of our Lord and Savior.

**76.** Nor does it avail to insist that, given this, it must be held as a matter of Faith that the Primacy of the universal Church is annexed to the Roman Episcopate, and therefore the contrary opinion would be heretical, and thus could not be defended by Catholic Doctors, as it is defended by many. This objection, I say, is not valid, because even granting that this should be held as a matter of Faith, as some Doctors maintain (among whom is Mattheucci, *in the cited place, Controversy 6, chapter 2, number 19*), nevertheless, the Doctors who advocate the contrary opinion would not be Heretics, because they are not contumacious, and do not sustain their own opinion with pertinacity, as is required for Heresy, but are prepared to obey the definition of the Church.

**77.** Nor does it avail to insist that if the Primacy of the Church were annexed to the Roman Episcopate by Divine Law, they could not be separated from one another, which is manifestly false, since Pontiffs can transfer the Pontifical seat to another City, as in fact it was transferred to Avignon, and remained there for a considerable time; or Rome could be utterly destroyed, and thus the Roman Episcopate would cease to exist.

**78.** It is not valid, I say, because truly the Primacy of the Church cannot be separated from the Roman Episcopate by any human power; since, as Barbosa correctly notes along with many others in *Book 1 of Universal Ecclesiastical Law, ch. 1, n. 32*, the Pontifical See must remain in Rome by necessity of Divine precept, and therefore cannot be transferred elsewhere from Rome against the Lord's command, as also seems to be gathered from the Sacred Canons adduced above in *number 73*, and other legal authorities cited by Abbat [Abbas Panormitanus] *in chapter Per venerabilem 14, Which children are legitimate, number 18*, by

*Quodlibet. qu. 4. Scholast. per tot. per Card. Tusch. tom. 6. lit. P. conclus. 50. num. 30. & 31. per Card. Bellarmin. tom. 1. de Romano Pontif. lib. 4. cap. 4. & per alios plurimos.*

**79.** Et quamvis aliqui Pontifices Avenione manserint, semper tamen Episcopatum Romanum tenuerunt, & Romani Pontifices fuerunt appellati, ut eorum Bullae clarissime demonstrant. Et dato etiam, quod Romana Civitas penitus extingueretur (qui casus tamen creditur impossibilis, & speratur a Divina Providentia, Romam usque ad mundi finem esse conservandam) adhuc tamen non extingueretur Episcopatus Romanus, siquidem ut semper duret, sufficit aliquando fuisse cum connotatione ad illos terminos materiales Urbis, ut recte notant Guarnieri *de Capite Militant. Eccles. lib. 2. cap. 8. num. 6.* Mattheucci *loc. cit. Controvers. 6. c. 2. num. 20.* & alii. Et pro tunc, sicuti in casu, quo Papa alio se transferat ad residendum, valeret illud vulgatum adagium, quod Ubi Papa, ibi Roma; ut in terminis Eugenianae Constitut. totius. Divina, editae ab Eugenio IV. octavo Idus Martii 1432. dixerunt Marchesan. de Commis. Eug. part. 3. cap. 11. num. 28. Ridolphin. in prax. part. 3. cap. 4. num. 164. Card. Petra tom. 4. Comment. ad Const. 4. Eugenii IV. num. 6. & alii.

[Note: 80 is missing from the original. It seems that it was skipped.]

**81.** Papa, etiamsi suis Litteris Apostolicis falsitate excommunicatum; immo quamvis scienter ipsi Excommunicato participet, Litteris, Verbis, Osculo, aut quovis alio modo, non idcirco censetur eum absolvere, nisi expresse se declaret velle per hoc ipsum absolvere. Communis, textu expresso in cap. Si aliquando 41. de sent. Excommunicationis; & in Clement. Si Summus Pont. scienter etiam excommun. participet litteris, verbo, vel osculo, seu alio quovis modo, ipsum per hoc absolvere nulla

Jacobatius *On Councils, book 8, art. 9,* by Alfonso Mendoza *in Quodlibetal Questions, question 4, Scholastic, throughout,* by Cardinal Tuschus *volume 6, letter P, conclusion 50, numbers 30 and 31,* by Cardinal Bellarmine *volume 1, On the Roman Pontiff, book 4, chapter 4,* and by many others.

**79.** And although some Pontiffs remained at Avignon, nevertheless they always held the Roman Episcopate, and were called Roman Pontiffs, as their Bulls most clearly demonstrate. And even if the City of Rome were to be completely destroyed (which case, however, is believed to be impossible, and it is hoped from Divine Providence that Rome will be preserved until the end of the world), still the Roman Episcopate would not be extinguished, since for it to endure forever, it suffices that it once existed in connection to those material boundaries of the City, as correctly noted by Guarnieri in *On the Head of the Church Militant, book 2, chapter 8, number 6,* Mattheucci in *the cited place, Controversy 6, chapter 2, number 20,* and others. And at that time, just as in the case where the Pope transfers himself elsewhere to reside, that common adage would hold true, that “Where the Pope is, there is Rome”; as, in terms of the Eugenic Constitution “Divina totius,” issued by Eugene IV on the eighth day before the Ides of March 1432, stated Marchesan in *On the Commissions of Eugene, part 3, chapter 11, number 28,* Ridolphinus in *Praxis, part 3, chapter 4, number 164,* Cardinal Petra in *volume 4, Commentary on Constitution 4 of Eugene IV, number 6,* and others.

[Note: 80 is missing from the original. It seems that it was skipped.]

**81.** The Pope, even if by his Apostolic Letters he [communicates with] someone falsely excommunicated; indeed, even if he knowingly participates with the Excommunicated person himself, through Letters, Words, a Kiss, or in any other manner, is not thereby deemed to absolve him, unless he expressly declares that he wishes through this very act to absolve him. This is the common opinion, expressly stated in chapter *Si aliquando 41,* on the Sentence of Excommunication; and in the Clementine

ratione censetur, nisi se velle sanctam exprimat illam ex hoc pro absoluto haberi; Juncto ejus Summario sic expresse habente: Si Papa etiam scienter Excommunicato participat, illum per hoc non absolvit, nisi exprimat, hoc se velle. Vide verb. Probatio a num. 37. ad 39.

**82.** Papae primatus a Graecis est agnoscendus. Bened. XIV. tom. 1. Constitut. 57. incip. Etsi Pastoralis §. 8.

**83.** Papae commemoratio in Missa fieri debet a Graecis Italiae, & Insularum. Idem ibid. §. 9.

**84.** Papa ex absoluta potestate, etiam inconsulto Dioecesis Episcopo, potest concedere exemptionem ab Ordinaria jurisdictione. Idem tom. 2. Constitut. 40. incipient. Causarum Palatii.

**85.** Papa, non autem ullus inferior Antistes, potest dispensare in iis, quae sunt de jure communi Canonico. Idem Const. 51. inc. Magno Nobis.

**86.** Papa est supremus dispensator bonorum Ecclesiae; Immo Canonistae communiter suffragio Dominum eum agnoscunt. Benedict. XIV. Constitut. incip. Cum Encyclicas litteras, §. 4.

**87.** Papa bona Ecclesiae potest injustis detentoribus concedere, quoties id Religionis utilitas, & detentorum salus postulare videatur. Idem ibid. §. 5. & 6. ubi ad id affert exempla praedecessorum Pontificum; Id autem Pontifex jure potest, non solum cum res est de Haereticis ad Ecclesiam revocandis, sed etiam cum Christifideles a probabili apostazandi periculo revocantur. Idem ibid. §. 6. & 9.

**88.** Papa potest Ecclesias quibuscumque in

[Constitution]: “If the Supreme Pontiff knowingly participates with an excommunicated person through letters, word, or kiss, or in any other manner whatsoever, he is by no means deemed to absolve him through this act, unless he explicitly expresses his wish that the person be considered absolved by this action”; Together with its Summary thus expressly stating: “If the Pope, even knowingly, participates with an Excommunicated person, he does not absolve him by this act, unless he expresses that this is his wish.” See the word *Probatio* from number 37 to 39.

**82.** The primacy of the Pope must be acknowledged by the Greeks. Benedict XIV, volume 1, Constitution 57, beginning with “Etsi Pastoralis,” § 8.

**83.** Commemoration of the Pope in the Mass must be made by the Greeks of Italy and the Islands. The same source, ibid., § 9.

**84.** The Pope, from his absolute power, even without consulting the Bishop of the Diocese, can grant exemption from Ordinary jurisdiction. The same author, volume 2, Constitution 40, beginning with “Causarum Palatii.”

**85.** The Pope, but not any inferior Prelate, can dispense in matters pertaining to the common Canon Law. The same in Constitution 51, beginning with “Magno Nobis” [Of Great Importance to Us].

**86.** The Pope is the supreme dispenser of the goods of the Church; indeed, Canonists commonly acknowledge him as Lord by their assent. Benedict XIV, Constitution beginning “Cum Encyclicas litteras” [When Encyclical Letters], §. 4.

**87.** The Pope can concede goods of the Church to unjust possessors, whenever the utility of Religion and the salvation of the possessors seem to require it. The same, ibid. §. 5 & 6, where he adduces examples of predecessor Pontiffs for this purpose; Moreover, the Pontiff can rightfully do this not only when it concerns recalling Heretics to the Church, but also when the faithful are recalled from a probable danger of apostasy. The same, ibid. §. 6 & 9.

**88.** The Pope can consecrate Churches situated in

dioecesibus sitas, per se, vel quatenus nolit, aut non possit, per suum Delegatum, irrequisitis locorum Ordinariis, consecrare. Benedict. XIV. Constit. incip. Jam inde, §. 75. & 28. Immo olim privativa fuit ipsi auctoritas consecrandi Ecclesias. Idem ibid.

*Plura de Papa minus exacte hic dicta emendantur in novo articulo Romanus Pontifex addito a romanis editoribus circa finem hujus sexti Tomi.*

### PAPALIS BENEDICTIO.

Quid novissime statuerit Clemens XIII. circa Benedictionem, quam vocant Papalem, cujus impertiendae aliquoties intra annum facultatem Patriarchis, Primatibus, Archiepiscopis &c. (eam auferendo ceteris Ecclesiasticis omnibus) tribuit, cum praescriptione ritus in casu servandi; vide tom. 1. verb. Benedictio, Benedictio art. 5. num. 65. ubi ad litteram adducuntur ea de re editae laudati Pontificis Apostolicae Litterae.

[^1]: **Romani Theologi Nota.** Dum Auctor noster ait, Papam ne quidem ut personam privatam incidere in haeresim posse, atque id esse de Fide, non ita intelligendum est, ut Ferraris exponit, ut contrariam opinionem tuentes haeretici habendi sint, et persuasionem non exuant. Nam haec quaestio Scholastica est, et nondum Ecclesiae judicio definita, ac salva fide cuique opinari fas est, non solum de fide non esse, Romanum Pontificem quatenus personam privatam non posse in haeresim incidere, quod verum omnino est, sed etiam errare posse. Item dum Theologi cum Auctore nostro ajunt, de fide esse Romanum Pontificem in Canonizatione Sanctorum errare non posse, ac de fide esse hunc numero Romanum Pontificem esse legitimum Petri Successorem; non ita intelligi debent, ut id veluti fidei dogma amplectendum cuilibet sit; cum etiam Ecclesiae sententia id definitum non sit, pro

any diocese whatsoever, either personally or, insofar as he may not wish or be unable, through his Delegate, without requiring permission from the local Ordinaries. Benedict XIV, Constitution beginning “Jam inde” [Already from that time], §. 75 & 28. Indeed, formerly the authority to consecrate Churches was exclusively his. The same, ibid.

*Several less precise statements about the Pope made here are corrected in the new article “Romanus Pontifex” [Roman Pontiff] added by the Roman editors near the end of this sixth Volume.*

### PAPAL BLESSING.

What Clement XIII has most recently decreed concerning the Blessing, which they call Papal, the faculty of imparting which several times throughout the year he grants to Patriarchs, Primates, Archbishops, etc. (while removing it from all other Ecclesiastics), with a prescription of the rite to be observed in this case; see volume 1, under the word Blessing, Blessing article 5, number 65, where the Apostolic Letters issued by the praised Pontiff on this matter are presented verbatim.

[^1]: **Note of a Roman Theologian.** When our Author asserts that the Pope cannot fall into heresy even as a private person, and that this is a matter of Faith, it should not be understood in the way Ferraris explains it, namely that those holding the contrary opinion are to be considered heretics and should abandon their persuasion. For this is a Scholastic question, not yet defined by the judgment of the Church, and it is permissible for anyone, while preserving the faith, to believe not only that it is not a matter of faith that the Roman Pontiff as a private person cannot fall into heresy (which is entirely true), but also that he can err. Likewise, when Theologians, along with our Author, state that it is a matter of faith that the Roman Pontiff cannot err in the Canonization of Saints, and that it is a matter of faith that this particular Roman Pontiff is the legitimate Successor of Peter; these statements should not be understood as if they must be embraced as dogmas

fidei dogmate proponi non possit: Sed intelligi haec facile debent, quod privati Doctores ex principiis revelatis deducere contendant, id adeo certum esse, ut ad fidem pertineat. At aliis, salvo dogmate, contrarium opinari licet; uti revera opinantur Ludovicus Antonius Muratorius in opere suo de Ingeniorum moderatione, atque alii, qui contendant, inerrantiae privilegium Ecclesiae concessum ad fidei dogmata constabilienda, versari circa ea, quae sunt a Deo revelata, non vero circa res humanas. Quamobrem cum Romanus Pontifex ferendo iudicium in Canonizatione Sanctorum nitatur testimonio hominum, qui de hominis Sanctitate, deque patratis in illius confirmationem miraculis testantur; cumque iudicium de legitimo Pontifice ferendum pendeat ab ipsius baptismo, rata ordinatione, atque legitima electione, quae res ab hominibus pendent, putant Auctores illi ad fidei dogma non pertinere Canonizationem Sanctorum, nec fidei dogma esse hunc Romanum Pontificem esse legitimum Successorem S. Petri, licet de his certitimus certitudine morali, ac non nisi per summam temeritatem revocare ea in dubium valeamus. Accedit etiam, quod dum nos pronuntiamus, de fide esse Romanum Pontificem esse infallibilem, non ita sententiam nostram sustinere debemus, ut Gallos Theologos agentes, infallibilia non esse decreta Romanorum Pontificum, nisi accesserit consensus majori partis Episcoporum, haereticos declaremus; haeretici enim non sunt, nisi homines, qui proposito ab Ecclesia dogmati pertinaciter obsistunt. Ecclesia vero Gallos Theologos huc usque non damnavit, eorundemque opinionem tolerat.

**Responsio Auctoris:** Quod ego assero, Papam nequidem ut personam privatam incidere in haeresim posse, atque id esse de fide &c. intelligendum est, prout expono ipso loc. cit. ubi expresse dico: adhuc tamen contrarium sentientes non fiunt haeretici, quia propriam opinionem non sustinent cum pertinacia, ut requiritur ad haeresim, sed

of faith by everyone. Since these matters have not been defined by the judgment of the Church, they cannot be proposed as dogmas of faith. But these assertions should be readily understood to mean that private Doctors contend to deduce from revealed principles that these matters are so certain as to pertain to the faith. However, others may, without harm to dogma, hold the contrary opinion; as indeed Ludovicus Antonius Muratorius does in his work on the Moderation of Intellects, along with others who contend that the privilege of inerrancy granted to the Church for establishing dogmas of faith pertains to those things that are revealed by God, but not to human affairs. Therefore, since the Roman Pontiff, in rendering judgment in the Canonization of Saints, relies on the testimony of men who attest to the Sanctity of a person and to the miracles performed in confirmation of that sanctity; and since judgment concerning a legitimate Pontiff depends on his baptism, valid ordination, and legitimate election, which matters depend on human actions, these Authors believe that the Canonization of Saints does not pertain to the dogma of faith, nor is it a dogma of faith that this Roman Pontiff is the legitimate Successor of St. Peter, although we are certain of these matters with moral certainty, and we cannot call them into doubt except through the greatest temerity. It should also be added that when we pronounce that it is a matter of faith that the Roman Pontiff is infallible, we should not maintain our opinion in such a way as to declare as heretics those French Theologians who say that the decrees of Roman Pontiffs are not infallible unless the consent of the majority of Bishops is added; for heretics are only those who obstinately resist a dogma proposed by the Church. The Church, however, has not thus far condemned French Theologians, and tolerates their opinion.

**Response of the Author:** What I assert, that the Pope cannot fall into heresy even as a private person, and that this is a matter of faith, etc., should be understood as I explain in the passage cited, where I expressly say: nevertheless, those who think the contrary do not become heretics, because they do not maintain their own opinion

parati sunt parere Ecclesiae definitioni. Et de qua pertinacia loquor ego, de pertinacia nempe non parata parere Ecclesiae definitioni, quales explicita habeatur. Sed etiam dico, quod haec quaestio scholastica est, ideo eam non resolvo, ut certam, sed tantummodo ut probabiliorem, ut expresse in mea conclusione ibidem num. 62, ibi: Papa probabilius etiam ut persona privata non potest in haeresim incidere, & in fide deficere; juxta classicos illos Auctores ibi allegatos, inter quos doctissimus noster Matthaeuccius in opere dogmatico Romae prius edito, & deinde Venetiis, contr. 7. c. 1. num. 3. ibi: dicendum, Pontifex Romanus, ut persona privata, non potest in haeresim incidere, & in fide deficere. Et sic etiam juxta eundem sensum intelligenda sunt tradita a me, quoad infallibilitatem Papae in Canonizatione Sanctorum, & quod hic Romanus Pontifex, Clemens XIII. v. g. legitime electus, & ut talis ab Ecclesia acceptatus, sit verus Papa, & legitimus Petri successor.

with the pertinacity required for heresy, but are ready to obey the definition of the Church. And the pertinacity of which I speak is pertinacity that is not prepared to obey the definition of the Church, should such be explicitly given. But I also say that this is a scholastic question, therefore I do not resolve it as certain, but only as more probable, as I expressly state in my conclusion there, number 62: "The Pope, more probably, even as a private person, cannot fall into heresy, and cannot fail in faith"; according to those classical Authors cited there, among whom is our most learned Matthaeuccius in his dogmatic work first published in Rome, and then in Venice, controversy 7, chapter 1, number 3, where he states: "It must be said that the Roman Pontiff, as a private person, cannot fall into heresy, and cannot fail in faith." And in the same sense should be understood what I have handed down concerning the infallibility of the Pope in the Canonization of Saints, and that this Roman Pontiff, Clement XIII for example, legitimately elected, and accepted as such by the Church, is the true Pope, and legitimate successor of Peter.