

# Cursus Theologicus Ad usum Tyronum elucubratus, Pars Quarta: De Fide, Spe, et Charitate (*Theological Course Elaborated for the Use of Beginners, Part Four: On Faith, Hope, and Charity*)

by Dominicus Viva S.J. (Dominic Viva), 1726

[Online Location of Text Here](#)

- OCR of the original text by AI (claude-sonnet-4-5-20250929).
- Translation of the original text performed by AI (claude-sonnet-4-5-20250929).
- Last Edit: November 27, 2025.
- Version: 1.0
- Selection pages: 63–65

## Disputatio II, Quæstio III

Latin	English
<i>Sitne de Fide, Clementem XI. esse verum Christi Vicarium?</i>	<i>Is it a matter of Faith that Clement XI is the true Vicar of Christ?</i>
I. EX dictis sequitur resolutio hujus celeberrimæ quæstionis. An scilicet sit objectum materiale fidei ista veritas, quod Clemens XI. sit verus Papa, & Petri successor? Communiter affirmant apud Amic. disp. 3. sect. 5. contra Cajet. 2. 2. quæst. 1. art. 3., Bagne, Canum, Cordubam.	I. FROM what has been said follows the resolution of this most celebrated question. Namely, whether this truth—that Clement XI is the true Pope and successor of Peter—is a material object of faith? This is commonly affirmed by Amicus [Franciscus Amicus] in disputation 3, section 5, against Cajetan [Thomas de Vio Cajetan] in his commentary on the Summa Theologica II-II, question 1, article 3, and also by Báñez [Domingo Báñez], Cano [Melchor Cano], and Córdoba [Antonio de Córdoba].
Dicendum itaque, esse materiale Fidei objectum, quod Clemens XI. sit verus Christi Domini Vicarius.	It must therefore be said that it is a material object of Faith that Clement XI is the true Vicar of Christ our Lord.
Prob. Quia conclusio theologica descendens ex una revelata, & altera evidenter cognita evidentiâ morali strictè dicta est materia Fidei, ut ostendimus quæst. præcedenti; sed Clementem XI. esse verum Christi Vicarium, est conclusio theologica	<b>Proof:</b> Because a theological conclusion derived from one revealed premise and another premise known with moral evidence strictly speaking is matter of Faith, as we demonstrated in the preceding question; but that Clement XI is the true Vicar of Christ is a theological conclusion derived

descendens ex hac præmissâ revelatâ: Omnis rite electus ab Ecclesiâ in Pontificem est verus Christi Vicarius; & ex hac altera evidenter nunc nota toti Ecclesiæ: Clemens XI. est rite electus; ergo hujusmodi conclusio est materia fidei.

Confirm. 1. ex decreto Martini V. in Concilio Constantiensi apud Art., in quo præcipitur, ut suspecti de hæresi interrogentur, An credant, quod Papa canonicè electus, qui pro tempore fuerit, sit Petri successor; habens supremam auctoritatem in Ecclesiâ?

Confirm. 2. Si non esset materia fidei, Clementem XI. esse verum Christi Vicarium, neque esset de fide, fuisse alium verum Christi Vicarium; nam eodem modo constat de electione Clementis XI. ac de electione aliorum Pontificum; sed dicere, quod nunquam de fide fuerit, extitisse in Ecclesiâ verum Christi Vicarium, repugnat tam Christi Domini promissionibus, quam conceptui Reipublicæ Ecclesiasticæ, quæ cum sit instituta à Christo Domino velut quoddam corpus morale, sine capite esse non potest; ergo.

Confirm. denùm, quia fide divinâ tenemur credere, Ecclesiam visibilem esse veram Dei Ecclesiam, & hoc determinatum Concilium, v. g. Tridentinum, fuisse verum, & catholicum, cui Spiritus Sanctus adstitit; atqui nec Ecclesia visibilis consistere potest cum solis membris sine capite, nec Concilium Acephalum est verum, ac legitimum; ergo de fide est, Ecclesiam visibilem, & Concilium legitimum habere caput visibile distinctum ab invisibili, quod est Christus Dominus: & consequenter de fide est, hunc numero Pontificem esse vere Christi Vicarium. Et sane infallibilis auctoritas declarandi, ac definiendi res fidei competit Concilio, & Ecclesiæ ratione capit; Unde, sede vacante, nihil definiri potest, cum Christus Dominus Petro dixit *Tu es Petrus*, & &c. ergo non potest credi fide divina, Concilium esse legitimum, & Ecclesiam habere adfistentiam Spiritus Sancti in rebus de fide definiendis, nisi

from this revealed premise: *Everyone duly elected by the Church as Pontiff is the true Vicar of Christ*; and from this other premise now evidently known to the whole Church: *Clement XI is duly elected*; therefore such a conclusion is matter of faith.

**Confirmation 1** from the decree of Martin V in the Council of Constance, found in the acts, in which it is commanded that those suspected of heresy be questioned whether they believe that the Pope canonically elected, whoever he may be at the time, is Peter's successor, having supreme authority in the Church?

**Confirmation. 2.** If it were not a matter of faith that Clement XI is the true Vicar of Christ, then neither would it be a matter of faith that any other person was the true Vicar of Christ; for the election of Clement XI is established in the same manner as the election of other Pontiffs. But to say that it has never been a matter of faith that a true Vicar of Christ has existed in the Church contradicts both the promises of Christ the Lord and the very concept of the Ecclesiastical Republic, which, since it was instituted by Christ the Lord as a kind of moral body, cannot exist without a head; therefore [the conclusion follows].

It is confirmed, finally, because we are bound by divine faith to believe that the visible Church is the true Church of God, and that this particular Council, for example the Council of Trent, was true and catholic, to which the Holy Spirit gave assistance; but neither can the visible Church subsist with members alone without a head, nor is an acephalous [headless] Council true and legitimate; therefore it is a matter of faith that the visible Church and a legitimate Council have a visible head distinct from the invisible one, which is Christ the Lord: and consequently it is a matter of faith that this particular Pope is truly Christ's Vicar. And indeed the infallible authority of declaring and defining matters of faith belongs to a Council and to the Church by reason of its head; whence, when the see is vacant, nothing can be defined, since Christ the Lord said to Peter "You are Peter," etc.; therefore it cannot be believed with divine faith that a Council is legitimate, and

credatur ut conjuncta suo capiti, atque adeo nisi de fide sit, Pontificem pro tempore existentem esse verum Christi Vicarium.

II. Objic. 1. Deus nusquam revelavit, quod Clemens XI. sit verus Pontifex; ergo non potest id credi fide divina.

Confirm. Non est de fide, hunc numero infantem esse a Sacerdote baptizatum; ergo neque est de fide, Clementem XI. esse baptizatum; sed si non est baptizatus, si non est vir, si non habet reliqua essentialia Pontificatus, neque est verus Christi Vicarius; ergo non est de fide, esse Christi Vicarium.

Resp. Distinguo antecedens: Non est revelatum explicite, concedo; implicite, nego antecedens, & consequentiam: eo prorsus modo, quo revelatum est, hanc numero Ecclesiam esse veram Dei Ecclesiam; ita prorsus revelatum est, hunc numero Pontificem esse vere Christi Vicarium, & Ecclesia caput. Quando enim revelavit Christus, Petrum, ejusque successores esse sui Vicarios, implicite revelavit, etiam Clementem XI. esse suum Vicarium in hypothesis, quod sit canonice electus, & constat de tali electione.

Ad confirm. concessio antecedente, distinguo primum consequens: neque est de fide, Clementem XI. esse baptizatum, in hypothesis, quod constet de ejus legitimae electione, nego consequentiam; antequam de ea constet, concedo primum consequentiam cum illa substantia, & nego secundam. Cum esse Pontificem essentialiter includat esse baptizatum, esse virum &c. hunc dum constat de electione, ita de fide est esse verum Pontificem, ut etiam de fide sit esse baptizatum, & habere reliqua Pontificatus essentialia: quicquid sit, an Ordo sacer sit Pontificatus essentialis, de quo dubitare Arriaga, quia videtur esse vetus Pontifex, qui eligitur antequam sacros ordines suscepit.

that the Church has the assistance of the Holy Spirit in defining matters of faith, unless it is believed as united to its head, and therefore unless it is a matter of faith that the Pope existing at the time is the true Vicar of Christ.

**II. Objection 1.** God has nowhere revealed that Clement XI is the true Pope; therefore this cannot be believed with divine faith.

**Confirmation.** It is not a matter of faith that this particular infant was baptized by a priest; therefore, neither is it a matter of faith that Clement XI was baptized; but if he is not baptized, if he is not a man, if he does not possess the other essentials of the pontificate, then he is not the true Vicar of Christ; therefore, it is not a matter of faith that he is the Vicar of Christ.

**Response.** I distinguish the antecedent: It is not explicitly revealed, I concede; implicitly, I deny both the antecedent and the consequent: in precisely the same way that it is revealed that this particular Church is the true Church of God, so it is entirely revealed that this particular Pontiff is truly the Vicar of Christ and head of the Church. For when Christ revealed that Peter and his successors are his Vicars, he implicitly revealed that Clement XI is also his Vicar, on the hypothesis that he was canonically elected and that such election is established.

**To the confirmation:** Having conceded the antecedent, I distinguish the first consequent: neither is it a matter of faith that Clement XI was baptized, on the hypothesis that his legitimate election is established, I deny the consequent; before this is established, I concede the first consequent with that substance, and deny the second. Since being Pontiff essentially includes being baptized, being a man, etc., when the election is established, just as it is a matter of faith that he is the true Pontiff, so also it is a matter of faith that he is baptized and possesses the other essentials of the pontificate: whatever may be the case regarding whether sacred orders are essential to the pontificate, about which Rodrigo de Arriaga raises doubt, since there appears to have been an ancient Pontiff who was elected before he had

III. Objic. 2. Aliquando Ecclesia accepando aliquem in verum Pontificem erravit; ergo non est de fide, Pontificem ab Ecclesia acceptatum esse verum Christi Vicarium. Probatur antecedens: Fertur enim Joannes VIII. anno 853. fuisse foemina: Eugenius etiam IV. fuit a Concilio Basileensi depositus, quamvis ab Ecclesia prius fuisse acceptatus, & deinde Ecclesiam rexit.

Confirm. Multi Romani Pontifices erraverunt in fide; nullus autem in fide errans est verus Pontifex; ergo, &c. Major constat; Nam D. Petrus negavit Christum Dominum, & coegit Gentiles judaizare. Salem potest Pontifex labi in haeresim etiam externam, quo lapsu posito, decidit e Pontificatu; ergo cum non sit de fide, quod hic numero Pontifex non sit lapsus in haeresim, non est de fide, quod sit verus Pontifex.

Confirm. 2. Qui negaret, Clementem XI. esse Christi Vicarium, non esset haereticus, nec peccaret contra fidem, sed esset Schismaticus peccans contra charitatem, & unitatem Ecclesiæ; ergo ut prius.

Resp. nego antecedens: ad illud de Joanna Papilla dicendum cum Bell., Becano, & aliis communissime, Joannem VIII. dictum fuisse foeminam per jocum, quia erat juvenis, & in suis operationibus non se gerebat viriliter; adeo ut ob suam mollitiem, & indulgentiam adversus Photium, alioisque haereticos ortum, & firmatum fuerit schisma Graecorum. Hinc haeretici dixerunt, Papam fuisse foeminam; quod est omnino commentitium. Eugenius IV. depositus fuit a Concilio Basileensi, non quando Concilium illud erat Catholicum, sed quando erat Conciliabulum schismaticum. Ecclesia etiam aliquando verum suum caput non agnovit, quia non constabat adhuc de ejus electione legitimæ: nunquam tamen Ecclesia universa in falsum caput conspiravit. Adde, quod licet aliquis simoniacæ v. gr. electus non sit catenas verus Pontifex, juxta bullam Julii II. at ubi

received sacred orders.

**III. Objection 2.** Sometimes the Church, in accepting someone as true Pontiff, has erred; therefore it is not a matter of faith that the Pontiff accepted by the Church is the true Vicar of Christ. The antecedent is proved: For it is reported that John VIII in the year 853 was a woman; Eugene IV also was deposed by the Council of Basel, although he had previously been accepted by the Church, and afterwards he ruled the Church.

**Confirmation.** Many Roman Pontiffs have erred in faith; but no one who errs in faith is a true Pontiff; therefore, etc. The major premise is established; for Saint Peter denied Christ the Lord, and compelled the Gentiles to judaize. At least the Pontiff can fall into heresy, even external heresy, and with this fall occurring, he falls from the Pontificate; therefore since it is not a matter of faith that this particular Pontiff has not fallen into heresy, it is not a matter of faith that he is the true Pontiff.

**Confirmation 2.** One who would deny that Clement XI is the Vicar of Christ would not be a heretic, nor would he sin against faith, but would be a schismatic sinning against charity and the unity of the Church; therefore as before.

**Response:** I deny the antecedent. Regarding that matter of Pope Joan, it must be said, along with [Robert] Bellarmine, [Martín] Becanus, and others most commonly, that John VIII was called a woman as a joke, because he was young and in his actions did not conduct himself in a manly fashion; so much so that, on account of his softness and indulgence toward Photius and other heretics who had arisen, the schism of the Greeks was born and strengthened. Hence heretics said that the Pope was a woman—which is entirely fabricated. Eugene IV was deposed by the Council of Basel, not when that Council was Catholic, but when it was a schismatic conventicle. The Church also sometimes did not recognize her true head, because his legitimate election was not yet established: nevertheless, the universal Church never conspired toward a false head. Add to this that, although someone elected simoniacally (for

Ecclesia illum acceptat, ejus acta sunt valida, & ut verus Pontifex habendus est, donec de simonia convincatur; quod constat ex lege *Barbarius* ff. de officio Prætors; & ideo in hujusmodi casu, ne Ecclesia acephala maneat, lex naturalis quodammodo prævalet in hoc casu legi positivae Iulii II. declarantis , nullam esse electionem simoniacam.

Ad 1. confirm. Nullus verus Pontifex docens ex cathedra erravit , quicquid hæretici oblatrent . D. Petrus ore tantum , non corde Christum negavit , nec docuit Judaismum, sed volebat circumcisionem permettere , ne offenderentur recentes in fide; in quo ab Apostolo reprehensus fuit. Negant multi Doctores , posse Pontificem in hæresim labi, cum dixerit Dominus Petro Lucæ 22. *Rogavi pro te, Petre, ut non deficiat fides tua.* Sed hoc transmisso, donec Pontifex declaretur hæreticus , perseverat in illo dignitas Pontificalis, ut communius docent cum Suár., Cajet., Cordub. apud Arr. disp. 7. sect. 9. Sicut enim constare debet de electione, ut credatur Pontifex, ita constare debet de hæresi, ut definat eredi Pontifex. Sicut autem Pontifex solum ob crimen hæresis decedit e Pontificatu, ex traditione Apostolica , non vero ob alia delicta ; quia prima sedes a nemine judicatur ( quando enim simoniaca eligitur, non decidit ob hoc delictum, sed non assurgit ad Pontificatum ) ita pariter decidit , si fiat perpetuo amens, quia tunc non est amplius civiliter homo . Constare tamen debet Ecclesiæ de amentia, antequam desinat esse Pontifex ; & interius ex assistentia Spiritus Sancti errare non potest in definiendis iis, quæ ad fidem , ad religionem , & ad Ecclesiæ regimen spectant .

Ad 2. potest aliquis esse schismaticus , &

example) is not truly the Pontiff according to the chains of Julius II's bull, yet where the Church accepts him, his acts are valid, and he is to be regarded as the true Pontiff until he is convicted of simony; this is established from the law *Barbarius* in the Digest, *On the Office of the Praetor*. And therefore in such a case, lest the Church remain without a head, natural law in some manner prevails in this instance over the positive law of Julius II declaring that a simoniacial election is null.

**To the first confirmation:** No true Pope teaching ex cathedra has erred, whatever heretics may bark against this. Saint Peter denied Christ only with his mouth, not with his heart, nor did he teach Judaism, but rather wished to permit circumcision so as not to offend those recently converted to the faith; for this he was reproved by the Apostle. Many Doctors deny that the Pope can fall into heresy, since the Lord said to Peter in Luke 22: *I have prayed for you, Peter, that your faith may not fail.* But setting this aside, as long as the Pope is not declared a heretic, the papal dignity persists in him, as is more commonly taught by Francisco Suárez, Thomas Cajetan, and Antonio Córdoba, cited by Arriaga in disputation 7, section 9. For just as the election must be established in order for one to be believed to be Pope, so too must heresy be established in order for one to cease to be believed to be Pope. Moreover, just as the Pope departs from the Pontificate only on account of the crime of heresy, according to Apostolic tradition, but not indeed on account of other crimes—because the first see is judged by no one (for when someone is elected simoniacially, he does not fall from office on account of this crime, but rather does not rise to the Pontificate)—so likewise he falls from office if he becomes perpetually insane, because then he is no longer civilly a man. Nevertheless, the Church must be certain of the insanity before he ceases to be Pope; and interiorly, by the assistance of the Holy Spirit, he cannot err in defining those things which pertain to faith, to religion, and to the governance of the Church.

**Response to objection 2:** Someone can be

non hæreticus , si scilicet nolit se submittere Clementi XI. quamvis non neget, cum esse verum Pontificem : schisma enim est divisio Ecclesiæ , & opponitur Charitati nedum illam suo capiti ; potest autem haberi ista divisio modo explicato sine peccato infidelitatis . Omnis autem negans , Clementem esse verum Pontificem , peccat etiam contra charitatem , tum etiam contra fidem, posito, quod constet de ejus legitimæ electione ; quamvis non puniatur ut hæreticus; quia talis veritas , quam negaret , non est proposita ab Ecclesia ut materia fidei ; ad hæresim enim; requiritur , ut quis pertinaciter contradicat Ecclesiæ aliquid proponenti ut credendum de fide, & a Deo revelatum.

IV. Alia, quæ objiciunt ad hæc hæretici, ut de Formoso Pontifice, qui sedidit sex annos, & deinde a Stephano VII. declaratus fuit Pseudopontifex, adeo ut iterum Stephanus ordinaverit eos, qui a Formoso Ordines acceperant: Necnon de Honorio I. qui interdannatos a 6. Synodo reperitur; videnda sunt apud Bell. l. 4. de Pontifice, ubi ostendit, perperam hæc obici. Nam Formosus fuit legitimus Pontifex, & Stephanus VII. erravit non tamquam Pontifex, sed tamquam privatus homo, dum sævit in Formofum mortuum, projicendo in Tyberim ejus cadaver, eo quod a Papatu prius obtinendo per Formofum prohibitus fuerat. Honorius vero a Schismaticis tantum, non a Catholicis insertus est inter damnatos a 6. Synodo.

schismatic without being heretical—namely, if he refuses to submit himself to Clement XI, even though he does not deny that Clement is the true Pontiff. For schism is a division of the Church and is opposed to charity, not only toward the Church but toward its head. However, this division can exist in the manner explained without the sin of infidelity. But everyone who denies that Clement is the true Pontiff sins not only against charity, but also against faith—provided that his legitimate election is established. Nevertheless, such a person is not punished as a heretic, because the truth which he would deny has not been proposed by the Church as a matter of faith. For heresy requires that someone pertinaciously contradict the Church when it proposes something to be believed as a matter of faith and as revealed by God.

**IV.** Other objections which heretics raise against these matters, such as concerning Pope Formosus, who held the papal seat for six years and was afterwards declared a pseudo-pontiff by Stephen VII, to such an extent that Stephen again ordained those who had received Orders from Formosus: As well as concerning Honorius I, who is found among those condemned by the Sixth Synod; these matters are to be examined in Bellarmine's work, book 4, "On the Pontiff," where he shows that these objections are improperly raised. For Formosus was a legitimate Pontiff, and Stephen VII erred not as Pontiff, but as a private man, while he raged against the dead Formosus, casting his corpse into the Tiber, because he had previously been prohibited by Formosus from obtaining the papacy. Honorius, however, was inserted among those condemned by the Sixth Synod only by Schismatics, not by Catholics.