

Commentariorum in Universam Theologiam Scholasticam, Tomus Tertius (*Commentaries on Universal Scholastic Theology, Volume 3*)

by R.P. Francisco Bonæ Spei (R.P. Francis of Good Hope), 1661

[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 14, 2025.
- Version: 1.0
- Selection pages: 149-151

Disputatio 4. De primario Ecclesia Capite. Dubium 6

Latin	English
## DV BIVM QVINTVM. <i>An sit de Fide, hunc Papam v.g. Alexandrum VII. esse legitimum Petri successorem? Et consequenter, an etiam de Fide sit hoc numero Concilium, v.g. Tridentinum, esse legitimum, & Spiritus sancti assistentiā in rebus Fidei tractandis infallibili donatum, iam Papa & Concilio agnitis vt legitimis?</i>	## FIFTH DOUBT <i>Whether it is a matter of Faith that this Pope, for example Alexander VII, is the legitimate successor of Peter? And consequently, whether it is also a matter of Faith that this particular Council, for example the Council of Trent, is legitimate and endowed with the infallible assistance of the Holy Spirit in treating matters of Faith, once the Pope and Council have been recognized as legitimate?</i>

62. Præsentem difficultatem sic rectè explicat P. Ouidius hic. An vi reuelationum vniuersalium, quibus reuelatum est, omnem hominem legitimè electum in Ecclesiæ legitimum Pontificem, esse Petri successorem in munere ac authoritate, & verum Papam. Item omne Concilium legitimè congregatum habere infallibilem autoritatem, eique Spiritum sanctum assistere in rebus ad Ecclesiam pertinentibus: consequenter sit reuelatum hunc numero Papam Alexandrum VII. v. g. esse verum Papam, & hoc numero Concilium v. g. Tridentinum esse legitimum, & Spiritus sancti assistentiā

62. Father Oviedo correctly explains the present difficulty here as follows: Whether by virtue of universal revelations—by which it has been revealed that every man legitimately elected as the lawful Pontiff of the Church is the successor of Peter in office and authority, and the true Pope; likewise, that every Council legitimately assembled possesses infallible authority, and that the Holy Spirit assists it in matters pertaining to the Church—it is consequently revealed that this particular Pope, Alexander VII for example, is the true Pope, and that this particular Council, for example the Council of Trent, is legitimate and has treated the affairs of the Church with the infallible assistance of the Holy Spirit and has defined truths pertaining to the faith, it

infallibili negotia Ecclesiæ tractasse, ac veritates ad fidem pertinentes definissse, aliunde Pontifice & Concilio ab Ecclesia agnitis vt legitimis. Hæc difficultas est valde celebris & summi momenti. Pro negatiua sententia apud P. Ouidem stant Turrecremata, Caietanus, Bannez, Vasquez, Torres, post Gasparem Hurtado, qui ideo cum ijs, qui huic eius sententiæ subscrisperant, Romam à Clemente 8. citatus fuit. Puteanus autem distinguit dicens, propositionem dictam non esse absolutè de fide; sed ex hypothesi tantùm.

63. Pro affirmatiua verò apud eundem Ouidem stant P. Suarez, Tannerus, Hurtado, Lugo Card. Palao, & plures alij, quos sequitur, & cum eis, sit.

RESOLVTIO I.

64. Dico 1. Sententia affirmatiua pro 1. parte mihi est certissimâ.

65. Probatur 1. De fide est illum esse legitimum Petri successorem, cui Christus nos obedire præcipit in spectantibus ad fidem & mores: Atqui constat Christum nobis & vniuersali Ecclesiæ præcipere, in his Papæ legitimè electo, & pro tali agnitiò, obedire; ergo &c. Probatur maior ex Scripturis, quibus Christus (Dub. 1. & infrà) Petro & eius successoribus (non ita alij, vt patet ex Dub. 3.) potestatem oues pascendi in fide & moribus contulit. Probatur minor; quia nihil certius, quam esse obediendum Præpositis nostris, quales sunt in Papam legitimè electi & pro talibus agniti: ergo &c.

66. Probatur 2. Quia alioqui etiam de fide non esset Innocentium X. fuisse legitimum Petri successorem, & sic de tota retrò serie Pontificū, atque ita rueret tota Ecclesiæ veræ certitudo; ac hæretica confirmarentur in suis erroribus; & legitimus Christi Vicarius ac S. Petri successor nō esset in particulari nobis certò notus: vndè esset occlusa via ad Iudicem controversiarum, aperta autem hæreticis, imò & catholicis omnem negandi, præter Scripturam, &

being otherwise acknowledged by the Church that the Pontiff and Council are legitimate. This difficulty is very celebrated and of the highest importance. For the negative opinion, Father Oviedo cites Torquemada, Cajetan, Báñez, Vásquez, Torres, and (following them) Gaspar Hurtado, who for this reason, along with those who had subscribed to this opinion of his, was summoned to Rome by Clement VIII. Puteanus, however, distinguishes, saying that the said proposition is not absolutely a matter of faith, but only hypothetically so.

63. For the affirmative position, however, according to the same Oviedo, there stand Father Suárez, Tanner, Hurtado, Cardinal Lugo, Palao, and many others, whom he follows and with whom he agrees.

RESOLUTION I.

64. I say first: The affirmative opinion regarding the first part is to me most certain.

65. It is proved first thus: It is of the faith that he is the legitimate successor of Peter whom Christ commands us to obey in matters pertaining to faith and morals. But it is established that Christ commands us and the universal Church to obey in these matters the Pope legitimately elected and recognized as such; therefore, etc. The major premise is proved from the Scriptures, by which Christ (Doubt 1, and below) conferred upon Peter and his successors (not in the same way upon others, as is clear from Doubt 3) the power of feeding the sheep in faith and morals. The minor premise is proved because nothing is more certain than that we must obey our Superiors, such as are those legitimately elected as Pope and recognized as such; therefore, etc.

66. It is proved secondly, because otherwise it would not even be a matter of faith that Innocent X was the legitimate successor of Peter, and thus [it would not be a matter of faith] concerning the entire series of Pontiffs going back in time, and in this way all certainty of the true Church would collapse; and heretics would be confirmed in their errors; and the legitimate Vicar of Christ and successor of Saint Peter would not be known to us with certainty in the particular case: whence the way to the Judge of

similia multa absurdia sequerentur, quibus, vt obuiaret Martinus V. speciali Bulla apud Concilium Constantiense, disponit, vt hæretici ad Ecclesiam redeuntes, credant Papam, qui pro tempore fuerit, eius nomine expresso, canonice electum, esse successorem Petri, & supremam in Ecclesia habere potestatem. ergo &c.

controversies would be closed, but [the way] opened to heretics—indeed, even to Catholics—to deny everything except Scripture, and many similar absurdities would follow. To obviate these [absurdities], Martin V, by a special Bull at the Council of Constance, decreed that heretics returning to the Church should believe that the Pope who shall be for the time being, his name being expressly stated, canonically elected, is the successor of Peter and possesses supreme power in the Church. Therefore, etc.

67. Confirmatur: ex eo, quòd vniuersalis Ecclesia hanc Scripturam, tamquam veram & legitimam recipit, de fide est, illam esse talem: ergo similiter; ex eo, quòd hunc numero Papam pro legitimo agnoscat, de fide est ipsum esse talem, etiam antequām quidpiam ex Cathedra definiat, vt clarè colligitur ex Concilijs; nominatim 6. Synodo Generali, quæ confitetur Agathonem esse verum Pontificem; Calchedonense Leonem, Mileuitanum talem esse Innocentium III. vide caput de libellis dist.28. & Augustinum tom.6.contra potestatem Donatiani & tom.2. Epistol. 155. Et nota, teste Diana Tom.11. Clementem VIII. nonnullos oppositæ sententiæ Doctores Romam vocasse ac incarcerasse.

68. Obijcies tamen 1. hæ propositiones, *Alexander VII. est Baptizatus; Alexander VII. est Canonice electus in Romanum Pontificem*, absolutè & simpliciter non sunt propositiones Fidei catholicæ: ergo &c. Probatur assumptum; quia de illarum veritate constat solo testimonio baptizantis, electorum & aliorum, qui ipsum in Pontificem agnoscent; viderürque de illis propositionibus resoluendū, prout de his, species istæ sunt consecratæ; istæ reliquiæ sunt venerandæ, quæ absolutè & simpliciter non sunt de fide, sed ex hypothesi: ergo &c.

69. Confirmatur: quia non appareat, cur aliquis incapax pontificiæ dignitatis, vt v.g. non baptizatus, vel non ordinatus, non mas, sed fœmella &c. assumi & proponi non possit tamquam legitimus Pontifex,

It is confirmed: from the fact that the universal Church receives this Scripture as true and legitimate, it is of the faith that it is such; therefore, similarly, from the fact that the Church acknowledges this particular Pope as legitimate, it is of the faith that he is such—even before he defines anything *ex cathedra*—as is clearly gathered from the Councils. Specifically, the Sixth General Synod, which confesses that Agatho is the true Pontiff; the Council of Chalcedon [confesses] Leo; the Council of Milevis [confesses] that Innocent III is such. See the chapter *De libellis*, distinction 28, and Augustine, tome 6, *Against the Power of Donatianus*, and tome 2, Epistle 155. And note that, according to the testimony of Diana, tome 11, Clement VIII summoned certain doctors of the opposite opinion to Rome and imprisoned them.

68. You will object, however: (1) these propositions—*Alexander VII is baptized; Alexander VII is canonically elected Roman Pontiff*—absolutely and simply are not propositions of the Catholic Faith; therefore, etc. The assumption is proved thus: because their truth is established solely by the testimony of the one baptizing, of the electors, and of others who acknowledge him as Pontiff. And it seems that these propositions must be resolved in the same manner as these: *these species are consecrated; these relics are to be venerated*—which absolutely and simply are not of the faith, but only *ex hypothesi*. Therefore, etc.

69. It is confirmed: because it does not appear why someone incapable of the pontifical dignity—for example, one not baptized, or not ordained, not male but female, etc.—cannot be assumed and presented as a legitimate Pontiff, provided that God does not

modò Deus non permittat eum ex cathedra aliquid definire, aut nonnisi vera definire; hoc enim modo esset Ecclesiæ Dei satis prouisum.

70. Respondeo 1. Distinguendo assumptum: hæ propositiones &c. non sunt absolutè & simpliciter Fidei Catholicæ, per se & directè concedo assumptum: indirectè & in speciali Dei assistentia, quam Deus Ecclesiæ suæ promisit, de non permittendo totam Ecclesiam suam errare in agnoscendo aliquem pro legitimo Petri successore, qui non sit talis, qui non sit legitimè electus, qui non sit baptizatus, &c. (alioqui non esset legitimus Petri successor, vndè propositiones illæ, vti hæc, certæ esse debent, nego assumptum. Admittunt quidem P. Suarez, Oviedo, & nonnulli alij, solùm constare euidentiâ morali illum esse baptizatum, canonice electum &c. & hoc sufficere. Sed contra, puto inde sequi solâ euidentiâ morali constare illum esse sumnum Pontificem, Petri legitimum successorem &c. hocque ad decretorum Fidei certitudinem sufficere; quod non probo, ne consequenter admittere oporteat decreta Fidei non effe nisi euidentia morali certa, ac per consequens de illis, vt de alijs moraliter, & non physicè certis, dubitari posse, quod non ausim asserere.

71. Dices fortè : quòd sicut Fide Diuinâ credimus nostram esse veram Ecclesiam, licet solùm præcedant motiu credibilitatis moraliter tantùm euidentia; sic similiter nos credere posse Alexandrum VII. esse legitimum Petri successorem, licet solùm præcedant motiu huius credibilitatis moraliter tantùm euidentia. Sed

72. Contra : hinc tantùm concluditur, ad hoc, vt Fide diuinâ credamus Alexandrum VII. esse legitimum Petri successorem, legitimè electum, legitimè baptizatum &c. sufficere, si sola præcedant motiu istius credibilitatis moraliter tantùm euidentia; non verò ad hoc vt fide diuina

permit him to define anything *ex cathedra*, or permit him to define only truths; for in this manner sufficient provision would be made for the Church of God.

70. I respond first by distinguishing the assumption: these propositions, etc., are not absolutely and simply matters of Catholic Faith *per se* and directly—I grant the assumption: indirectly and with respect to the special assistance of God, which God has promised to His Church, concerning not permitting His whole Church to err in recognizing someone as the legitimate successor of Peter who is not such, who is not legitimately elected, who is not baptized, etc. (otherwise he would not be the legitimate successor of Peter; whence those propositions, as this one, ought to be certain)—I deny the assumption. Father Francisco Suárez, [Gonzalo de] Oviedo, and some others indeed admit that it is established only by moral evidence that he is baptized, canonically elected, etc., and that this suffices. But on the contrary, I think it follows from this that it is established only by moral evidence that he is the Supreme Pontiff, the legitimate successor of Peter, etc., and that this suffices for the certitude of decrees of Faith; which I do not approve, lest it should consequently be necessary to admit that decrees of Faith are only morally certain by evidence, and consequently that doubt can be raised concerning them, as concerning other things that are morally, and not physically, certain—which I would not dare to assert.

71. You will perhaps say: that just as by Divine Faith we believe ours to be the true Church, although only motives of credibility that are merely morally evident precede [that belief]; so similarly we can believe Alexander VII to be the legitimate successor of Peter, although only motives of this credibility that are merely morally evident precede [that belief]. But

72. On the contrary: from this it is only concluded that, in order for us to believe by divine faith that Alexander VII is the legitimate successor of Peter, legitimately elected, legitimately baptized, etc., it suffices if only motives of this credibility that are merely morally evident precede; not, however, that in order for us to believe by divine faith that he is the

credamus ipsum esse legitimū Petri successorem, sufficere esse moraliter tantū eidens ipsum esse baptizatum, legitimē electum &c. vt consideranti patebit: alioqui adhuc aliquo tempore postquam Alexand. VII. esset agnitus in verum Petri successorem, liceret & de eo dubitare, vti de eius baptismo, & electione legitimis.

72. Respondeo 2. ad id, quod additur de istis speciebus consecratis, istis reliquijs venerandis &c. non vrgere; quia non concurrit totius Ecclesiæ testimonium, in istarum specierum consecrationis, istarum reliquiarum venerationis &c. approbationem; prout in approbationem Pontificis tamquam legitimi Petri Successoris: vnum enim non est tam moraliter eidens, quām aliud; neque est à Deo promissa specialis assistentia, ne ista consecratio, veneratio &c. à priuatis falsa proponatur, tamquam vera; sicuti est promissa, ne à tota Ecclesia proponatur pontifex non legitimē electus, non baptizatus &c. tamquam legitimē electus, verè baptizatus & legitimus pontifex, vt à tota Ecclesia omnis error remouetur.

Ad confirmationem verò.

74. Respondeo negando assumptū: quia vel talis haberet specialem Spiritus sancti assistentiā sibi in antecessoribus promissam, in definiendis rebus Fidei & morū; vel non? Si primū; dicendū esset, defectūm Baptismi, Ordinis & sexus, neminem reddere incapacem Papatus & legitimae ad Petrum successionis, cuius oppositum supponit argumentum sub nō incapax. Si secundū; erraret tota Ecclesia circa legitimū Petri successorem, regulam Fidei & morum animatam &c. quod est hæreticum, vt infrā patebit. Dum verò additur, *modo Deus non permittat &c.* addūtur miracula sine necessitate, & totam vim retinet dilemma factum, semperquè maneret dubia veritas proponentis res Fidei & morum, vti & an Deus suam assistentiam promisisset non baptizato, non ordinato, non mari, sed fœmellæ &c. ex

legitimate successor of Peter, it suffices that it be only morally evident that he is baptized, legitimately elected, etc., as will be clear to one who considers [the matter]: otherwise, even for some time after Alexander VII had been recognized as the true successor of Peter, it would still be permissible to doubt concerning him, as concerning his baptism and legitimate election.

73. I respond secondly to what is added concerning these consecrated species, these relics to be venerated, etc., that it does not press the case; because the testimony of the whole Church does not concur in the approval of the consecration of those species, the veneration of those relics, etc., as it does in the approval of the Pontiff as the legitimate Successor of Peter: for the one is not as morally evident as the other; nor has a special assistance been promised by God to prevent this consecration, veneration, etc., from being falsely proposed by private persons as true, as assistance has been promised to prevent a pontiff not legitimately elected, not baptized, etc., from being proposed by the whole Church as legitimately elected, truly baptized, and a legitimate pontiff, so that all error may be removed from the whole Church.

But as to the confirmation.

74. I respond by denying the assumption: because either such a person would have the special assistance of the Holy Spirit promised to him in his predecessors in defining matters of Faith and morals, or not? If the first; it would have to be said that a defect of Baptism, of Orders, and of sex renders no one incapable of the Papacy and of legitimate succession to Peter—the opposite of which the argument supposes under “not incapable.” If the second; the entire Church would err concerning the legitimate successor of Peter, the living rule of Faith and morals, etc., which is heretical, as will be shown below. When it is added, however, *provided that God does not permit, etc.*, miracles are being added without necessity, and the dilemma posed retains all its force, and there would always remain doubt about the truthfulness of the one proposing matters of Faith and morals, as well as whether God had promised His assistance to one not baptized, not ordained, not

quo sequeretur dubiam esse veritatem rerum à primo proponente,sive prima regula animata, propositarum,quod etiam est hæreticum: vndè hæc illatio valet, *Tenemur certâ fide credere id, quod prima regula animata credendum proponit*: ergo & hunc numero hominē esse primam regulam animatam ; licet hæc non valeat , Rusticus tenetur certâ fide credere,quæ parochus proponit,tamquam fidei; ergo & ipsum esse legitimum Parochum: disparitas enim est; quòd tota Ecclesia isti tenetur (promisit enim Deus illam totam non defecturam, non erraturam;) non tenetur autem tota Ecclesia credere Parocho, sed hic vel ille Parochianus in particulari tantum,qui errare potest; secùs tota Ecclesia,vt patet, neque Christus illum non defecturum aut erratum promisit.

75. Obiicies 2.Tota ratio,cur teneamur credere hunc numero Pontificem esse legitimum Petri successorem,est,ne alioqui tota Ecclesia in credendo erret : atqui ad hoc sufficit, quod Deus impedit ne falsum ex Cathedra definiat: ergo &c.

76. Respondeo negando minorem;quia,vt patet ex paulò ante præmissis ad confirmationem, hinc non tollitur totius Ecclesiæ fallibilitas circa primam regulam fidei & morum, sive circa ipsum legitimum Petri successorem, quidquid sit de illis, quæ proponeret.

RESOLVTIO II.

77. Dico 2. etiam sententia affirmans pro 2. parte est mihi certissima.

78. Probatur : quia non datur legitimum Concilium, nisi à Pontifice confirmatum: atqui Pontificis confirmatio in rebus fidei & morum est fide diuinâ certa: ergo &c. Minor probabitur dubio sequenti: consequentia patet; quia alioqui nihil definitum in Tridentino & aliis Conciliis, esset Fide Diuinâ credendum.

a male but a female, etc. From this it would follow that the truth of matters proposed by the first proposer, or the first living rule, would be doubtful, which is also heretical: whence this inference is valid: *We are bound by certain faith to believe that which the first living rule proposes as to be believed*: therefore also that this particular man is the first living rule; although this inference is not valid: A peasant is bound by certain faith to believe what the parish priest proposes as of the faith; therefore also that he himself is the legitimate Parish Priest: for there is a disparity; because the entire Church is bound to this one (for God promised that the whole Church would not fail, would not err); but the entire Church is not bound to believe a Parish Priest, but only this or that particular parishioner, who can err; not so the entire Church, as is evident, nor did Christ promise that he [the parish priest] would not fail or err.

75. You will object secondly: The entire reason why we are bound to believe that this particular Pontiff is the legitimate successor of Peter is so that the whole Church would not otherwise err in believing; but for this purpose it suffices that God prevent him from defining something false from the Chair [*ex Cathedra*]: therefore, etc.

76. I respond by denying the minor [premise]; because, as is evident from what was set forth a little earlier in confirmation, this does not remove the fallibility of the whole Church concerning the first rule of faith and morals, or concerning the legitimate successor of Peter himself, whatever may be the case regarding those things which he might propose.

RESOLUTION II.

77. I say secondly that the affirmative opinion concerning the second part is also most certain to me.

78. Proof: because there is no legitimate Council unless it be confirmed by the Pontiff; but the Pontiff's confirmation in matters of faith and morals is certain by divine faith: therefore, etc. The minor [premise] will be proved in the following doubt; the consequence is evident, because otherwise nothing defined in Trent and other Councils would have to be believed by Divine Faith.

