

**Ecclesia Christi In Terris Militans: Seu Catholica Religio, Cum Fide, Spe Et Charitate Theologica, Gratia Habituali, Iustificatione, Et Merito: Tractatus de Ecclesia Militante**  
*(The Church of Christ Militant on Earth: That is, the Catholic Religion, with Faith, Hope, and Theological Charity, Habitual Grace, Justification, and Merit: Treatise on the Church Militant)*

by **Benedict Schmier, 1732**

[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 1, 2025.
- Version: 1.0
- Selection pages: 228–234

**Exercitatio II, Question XX**

*Latin*

**QUAESTIO VIGESIMA.**

*Sitne de fide, Clementem XII. legitime electum, esse verum Papam, seu Vicarium Christi?*

**408.** Praemitto ex Theolog. Scholast. Salisb. tract. de fid. disp. 11. a.3. non tantum ea, quae sunt revelata vel formaliter seu explicite, aut implicite seu confuse (cujus exemplum est in hac Propositione: Christus est homo: in qua confuse revelatur, quod constet corpore & anima) sed etiam revelata virtualiter, hoc est, contenta in aliquo formaliter revelato tanquam in virtute & radice (v.g. quod Christus habeat voluntatem creatam continetur in hac revelata, quod Christus sit homo) terminare posse actum fidei Theologicae, ita ut

*English*

**QUESTION TWENTY.**

*Is it a matter of faith that Clement XII, having been legitimately elected, is the true Pope, or Vicar of Christ?*

**408.** I premise from the Scholastic Theology of Salzburg, treatise on faith, disputation 11, article 3, that not only those things which are revealed either formally or explicitly, or implicitly or confusedly (an example of which is in this proposition: “Christ is man,” in which it is confusedly revealed that He consists of body and soul), but also things virtually revealed, that is, contained in something formally revealed as in its power and root (e.g., that Christ has a created will is contained in this revealed truth that Christ is man), can be the object of an act of theological faith, such that virtual

revelatio virtualis sit. sufficiens motivum assensus supernaturalis, & pure propter Divinam revelationem praestetur.

Et ideo discursiva & artificiosa connexio extremorum tunc non est aliud, quam pura conditio applicans Divinam revelationem, per discursum Syllogisticum manifestatam, ut in allato exemplo: *Christus est homo*: omnis homo habet voluntatem creatam: ergo Christus habet voluntatem creatam. Secunda praemissa est solum applicans magis, & explicativa, ut constet, particularem esse contentam sub universali. Sufficisset enim dixisse, in Christo qua homine necessario voluntatem creatam contineri.

Praeterea laudata Theologia concludit loc. cit. ad eliciendum assensum fidei circa objectum virtualiter revelatum non esse necessarium, ut utraque praemissa sit de fide, sed sufficere, quod altera sit physice, vel moraliter evidens. Hinc facta alicui speciali revelatione, quod omnes Civitates Italiae sint solo aequandae, ille fide Divina (si non Theologica, saltem communiter dicta) crederet, Romam quoque fore vastandam: etsi de existentia Romae solummodo moralem evidentiam seu certitudinem haberet. His praemissis,

**409.** Assertio statuitur affirmative. Non itaque assentior illis, qui olim tenebant, hanc Propositionem, *modernus Pontifex est Vicarius Christi*, certam esse solum certitudine morali. Probatur primo auctoritate Martini V. qui in Concilio Constantiensi post damnationem errorum Wicleffi, statuit, suspectos de fide interrogandos esse, utrum credant, quod Papa Canonice electus, qui pro tempore fuerit ejus nomine proprio expresso, sit Successor Beati Petri habens supremam auctoritatem in Ecclesia DEI? Secundo: Haec Propositio: *Clemens XI. legitime electus est verus Pontifex, sive Vicarius Christi*, continetur directe sub ista universali revelata: Omnis Pontifex sive Episcopus Romanus legitime electus est verus Pontifex, & Vicarius Christi: atqui, ubi propositio universalis est revelata, ac

revelatio est a sufficienti motivo pro supernaturali assensu, et est data pure propter Divinam revelationem.

Et ideo discursiva et artificiosa connectio extremorum est tunc nihil aliud, quam pura conditio applicans Divinam revelationem, manifestatam per syllogisticum discursum, ut in exemplo datus: *Christus est homo*; omnis homo habet voluntatem creatam: ergo Christus habet voluntatem creatam. Secundum praemissum solummodo applicat magis, et explicat, ut constet, particularem esse contentam sub universali. Sufficere enim dixisset, in Christo per hominem necessario voluntatem creatam contineri.

Ad praeterea laudata Theologia concludit loc. cit. ad eliciendum assensum fidei circa objectum virtualiter revelatum non esse necessarium, ut utraque praemissa sit de fide, sed sufficere, quod altera sit physice, vel moraliter evidens. Hinc facta alicui speciali revelatione, quod omnes Civitates Italiae sint solo aequandae, ille fide Divina (si non Theologica, saltem communiter dicta) crederet, Romam quoque fore vastandam: etsi de existentia Romae solummodo moralem evidentiam seu certitudinem haberet. His praemissis,

**409.** The assertion is established in the affirmative. I do not, therefore, agree with those who formerly held that this proposition, *the current Pontiff is the Vicar of Christ*, is certain only with moral certainty. This is proven first by the authority of Martin V, who in the Council of Constance, after the condemnation of the errors of Wycliffe, decreed that those suspected of heresy should be asked whether they believe that the canonically elected Pope, whoever he may be at the time, his proper name being expressly stated, is the Successor of Blessed Peter, having supreme authority in the Church of GOD. Secondly: This proposition: *Clement XI, legitimately elected, is the true Pontiff, or Vicar of Christ*, is contained directly under this universal revealed truth: Every Pontiff or Roman Bishop legitimately elected is the true Pontiff and Vicar of Christ. Now, when a universal proposition is revealed and immediately

immediate de fide, etiam particularis contenta sub universali est immediate de fide: Prob. hoc : quia subjectum propositionis universalis & subjectum propositionis particularis sunt idem, sic, ut subjectum particularis constituat inadaequate subjectum propositionis universalis, & subjecta omnium particularium collective sumpta sint adaequate idem cum subjecto universalis : Ex. gr. omnis homo per propagationem seminalem descendens ab Adamo est a Christo redemptus: Sensus est, & hic, & ille, & iste, & caeteri particulares quicunque descendentes ab Adamo: ita similiter in priori, syncategorema collectivum omnis Episcopus Romanus includit singulos in particulari legitime electos: consequenter & modernum nuper electum. Ergo sicuti est de fide propositio universalis qua revelata in se, ita quoque particularis qua revelata & contenta sub illa tanquam particularis.

Neque replices, non esse revelatum, quod Clemens XII. fuerit legitime electus. Nam contra est primo, quod virtualiter & exercite sit revelatum, hunc numero hominem esse canonice electum, in quantum pacifice ab Ecclesia (cujus autoritas in Cardinalibus Electoribus, qui nomine totius Ecclesiae negotium Pontificiae electionis tractant, praesentatur) agnoscitur, acceptatur, & ut Vicarius Christi legitimus honoratur; cum Divina Providentia totam Ecclesiam errare non permittat in his, quae fidem & mores concernunt, sicuti concernit legitima electio S. Pontificis. Contra est secundo, quod ad assensum fidei supernat. sufficiat, si una propositio sit revelata, & altera moraliter sit certa vel evidens, veluti supra praemissum fuit.

**411.** Tertio Assert. sic probat Joan: a S. Thoma. Duo sunt, quae Ecclesia acceptat in Pontifice: unum, quod hic & nunc sit regula fidei nimirum animata; alterum, quod acceptet illum tanquam Caput, cui universalis Ecclesia unitur, & sic acceptando faciat illam propositionem de

of faith, the particular proposition contained under the universal is also immediately of faith. This is proven thus: because the subject of the universal proposition and the subject of the particular proposition are the same, such that the subject of the particular proposition constitutes inadequately the subject of the universal proposition, and the subjects of all particular propositions collectively taken are adequately identical with the subject of the universal. For example: every human descending from Adam through seminal propagation is redeemed by Christ. The meaning is: this one, and that one, and another, and all other particular individuals whatsoever descending from Adam. Similarly, in the former case, the collective syncategoreme "every Roman Bishop" includes each particular legitimately elected bishop, consequently including the recently elected current one. Therefore, just as the universal proposition is of faith because it is revealed in itself, so likewise is the particular proposition because it is revealed and contained under the former as a particular instance.

Nor should you object that it has not been revealed that Clement XII was legitimately elected. For against this stands, firstly, that it has been virtually and effectively revealed that this particular man was canonically elected, insofar as he is peacefully recognized, accepted, and honored as the legitimate Vicar of Christ by the Church (whose authority is represented in the Cardinal Electors, who handle the matter of Pontifical election in the name of the entire Church); since Divine Providence does not permit the whole Church to err in matters concerning faith and morals, as does the legitimate election of the Supreme Pontiff. Against this stands, secondly, that for an assent of supernatural faith, it is sufficient if one proposition is revealed, and another is morally certain or evident, as was premised above.

**411.** Thirdly, John of St. Thomas proves the assertion thus. There are two things which the Church accepts in a Pontiff: first, that here and now he is the rule of faith, namely an animated one; second, that the Church accepts him as the Head to whom the universal Church is united, and

fide, scil. quod haec persona particularis rite electa sit verus Pontifex: est namque impossibile, quod Ecclesia erret in acceptanda quacunque Regula fidei, sive sit definitio Concilii, sive liber aliquis Canonicus, sive traditio aliqua: & similiter est impossibile, quod acceptando talem regulam tanquam regulam fidei, non sit de fide, quod illa sit vera & legitima regula: Ergo pariter impossibile est, quod Ecclesia erret in acceptando S. Pontificem in particulari: siquidem illum acceptat tanquam regulam supremam & animatam in proponendis rebus fidei. Confirmatur. Si enim non esset certum secundum fidem, quod iste liber in particulari sit Canonicus, ut ista definitio sit legitima definitio, non possemus esse certi de rebus definitis aut traditis in Libro Canonico. Ergo simili modo non esset certum secundum fidem, quod ista persona in particulari aliquid revera circa credenda definiat aut declaret, quando de ejus legitima electione, potestate & auctoritate prudenter dubitare possemus. Demum huc faciunt omnes rationes, quibus probatur Summi Pontificis Primatus, superioritas, & infallibilitas. Non enim procedunt solum de Summo Pontifice ut sic, & existente in statu abstractionis seu intentionali, sed de quolibet in singulari, ad Thronum Apostolicum per legitimam electionem evecto. Quid autem ad hanc requiratur, cum Canonistis in meo Tr. de Roman. Pontif. part. I. dissert.2. per extensum expono.

*Sed contra*

**412.** Arguis primo: Si est de fide, hunc numero electum esse verum Pontificem, etiam est de fide, electores servasse formam praescriptam electioni Pontificiae, ex. gr. quod saltem duae tertiae in hanc personam conspiraverint, sine interveniente simonia vota sua contulerint &c. Atqui hoc non est de fide: quis enim nobis hoc proposuit tanquam de fide tenendum? Ergo &c.

**413.** Secundo: Non est de fide, saltem immediate, hoc Concilium generale v.g. Tridentinum esse legitimum, esto sit de fide,

thus by accepting him makes that proposition a matter of faith, namely, that this particular person duly elected is the true Pontiff. For it is impossible that the Church should err in accepting any Rule of faith, whether it be the definition of a Council, or some Canonical book, or some tradition; and similarly it is impossible that in accepting such a rule as the rule of faith, it should not be a matter of faith that this is a true and legitimate rule. Therefore, it is likewise impossible that the Church should err in accepting the Holy Pontiff in particular, since it accepts him as the supreme and animated rule in proposing matters of faith. This is confirmed as follows: If it were not certain according to faith that this particular book is Canonical, or that this definition is a legitimate definition, we could not be certain about matters defined or handed down in a Canonical Book. Therefore, in a similar manner, it would not be certain according to faith that this particular person truly defines or declares something concerning what must be believed, when we could prudently doubt his legitimate election, power, and authority. Finally, all the arguments by which the Primacy, superiority, and infallibility of the Supreme Pontiff are proven apply here. For they do not only proceed regarding the Supreme Pontiff in the abstract or in an intentional state, but concerning any individual who has been raised to the Apostolic Throne through legitimate election. What is required for this legitimate election, I explain at length with the Canonists in my Treatise on the Roman Pontiff, part I, dissertation 2.

*On the Contrary*

**412.** You argue first: If it is a matter of faith that this particular elected individual is the true Pontiff, then it is also a matter of faith that the electors observed the prescribed form for Pontifical election, e.g., that at least two-thirds agreed upon this person, that they cast their votes without the intervention of simony, etc. But this is not a matter of faith: for who has proposed this to us as something to be held by faith? Therefore, etc.

**413.** Second: It is not a matter of faith, at least not immediately, that this general Council, e.g., the Council of Trent, is legitimate, although it is a

quod omne Concilium legitime congregatum sit verum Concilium. Ergo nec de fide est, hunc numero Clementem esse verum Pontificem; licet sit de fide, omnem Episcopum Romanum legitime electum & pacifice acceptatum, esse verum Pontificem. Ant. fundatur in eo, quod non constet de fide, Episcopos in Concilio congregatos fuisse revera Episcopos.

**414.** Tertio: Non est de fide, hunc numero hominem esse vivum, aut esse baptizatum: ergo nec est de fide, esse verum Pontificem & Vicarium Christi. Ant. prob. Ante electionem non erat de fide, esse virum, vel baptizatum : ergo nec post electionem erit de fide : nulla siquidem desuper subsequuta fuit revelatio vel definitio. Conf. jam etiam prob. Si consequens est contingens, seu non necessarium, etiam antecedens non potest esse necessarium : ex. gr. ponitur haec propositio antecedens : hic homo, Clemens XII. est Summus Pontifex : illius consequens est, quod sit baptizatus : cum sine baptismo Pontificatus in Clemente secundum modernam DEI Providentiam sit impossibilis.

**415.** Quarto: non minus Ecclesia acceptat hunc numero Sanctum, v. g. Joannem Nepomucenum a Sede Apostolica rite canonizatum, quam acceptet hunc numero Clementem tanquam a Cardinalibus, Ecclesiam universam repraesentantibus, rite electum : & tamen haec propositio : *Hic numero canonizatus est in gloria* non est de fide, uti docet D. Th. Quodlib. 9. a. 16. Ergo &c.

**416.** Quinto: In hoc syllogismo (Omnis hostia rite consecrata continet sub speciebus panis verum Corpus Christi : sed haec hostia in particulari est rite consecrata : Ergo haec hostia in particulari sub speciebus panis continet verum Corpus Christi) conclusio non est de fide absoluta, quamvis per propositionem minorem manifestetur, quod praedicta conclusio sit propositio particularis immediate contenta sub universali revelata. Ergo nec erit de fide conclusio in isto syllogismo: Omnis

matter of faith that every legitimately convened Council is a true Council. Therefore, it is not a matter of faith that this particular Clement is the true Pontiff, although it is a matter of faith that every Bishop of Rome legitimately elected and peacefully accepted is the true Pontiff. The antecedent is founded on the fact that it is not established as a matter of faith that the Bishops gathered in the Council were truly Bishops.

**414.** Third: It is not a matter of faith that this particular man is alive, or is baptized; therefore, neither is it a matter of faith that he is the true Pontiff and Vicar of Christ. The antecedent is proven thus: Before his election, it was not a matter of faith that he was a man or baptized; therefore, neither after his election will it be a matter of faith, since no revelation or definition has subsequently occurred on this matter. The inference is also proven: If the consequent is contingent or non-necessary, the antecedent likewise cannot be necessary. For example, consider this antecedent proposition: "This man, Clement XII, is the Supreme Pontiff." Its consequent is that he is baptized, since without baptism, the Pontificate in Clement, according to God's present Providence, would be impossible.

**415.** Fourth: The Church accepts this particular Saint, e.g., John Nepomucene, duly canonized by the Apostolic See, no less than it accepts this particular Clement as duly elected by the Cardinals who represent the universal Church. And yet this proposition: "*This particular canonized person is in glory*" is not a matter of faith, as St. Thomas teaches in Quodlibet 9, article 16. Therefore, etc.

**416.** Fifth: In this syllogism (Every properly consecrated host contains under the species of bread the true Body of Christ; but this particular host is properly consecrated; Therefore this particular host contains under the species of bread the true Body of Christ), the conclusion is not of absolute faith, even though through the minor proposition it is made manifest that the aforementioned conclusion is a particular proposition immediately contained under a universal revealed truth. Therefore, neither will the

Pontifex legitime electus & ab Ecclesia acceptatus est verus Pontifex. Clemens XII. est legitime electus & ab Ecclesia acceptatus; ergo Clemens est verus Pontifex.

**417.** Sexto: Quod est de fide, tenemur credere: item debet non esse solum probabile, sed necessarium, certum & infallibile: at, Clementem XII. esse verum Pontificem, non tenemur credere: etsi enim de fide sit, esse de fide; quemlibet rite electum in Caput Romanae Ecclesiae, esse verum Pontificem, non tamen est de fide; esse de fide, quod hic Clemens XII. sit verus Pontifex: siquidem nullibi sufficienter hoc declaratum fuit. Insuper sententia opposita non est damnata; adeoque nostra non est certa, sed intra lineam probabilitatis consistit.

**418.** Resp. ad primum, secund. & tertium, posse aliquid dupliciter de fide esse: nimirum vel per se primo, immediate, & formaliter: vel per se secundo, mediate, illative, seu virtualiter. Primo modo est de fide; quod & per lumen DEI immediate attingitur, & quod tanquam aliquid immediate revelatum assensum fidei terminat: secundo modo est de fide, quod ut contentum in propositione immediate revelata attingitur tanquam conclusio in suo principio; puta, per lumen Theologicum, quod est illativum ex his, quae sunt de fide. Quibus praemissis, dicendum primo est, esse immediate, & de per se primo de fide, quod haec persona ut legitime electa, & acceptata tanquam regula & Judex fidei, sit verus Pontifex: hoc quippe de quolibet legitime electo definit Martinus V. & continetur in promissione Petro facta, in Symbolo Professionis fidei, declaraturque in exercitio per acceptance[m] Ecclesiae. Dicendum est secundo, hinc esse saltem mediate de fide, & per illationem Theologicam; in hujus Pontificis electione ex parte eligentium formam praescriptam fuisse observatam sine aliquo defectu substantiali: similiter ex parte electi nihil deesse ex requisitis necessariis, v. g. quod sit baptizatus, mas, Catholicus, nulloque impedimento Juris naturalis & Divini

conclusion in this syllogism be of faith: Every Pontiff legitimately elected and accepted by the Church is the true Pontiff. Clement XII is legitimately elected and accepted by the Church; therefore Clement is the true Pontiff.

**417.** Sixth: What is of faith, we are bound to believe; likewise, it ought to be not merely probable, but necessary, certain, and infallible. But we are not bound to believe that Clement XII is the true Pontiff. For although it is of faith that it is of faith that anyone duly elected as the Head of the Roman Church is the true Pontiff, it is not, however, of faith that it is of faith that this particular Clement XII is the true Pontiff, since nowhere has this been sufficiently declared. Moreover, the opposing opinion has not been condemned; therefore our opinion is not certain, but remains within the bounds of probability.

**418.** In response to the first, second, and third points, something can be of faith in two ways: namely, either primarily, immediately, and formally; or secondarily, mediately, illatively, or virtually. In the first way, something is of faith when it is directly comprehended through God's light and when, as something immediately revealed, it terminates in the assent of faith. In the second way, something is of faith when it is understood as contained within an immediately revealed proposition, like a conclusion in its principle—namely, through theological reasoning, which derives conclusions from matters of faith. With these distinctions established, we must first state that it is immediately and primarily of faith that this person, legitimately elected and accepted as the rule and judge of faith, is the true Pontiff. Indeed, Martin V defined this regarding anyone legitimately elected, and it is contained in the promise made to Peter, in the Symbol of the Profession of Faith, and is declared in practice through the Church's acceptance. Secondly, we must state that it is at least mediately of faith, through theological inference, that in the election of this Pontiff, the prescribed form was observed by the electors without any substantial defect. Similarly, on the part of the one elected, nothing was lacking from the necessary requirements—for

laboret; quo Pontificalis Dignitatis redderetur incapax: nam haec omnia necessariam connexionem & consequentiam important cum praedicta fidei propositione, utpote, quae sine veritate & subsistentia talium requisitorum subsistere non posset. Eadem responsione dissolvitur, quod de Concilii generalis congregatione adducitur: siquidem, si semel acceptata sint & a S. Pontifice approbata, quae in aliquo Concilio fuerunt conclusa & definita, per consequentiam Theologicam deducitur, Concilium fuisse legitime congregatum, & ex veris Episcopis compositum. Neque necesse est, ut omnes convocati ad definiendum sint veri Episcopi. Sed nec per aliquam revelationem in scriptura, aut definitionem tanquam de fide certum constat, quod hic determinatus Episcopus legitime electus, & pacifice acceptatus sit verus Episcopus: & quod haec particularis contineatur immediate sub propositione universali, quae esset de fide, v. g. haec: *omnis Antistes ad Episcopalem Ecclesiam legitime electus, & pacifice acceptatus, est verus Episcopus*: Non enim talis Divina revelatio, & promissio, expeteretur vel conduceret ad regulam infallibilem Ecclesiae universalis, sed tantum ad utile Regimen Ecclesiae vel Provinciae particularis.

**419.** Ad quart. Thomistae ut salvent mentem Doctoris Angelici Resp. non constare, hanc universalem, *omnis homo legitime seu rite canonizatus est sanctus & in gloria*, alicubi formaliter & immediate revelatam esse: idcirco nec particularis (*hic homo rite canonizatus est sanctus, & existit in gloria*) est immediate & formaliter revelata. Propterea D. Th. cit. quodlib. 9. art. 16. dicit, Sanctorum canonizationem esse medium quid inter iudicium Papae de rebus fidei definientis, & inter iudicium pronuntiantis de factis particularibus, veluti dum agitur de criminibus, aut possessionibus. Subdit autem: *quia tamen honor, quem Sanctis exhibemus, quaedam professio fidei est, qua Sanctorum gloriam credimus, pie credendum est, quod nec in his iudicium Papae errare possit*. Si quis

example, that he is baptized, male, Catholic, and free from any impediment of natural or Divine law that would render him incapable of the Pontifical Dignity. For all these requirements have a necessary connection and consequence with the aforementioned proposition of faith, since it could not subsist without the truth and existence of such requirements. The same response resolves what is brought up concerning the convocation of a general Council: indeed, if the conclusions and definitions of a Council have once been accepted and approved by the Holy Pontiff, it can be deduced through theological reasoning that the Council was legitimately convened and composed of true Bishops. Nor is it necessary that all those summoned for making definitions be true Bishops. Furthermore, it is not established as certain through any revelation in Scripture or through any definition of faith that this particular Bishop, legitimately elected and peacefully accepted, is a true Bishop, or that this particular case is immediately contained under a universal proposition that would be of faith, such as: *every prelate legitimately elected to an Episcopal Church and peacefully accepted is a true Bishop*. For such a Divine revelation and promise would not be sought or conducive to the infallible rule of the universal Church, but only to the useful governance of a particular Church or Province.

**419.** To the fourth [question]. The Thomists, in order to preserve the mind of the Angelic Doctor, respond that it is not established that this universal proposition, *every person legitimately or duly canonized is a saint and in glory*, has been formally and immediately revealed anywhere: therefore, neither is the particular proposition (*this duly canonized person is a saint and exists in glory*) immediately and formally revealed. For this reason, St. Thomas, in the cited *Quodlibet 9, article 16*, says that the canonization of Saints is something intermediate between the Pope's judgment when defining matters of faith, and his judgment when pronouncing on particular facts, such as when dealing with crimes or possessions. He adds however: *because the honor which we show to the Saints is a certain profession of faith*

cum aliis, qui revelationem propositionis universalis de canonizatione Sanctorum adstruunt, sentiat, consequenter tenebit, esse immediate de fide, quod Joannes Nepomucenus sit Sanctus, & in gloria.

**420.** Ad quint. Resp. Magnif. P. Bened. Petschach. *tr. de fide, thes. 7.* non esse moraliter evidens eo gradu, quo evidentia credibilitatis requiritur ad actum fidei, hanc numero hostiam esse rite consecratam a legitimo Ministro: non enim adest testimonium universalis Ecclesiae, quod hoc suadeat, sicuti adest ad suadendum, hunc numero Pontificem esse legitime electum. Sic ille. Magnif. D.P. Rector, Coelestin. Mayr *tr. de fid. Div. disp. 1. q. 3. art. 3. §.2.* respond. hanc particularem, *Haec hostia est consecrata*, nulla nobis evidentia applicari, quae tamen ad assensum fidei necessario concurrere debet &c. Addo ego, dictam particularem propositionem, ejusque certitudinem non pertinere ad regulam infallibilem universalis Ecclesiae.

**421.** Ad sext. Resp. Paul. a Concept. hanc propositionem, quod Clemens sit verus Pontifex, non esse credibilem fide Divina & supernaturali, usque dum Ecclesia declaret, revelationem universalis esse immediatam revelationem particularis: hoc enim certo constare debere, ait; nec sufficere solam probabilitatem : cum hoc tamen cohaerere, quod praefata propositio in se & speculative sit immediate de fide : & hoc defendit ille, sed tantum ut probabile. Sique insistimus, qualis ergo assensus practice praestetur praedictae propositioni reponis, assensum fidei humanae, aut Theologicum, similem illi, quem praebemus huic propositioni : *Christus est visibilis.*

**422.** Verum, insistendo connexio-432 ni doctrinae, melius defenditur, esse de fide,

*by which we believe in the glory of the Saints, it should be piously believed that the Pope's judgment cannot err in these matters.* If anyone agrees with others who assert the revelation of the universal proposition concerning the canonization of Saints, they will consequently hold that it is immediately of faith that John Nepomucene is a Saint and in glory.

**420.** In response to the fifth [question], the Magnificent Father Benedict Petschach in his *treatise on faith, thesis 7* [states that] it is not morally evident to the degree that evidence of credibility is required for an act of faith, that this particular host has been duly consecrated by a legitimate Minister: for there is no testimony of the universal Church which persuades us of this, as there is to persuade us that this particular Pontiff has been legitimately elected. Thus he says. The Magnificent Doctor and Rector, Celestine Mayr, in his *treatise on Divine Faith, disputation 1, question 3, article 3, §2*, responds that this particular proposition, "*This host is consecrated*," is not applied to us with any evidence, which nevertheless must necessarily concur for an assent of faith, etc. I add that the said particular proposition and its certainty do not pertain to the infallible rule of the universal Church.

**421.** In response to the sixth [question], Paul of the Conception [states] that this proposition, that Clement is the true Pontiff, is not credible by Divine and supernatural faith until the Church declares that the universal revelation is an immediate revelation of the particular: for he says this must be established with certainty, and mere probability is not sufficient. Nevertheless, it is consistent with this that the aforementioned proposition in itself and speculatively is immediately of faith: and he defends this, but only as probable. And if we insist on what kind of assent is practically given to the aforesaid proposition, he replies [that it is] an assent of human faith, or Theological [assent], similar to that which we give to this proposition: "*Christ is visible.*"

**422.** However, adhering to the connection of doctrine, it is better defended that it is a matter of



quod sit de fide, hunc numero Clementem post pacificam ejus acceptationem, esse verum Pontificem, idque fide Divina credi posse; quandoquidem, ut inter alios Theologos tenet Joan. a S. Th. negans illam propositionem, non tantum esset schismaticus, sed etiam haereticus : quia non tantum scinderet unitatem Ecclesiae, verum etiam perversum dogma foveret, negando, Caput Ecclesiae noviter electum, acceptatumque habendum esse pro Pontifice & pro Regula fidei.

faith—that it is a matter of faith—that this particular Clement, after his peaceful acceptance, is the true Pontiff, and that this can be believed with Divine faith. Indeed, as John of St. Thomas maintains among other theologians, one who denies this proposition would be not only schismatic but also heretical: because he would not only rend the unity of the Church, but also foster a perverse dogma by denying that the newly elected and accepted Head of the Church must be regarded as the Pontiff and as the Rule of faith.