

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 stabilient, 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 principaliores, & 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^[^1].

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^[^1].

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.

[^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

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.

[^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

Ecclesiae iudicio 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 fidei dogmate proponi non possit: Sed intelligi haec facile debent, quod privati Doctores ex principiis revelatis deducere contendunt, 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 contendunt, 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

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 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

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: adhec tamen contrarium sentientes non fiunt haeretici, quia propriam opinionem non sustinent cum pertinacia, ut requiritur ad haeresim, sed 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.

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 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.