

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: 228–238

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

revelation is a sufficient motive for supernatural assent, and is given purely on account of Divine revelation.

And therefore the discursive and artful connection of extremes is then nothing other than a pure condition applying Divine revelation, manifested through syllogistic discourse, as in the example given: *Christ is man*; every man has a created will; therefore Christ has a created will. The second premise merely applies more specifically and explicates, so that it may be established that the particular is contained under the universal. For it would have sufficed to say that a created will is necessarily contained in Christ as man.

Furthermore, the aforementioned Theology concludes in the cited passage that to elicit an assent of faith concerning an object virtually revealed, it is not necessary that both premises be of faith, but it suffices that one of them be physically or morally evident. Hence, if someone receives a special revelation that all the cities of Italy are to be razed to the ground, that person would believe by Divine faith (if not Theological, at least commonly so called) that Rome too will be destroyed, even though he would have only moral evidence or certainty about the existence of Rome. With these premises established,

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.

De Intolerabili calumnia Vicarium Christi Antichristum nominantium.

423. Venerationi & filiali subiectioni, quam SS. Patres, tot Ecclesiastici Praesules, Sapientissimi Doctores, nec minus coronata Imperatorum Regumque Capita, atque alii eminentes Principes legitimo Christi in terris Vicario a primis nascentis Ecclesiae saeculis usque ad nostra tempora, quidam nescio, quo insano oestro abrepti sectarii superioris aevi per Antichristi detestabilem nomenclaturam objicere non sunt veriti.

424. Joannes Wicleff. art. 30. in Constantiensi Concilio Sess. 8. damnato, excommunicatio Papae, ait, vel cujuscunque, non est timenda: quia est censura Antichristi. Joan. Huss apud Cochlaeum lib. 3. Histor. Hussiticae dixit: Papa non est conformis Christo, & Apostolis; non Christi, sed potius Antichristi est Vicarius, & bestia illa, de qua in Apocalypsi. Lutherus ad cap. 49. Genes. vulgata opinio est (inquit) apud omnes Auctores Ecclesiasticos, quod ex Tribu Dan venturus sit Antichristus, quem per colubrum intelligunt: sed alienissima est ab hoc loco, & falsissima opinio: ac puto, diabolum hujus fabulae fictorem fuisse, & finxisse hanc glossam, ut nostras cogitationes a vero & praesente Antichristo abduceret. Nam ex omnibus scholis Papisticis nemo est, qui sentiat, Papam esse Antichristum. Joan. Calvinus ad cap. 2. posterioris ad Thessalonicenses, quisquis e scriptura edoctus erit, quaenam DEO maxime sunt propria, & ex adverso intuebitur, quid sibi Papa usurpet, etiamsi

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.

On the Intolerable Calumny of Those Who Call the Vicar of Christ the Antichrist.

423. To the veneration and filial subjection which the Holy Fathers, so many Ecclesiastical Prelates, Most Wise Doctors, and no less the crowned heads of Emperors and Kings, and other eminent Princes have shown toward the legitimate Vicar of Christ on earth from the first centuries of the nascent Church until our times, certain sectarians of the previous age, carried away by some insane frenzy, have not feared to oppose by the detestable nomenclature of Antichrist.

424. John Wycliffe, in article 30 condemned in the Council of Constance, Session 8, says: “Excommunication by the Pope, or by anyone else, is not to be feared because it is a censure of the Antichrist.” John Huss, according to Cochlaeus in book 3 of his History of the Hussites, said: “The Pope is not in conformity with Christ and the Apostles; he is not the Vicar of Christ, but rather of the Antichrist, and he is that beast mentioned in the Apocalypse.” Luther, commenting on Genesis chapter 49, says: “It is a common opinion among all ecclesiastical authors that the Antichrist will come from the Tribe of Dan, whom they understand as the serpent. But this opinion is completely foreign to this passage and utterly false. I believe that the devil was the inventor of this fable and created this gloss to divert our thoughts from the true and present Antichrist. For among all the Papist schools, there is no one who believes that the Pope is the Antichrist.” John Calvin, in his commentary on the second chapter of the Second Epistle to the Thessalonians, states: “Whoever is instructed from Scripture about what

puer sit decennis, non multum laborabit in noscendo Antichristo.

425. Hanc horribilem calumniam 425 inter caeteros perample & nervose refutat Cardinal. Bellarm. To. 1. contr. lib. 3. per aliquot capita, quae in compendio refert Coccus in Thesaur. To. 1. lib. 7. & probatur primo: Antichristi nomen (quod hostem & aemulum Christi significat) Romano Pontifici, qui se servum & Christo subjectum fatetur in omnibus, non convenit. Secundo: Summi Pontifices jam in magno numero unus alteri successit; Antichristus erit unus. Tertio, Antichristus nondum venit: illiusque nomen proprium adhuc ignoratur; si autem esset Summus Pontifex, utique de ejus nomine certo constaret. Quarto, Antichristus erit Judaeus nasciturus ex Tribu Dan: quis autem Summorum Pontificum vel stemate, vel religione vel ullo modo fuit Judaeus? Quis eorum a Judaeis pro Messia susceptus? Quinto, Antichristus sedebit in Templo Salomonis Hierosolymae; at nullum Summum Pontificem ab Anno 600. unquam Hierosolymis fuisse, credibile est. Sexto, Antichristus negabit, JESUM esse Christum: docebit vero, se esse verum Christum in Lege & Prophetis promissum: Se solum esse DEUM: an ullus Summorum Pontificum talia docuit? Septimo, Antichristus miracula falsa patrabit: faciet enim ignem de Coelis descendere: dabit imagini bestiae vim loquendi: finget se mori, & resurgere: item per fraudes & dolos Regnum Judaeorum adipiscetur: pugnabit cum tribus Regibus, nimirum Aegypti, Libiae, atque Aethiopiae, eorumque Regna, illis devictis, occupabit: subjicet sibi alios septem Reges, eoque modo Monarcha Mundi evadet: cum innumerabili exercitu Christianos toto Orbe persequetur. De his, quomodo singula de Antichristo probentur, videatur Bellarm. *loc. cit.* Omnes autem boni summe detestabuntur impudentem calumniam eorum, qui ex Vicario Christi belluam tam terribilem efformare non formidant.

is most characteristic of God, and then observes what the Pope has usurped for himself, even if he be a ten-year-old boy, will not have much difficulty in recognizing the Antichrist.”

425. Cardinal Bellarmine, among others, extensively and vigorously refutes this horrible calumny in Volume 1 of his Controversies, Book 3, through several chapters, which Coccus summarizes in his Thesaurus, Volume 1, Book 7. It is proven first: The name of Antichrist (which signifies an enemy and rival of Christ) does not befit the Roman Pontiff, who acknowledges himself as a servant and subject to Christ in all things. Second: Many Supreme Pontiffs have already succeeded one another in great number; Antichrist will be one single individual. Third, Antichrist has not yet come, and his proper name remains unknown; but if he were the Supreme Pontiff, certainly his name would be known with certainty. Fourth, Antichrist will be a Jew born from the Tribe of Dan: but which of the Supreme Pontiffs was ever Jewish by lineage, religion, or in any manner? Which of them was accepted by the Jews as the Messiah? Fifth, Antichrist will sit in Solomon's Temple in Jerusalem; yet it is credible that no Supreme Pontiff has been in Jerusalem since the year 600. Sixth, Antichrist will deny that JESUS is the Christ: indeed, he will teach that he himself is the true Christ promised in the Law and the Prophets: that he alone is GOD: has any Supreme Pontiff ever taught such things? Seventh, Antichrist will perform false miracles: for he will cause fire to descend from Heaven; he will give the image of the beast the power of speech; he will pretend to die and rise again; likewise, through frauds and deceptions he will obtain the Kingdom of the Jews; he will fight with three Kings, namely those of Egypt, Libya, and Ethiopia, and after conquering them, will occupy their kingdoms; he will subject seven other Kings to himself, and in this way will become Monarch of the World; he will persecute Christians throughout the whole world with an innumerable army. Concerning these matters, and how each applies to the Antichrist, see Bellarmine in the cited location. All good people will utterly detest the impudent

426. Si apud multos Adversarios haec propositio: *Papa est Antichristus*, est articulus fidei, tunc apud ipsos est necessario credendus. Si autem non est articulus fidei, quare ergo tale quid docent & credunt? Non autem esse articulum fidei, constat ex ipsorum perpetuo principio: illud enim statuunt pro articulo fidei, quod ex obvio Scripturae sensu quilibet fidelis ac illiteratus absque difficultate eruere potest. At veritatem dictae propositionis quilibet fidelis ac illiteratus Adversarius ex obvio al: cuius Scripturae sensu eruere non valet; imo nec literatissimi quoque. Ergo dicta propositio non est articulus fidei: ergo nec credenda.

427. Multi (ut recte instat Godefrid. Volusius in *Aurora Pacis Religiosae pag. mihi 33.*) quos ipsi Protestantes pro Sanctis & piis habent, ante Lutherum Romano Pontifici communicarunt, & eum non pro Antichristo, sed Christi supremo & Oecumenico in his terris Vicario agnoverunt. Talis fuit Augustinus, Benedictus, Bernardus, Dominicus, Franciscus &c. viri literis magis e Coelo, quam humanitus exculiti, quibus nec scientia deerat ejusmodi articulum ex Scriptura eruendi, nec conscientia illum intrepide coram toto mundo profitendi.

428. Teste eodem Volusio inter ipsos Protestantes non pauci reperiuntur, qui hunc articulum fidei nec verum nec necessarium agnoscunt. Ex iis sua aetate notus ipsi erat in Germania Conradus Bergius Professor Bremensis in paucis doctus & moderatus. In Anglia H. Hammond. Professor Oxoniensis, cui Maresius (Aatholicus) his verbis insultat: *Eo furoris hic Hammond processit, ut causam Papae ex professo propugnet, eumque esse Antichristum neget.* Ipse Hammond id recenset, & hanc dicam false irridet in *Commentar. de Confirmatione per impositionem manuum Episcopi* cap. 1. Sect. 11. pag. 8. Eandem assertionem confirmat Serenissimi Angliae Regis Jacobi ingenua confessio, quae habetur in eius

calumny of those who do not hesitate to transform the Vicar of Christ into such a terrible beast.

426. If among many Adversaries this proposition: *The Pope is Antichrist*, is an article of faith, then it must necessarily be believed by them. If, however, it is not an article of faith, why then do they teach and believe such a thing? That it is not an article of faith is evident from their own perpetual principle: for they establish as an article of faith that which any faithful and unlettered person can extract without difficulty from the obvious sense of Scripture. But any faithful and unlettered Adversary cannot extract the truth of the said proposition from the obvious sense of any Scripture; indeed, not even the most learned can do so. Therefore, the said proposition is not an article of faith; therefore, it ought not to be believed.

427. Many (as Gottfried Volusius correctly insists in *Aurora Pacis Religiosae, page 33 in my edition*) whom the Protestants themselves consider as Saints and pious men, before Luther communicated with the Roman Pontiff, and acknowledged him not as Antichrist, but as Christ's supreme and Ecumenical Vicar on this earth. Such were Augustine, Benedict, Bernard, Dominic, Francis, etc., men cultivated by learning more from Heaven than from human sources, who neither lacked the knowledge to extract such an article from Scripture, nor the conscience to profess it intrepidly before the whole world.

428. According to this same Volusius, not a few among the Protestants themselves can be found who acknowledge this article of faith as neither true nor necessary. Among these, in his time, was known to him in Germany Conradus Bergius, Professor at Bremen, a man exceptionally learned and moderate. In England, H. Hammond, Professor at Oxford, whom Maresius (a non-Catholic) insults with these words: *This Hammond has proceeded to such madness that he openly defends the cause of the Pope and denies that he is the Antichrist.* Hammond himself recounts this and rightly ridicules this accusation in his *Commentary on Confirmation by the Imposition of the Bishop's Hands*, chapter 1, Section 11, page 8. The same assertion is confirmed by the ingenuous confession

Apologia pro iuramento fidelitatis in praefat. monitoria: ubi sic inquit: “Sane quoad definitionem Antichristi, nolo rem tam obscuram & involutam tanquam omnibus Christianis ad credendum necessariam urgere &c. In disputatione tanta scrutari nos Scripturas oportet, ut veritatem eruamus.” Ergo iuxta Sententiam Regis Angliae non patet ex obvio Scripturae sensu, Papam esse Antichristum, ac proinde non est articulus fidei necessarius.

429. Ex Augustanis sine dubio praememoratis annumerandi sunt Auctores formulae interim, speciatim Calixtus & Hornaeus a Volusio allegati, qui eo ipso, quod Romanam Ecclesiam in fundamentalibus ad salutem perstitisse fateantur, Antichristianismum Romani Pontificis exploserunt. Esto etiam hinc inde aliter ab ipsis scriptum reperiatur, id factum forte in juvenilibus annis, & quando ex lectione SS. Patrum nondum ita defoecati erant ingenii. Id ex Augustanis agnovisse, dicit Volusius, Lubicensem Hierarcham Lutheranum & veteranum Theologum Menonem Hanckenium in *Irenico suo* p. 825. ibi: Ob der Pabst der grosse Antichrist sey, ist eben kein zu der Seeligkeit nothiger Lehr-Punct, wann wir nur unsern lieben HErrn Christum und dessen, von ihm in seinem Wort vorgeschriebene Religions-Puncta behalten, so mag es umb den Pabst und sein Reich beschaffen seyn, wie es wolle, wie dann vil tausend unter uns seynd, die vom Pabst und grossen Antichrist nichts zu sagen wissen, aber doch GOTTes liebe Kinder seyn können.

430. Quibus annectendum, nec in primis illis & Oecumenicis Symbolis, nec in Augustana Confessione hujus articuli vel minimam ingeri mentionem: Igitur nec certus nec ad salutem necessarius est: praesertim quod Lutherus Apocalypsin de authenticam concedere nolit. Confer Cleopham Distelmeyer, qui viginti palmaribus rationibus ex Petro Tyraeo Latino scriptore, in idioma Germanicum

of the Most Serene King of England, James, which is found in his *Apology for the Oath of Allegiance* in the prefatory admonition, where he speaks thus: “Truly, regarding the definition of the Antichrist, I do not wish to press a matter so obscure and convoluted as if it were necessary for all Christians to believe, etc. In such a great dispute, we ought to search the Scriptures to discover the truth.” Therefore, according to the opinion of the King of England, it is not evident from the plain sense of Scripture that the Pope is the Antichrist, and consequently it is not a necessary article of faith.

429. Without doubt, among the aforementioned Augsburg [theologians] must be counted the authors of the Interim formula, especially Calixtus and Horneius cited by Volusius, who, by the very fact that they acknowledge the Roman Church has persisted in fundamentals necessary for salvation, have rejected the notion of Antichristianism attributed to the Roman Pontiff. Even if here and there other statements may be found written by them, this perhaps occurred in their younger years, and when, from their reading of the Holy Fathers, their intellect was not yet so refined. Volusius states that Meno Hanckius, the Lutheran Hierarch of Lübeck and a veteran theologian, recognized this from the Augsburg [theologians] in his *Irenicum*, p. 825, where he writes: “Whether the Pope is the great Antichrist is not a doctrinal point necessary for salvation; if we only retain our dear Lord Christ and the articles of religion prescribed by Him in His Word, then the Pope and his kingdom may be constituted however they may be. Indeed, there are many thousands among us who know nothing to say about the Pope and the great Antichrist, yet who can still be God’s dear children.”

430. To these must be added that neither in those first and Ecumenical Creeds, nor in the Augsburg Confession, is even the slightest mention of this article introduced. Therefore, it is neither certain nor necessary for salvation, especially since Luther was unwilling to grant the Apocalypse as authentic. Consult Cleophas Distelmeyer, who, with twenty compelling arguments from Peter Tyraeus, a Latin writer translated into the German

traducto, Romanum Pontificem a summa injuria imputati Antichristianismi egregie vindicat. Quodque haec gravissima injuria, Capiti illata, in universum Corpus Ecclesiae Catholicae redundet, per se patet: nam omnes Catholici, etiam Imperatores, Reges, & Principes Romanum & Summum Pontificem tanquam filii obedientes Patrem suum Spiritualem venerantur, & sectantur. Si ergo S. Pontifex esset Antichristus, omnes Christiani Catholici forent Antichristiani, adeoque peiores, quam omnes Mahumetani, & pagani, utpote de quorum Capite vel Supremo Principe nostri Novatores non solent scribere & docere, quod sit Antichristus Bestia illa saevissima, & infernalis. Satis de his. Progrediemur ad materiam de fide Divina.

idiom, excellently vindicates the Roman Pontiff from the grave injustice of the imputed Antichristianism. And that this most serious injury, inflicted upon the Head, redounds upon the whole Body of the Catholic Church is self-evident: for all Catholics, including Emperors, Kings, and Princes, venerate and follow the Roman and Supreme Pontiff as obedient children do their Spiritual Father. If, therefore, the Holy Pontiff were the Antichrist, all Catholic Christians would be Antichristians, and thus worse than all Mohammedans and pagans, about whose Head or Supreme Prince our Innovators do not usually write and teach that he is the Antichrist, that most savage and infernal Beast. Enough of these matters. Let us proceed to the subject of Divine faith.