

Clypeus theologiae Thomisticae, Tomus IV (*Shield of Thomistic Theology, Volume 4*)

by Joannes Baptista Gonet (Jean-Baptiste Gonet), 1680

[Online Location of Text Here](#)

- OCR of the original text by AI (claude-sonnet-4-5-20250929).
- Translation of the original text performed by AI (claude-sonnet-4-5-20250929).
- Last Edit: November 16, 2025.
- Version: 1.0
- Selection pages: 261-264

Tractatus Decimus, Disputatio Quarta, Articulus IV

Latin

ARTICULUS IV.

An facta legitima electione Summi Pontificis, immediatè & per se primò sit de fide, hanc personam in particulari, v. g. Innocentium XI. esse verè Pontificem?

§. I. *Quibusdam præmissis referuntur sententiæ.*

Suppono primò dupliciter aliquid dici posse de fide divina, nimirum vel immediatè, sive formaliter, vel mediatè tantùm, sive virtualiter. Illud dicitur esse de fide divina immediatè, quòd immediatè revelatum est à Deo; mediatè verò, quod evidenter infertur ex una propositione immediatè à Deo revelata, & ex alia lumine naturali nota. Exemplum veritatis primi generis est, quòd Christus sit homo; secundi, quòd sit risibilis.

Suppono secundò, difficultatem in titulo propositam non esse de Summo Pontifice, cujus electionem nullam esse declaravit Ecclesia, nec de eo cujus electio est dubia, & nondum determinata, sed de Summo Pontifice quem legitimè electum fuisse

English

ARTICLE IV.

Whether, once a legitimate election of the Supreme Pontiff has been made, it is immediately and per se primarily a matter of faith that this person in particular, for example Innocent XI, is truly the Pontiff?

§. I. *With certain premises having been set forth, the opinions are reported.*

I suppose first that something can be said to be of divine faith in two ways, namely either immediately, or formally, or only mediatly, or virtually. That is said to be of divine faith immediately which is immediately revealed by God; mediatly, however, that which is evidently inferred from one proposition immediately revealed by God, and from another known by natural light. An example of a truth of the first kind is that Christ is man; of the second, that he is capable of laughter.

I suppose second that the difficulty proposed in the title is not about a Supreme Pontiff whose election the Church has declared to be null, nor about one whose election is doubtful and not yet determined, but about a Supreme Pontiff whom the Church has

declaravit Ecclesia, acceptando eum in Summum Pontificem. Ideoque in titulo posuimus, *factâ legitimâ electione Summi Pontificis*. De illo ergo Pontifice legitime electo, & ab Ecclesia acceptato, qualis nunc est Innocentius XI. feliciter Ecclesiam regens, inquirimus, an immediatè & per se primò sit de fide illum esse verè Pontificem & Ecclesiæ caput?

Partem negantem tenere videntur ex Thomistis Turrecremata, Cano, & Bannez: expressè verò eam docet extra Scholam D. Thomæ Alphonsus à Castro lib. 1. adversus hæreses cap. 9. ubi hæc scribit: *Quamvis credere teneamur ex fide, verum Christi successorem esse supremum totius Ecclesiæ Pastorem, non tamen tenemur eadem fide credere, Leonem, aut Clementem esse verum Petri successorem, quia non tenemur ex fide Catholica credere, eorum quemlibet rectè & canonicè fuisse electum*. Unde concludit, quòd qui hoc negaret, non esset dicendus hæreticus, sed schismaticus.

Affirmativa tamen sententia communior est inter Theologos, eamque ex Thomistis expressè docent Joannes à S. Thoma 2. 2. Tractatu de Summo Pontifice disp. 2. art. 2. & Dominicus à S. Trinitate tomo 3. Bibliothecæ Theologicæ libro 3. sect. 4. cap. 10. ubi eruditè hanc quæstionem pertractat. Est tamen inter Authores hujus sententiæ aliqua differentia, quia aliqui dicunt non statim ac aliquis est acceptatus ab Ecclesia in Summum Pontificem, esse de fide quòd sit verus Papa, sed solùm à tempore quo incipit exercere aliquos actus Summi Pontificis proprios, quales sunt definitiones propositionum ad fidem pertinentium; tunc enim (inquiunt) simul definit & determinat se esse Summum Pontificem. Alii verò dicunt statim ac pro Summo Pontifice acceptatur ab Ecclesia, de fide esse immediatè quòd sit verus Papa.

§. II. *Vera sententia duplici conclusione*

declared to have been legitimately elected, by accepting him as Supreme Pontiff. Therefore in the title we have placed, *once a legitimate election of the Supreme Pontiff has been made*. Concerning that Pontiff therefore who has been legitimately elected and accepted by the Church, such as now is Innocent XI happily governing the Church, we inquire whether it is immediately and per se primarily a matter of faith that he is truly the Pontiff and head of the Church?

Among the Thomists, Torquemada, Cano, and Báñez appear to hold the negative position: but outside the School of Saint Thomas, Alfonso de Castro expressly teaches this in book 1 against heresies chapter 9, where he writes these things: *Although we are bound to believe by faith that the true successor of Christ is the supreme Pastor of the entire Church, nevertheless we are not bound by the same faith to believe that Leo or Clement is the true successor of Peter, because we are not bound by Catholic faith to believe that any one of them was rightly and canonically elected*. Whence he concludes that one who would deny this ought not to be called a heretic, but a schismatic.

The affirmative opinion is nevertheless more common among Theologians, and among the Thomists it is expressly taught by John of St. Thomas in 2. 2. Treatise on the Supreme Pontiff disp. 2. art. 2. and Dominic of the Holy Trinity in tome 3. of the Theological Library book 3. sect. 4. cap. 10. where he learnedly treats this question. There is nevertheless some difference among the Authors of this opinion, because some say that not immediately when someone is accepted by the Church as Supreme Pontiff is it a matter of faith that he is the true Pope, but only from the time when he begins to exercise some acts proper to the Supreme Pontiff, such as definitions of propositions pertaining to faith; for then (they say) he simultaneously defines and determines himself to be the Supreme Pontiff. Others however say that immediately when he is accepted by the Church as Supreme Pontiff, it is immediately a matter of faith that he is the true Pope.

§. II. *The true opinion is established by a*

statuitur.

Dico primò: Fide divinâ constat, Romanum Pontificem pro tempore existentem, esse legitimum Petri successorem, & verum Christi Vicarium, quando aliquid definit fide divinâ credendum.

Probat: Cùm Pontifex definit aliquid fide divinâ credendum, de fide est ipsum tunc habere potestatem definiendi, & infallibilem assistentiam Spiritus Sancti: Ergo & tunc fide divinâ constat, ipsum esse verum Pontificem. Consequentia patet, quia hujusmodi potestas & assistentia non datur nisi vero Pontifici, cui soli est promissa in persona Petri, cujus est successor: Christus enim non cuilibet, sed Petro tantùm & legitimis successoribus dixit: *Tu es Petrus, &c. Rogavi pro te &c. Pasce oves meas &c.* Matth. 16. Lucæ 22. Joan. 21. Antecedens etiam videtur manifestum, cùm enim Pontifex definit aliquid tanquam de fide tenendum, impossibile est quòd fide credamus illud objectum tanquam definitum, & non credamus ipsam definitionem esse legitimam, & consequenter ipsum definientem hîc & nunc infallibilem auctoritatem & assistentiam Spiritus Sancti habere.

Confirmatur & magis illustratur hæc ratio: Cùm Pontifex definit aliquid fide divinâ credendum, eo ipso seipsum proponit tanquam regulam fidei nostræ: Ergo tunc fide divinâ constat, ipsum esse verum Pontificem. Antecedens manifestum est, Pontifex enim definiendo aliquid ad fidem pertinens, seipsum proponit tanquam judicem legitimum controversiarum fidei, subindeque tanquam veram regulam doctrinæ nostræ fidei. Consequentia verò probatur: Quando aliquid est regula fidei, non minùs credibile per fidem esse debet, quod sit regula quàm quod sit de fide id quod determinatur & regulatur per illam: sicut quando proponitur aliquis Scripturæ liber tanquam canonicus, quemadmodum est de fide totum id quod in eo continetur, ita quoque est de fide quod talis liber sit canonicus, & per revelationem Dei habitus; aliàs certi nunquam esse possemus de rebus

twofold conclusion.

I say first: It is established by divine faith that the Roman Pontiff existing for the time being is the legitimate successor of Peter and the true Vicar of Christ, when he defines something to be believed by divine faith.

It is proven: When the Pontiff defines something to be believed by divine faith, it is of faith that he then has the power of defining, and the infallible assistance of the Holy Spirit: Therefore it is also then established by divine faith that he is the true Pontiff. The consequence is evident, because such power and assistance is given only to the true Pontiff, to whom alone it is promised in the person of Peter, whose successor he is: for Christ said not to anyone, but to Peter alone and to his legitimate successors: *You are Peter, etc. I have prayed for you etc. Feed my sheep etc.* Matt. 16. Luke 22. John 21. The antecedent also seems manifest, for when the Pontiff defines something as to be held of faith, it is impossible that we should believe by faith that object as defined, and not believe that the definition itself is legitimate, and consequently that the one defining has here and now infallible authority and assistance of the Holy Spirit.

This reasoning is confirmed and more clearly illustrated: When the Pontiff defines something to be believed by divine faith, by that very act he proposes himself as the rule of our faith: Therefore it is then established by divine faith that he is the true Pontiff. The antecedent is manifest, for the Pontiff, by defining something pertaining to faith, proposes himself as the legitimate judge of controversies of faith, and consequently as the true rule of the doctrine of our faith. The consequent, moreover, is proved thus: When something is a rule of faith, it must be no less credible through faith that it is a rule than that what is determined and regulated through it is of the faith: just as when some book of Scripture is proposed as canonical, just as everything contained in it is of the faith, so also it is of the faith that such a book is canonical and received through God's revelation; otherwise we could never be certain about the things defined and handed down in

definitis, & traditis in libro Sacro, ut per se patet: Ergo si cùm Pontifex aliquid fide divinâ credendum definit, eo ipso seipsum tanquam regulam fidei nostræ proponit, ad eandem quoque fidem tanquam quid credibile per illam spectare debet, illum esse verum Pontificem. Neque enim minùs id requiritur in regula fidei viva, quàm in regula mortua.

Dices, Licet Prædicatores Evangelii nobis res fidei credendas proponant, non tamen fide tenemur credere, quòd sint legitimi Evangelii Prædicatores: Ergo pariter quamvis Pontifex aliquid de fide credendum nobis proponat, non tenemur fide divinâ credere, ipsum esse verum Pontificem, & legitimum Christi Vicarium, ac Petri successorem, sed sufficit quòd fidem humanam & moralem certitudinem de hoc habeamus.

Sed contra: Hoc intercedit discrimen inter Summum Pontificem res fidei suâ definitione credendas proponentem, & inter ministrum Evangelicum illas prædicantem, quod iste non se habet tanquam regula determinativa rerum fidei, sed ut minister duntaxat intimans & denuntians aliis quæ credenda sunt: unde nec tenemur credere ipsum esse verum ac legitimum ministrum, nec illi qui credunt rebus ab eo propositis, moventur ad hoc ex illius autoritate, sed ex credibilitate eorum quæ proponuntur; ita ut nisi sufficienter proponantur, talisque credibilitas eis innotescat credere non teneantur. At verò Summus Pontifex proponit res credendas, tanquam animata fidei regula, vel supremus iudex determinans quænam credenda sint, ita ut ex ejus autoritate obligentur fideles ad illas credendas: unde necesse est ut illi non morali solum certitudine, cui absolute falsum subesse potest, verum etiam certitudine fidei, hunc numero Pontificem pro tempore existentem ac Ecclesiam regentem, verum esse illius Pontificem, & legitimum Christi Vicarium ac Petri successorem credant.

Dico secundò; de fide est, etiam immediate, hunc hominem in particulari, v. g.

Sacred Scripture, as is evident in itself: Therefore if when the Pontiff defines something to be believed by divine faith, by that very act he proposes himself as the rule of our faith, it must also pertain to the same faith as something credible through it, that he is the true Pontiff. For this is required no less in a living rule of faith than in a dead rule.

You say: Although the Preachers of the Gospel propose to us things of faith to be believed, nevertheless we are not bound by faith to believe that they are legitimate Preachers of the Gospel: Therefore likewise, although the Pontiff proposes to us something of faith to be believed, we are not bound by divine faith to believe that he is the true Pontiff and legitimate Vicar of Christ and successor of Peter, but it suffices that we have human faith and moral certitude concerning this.

But on the contrary: This distinction exists between the Supreme Pontiff proposing things of faith to be believed by his definition, and the evangelical minister preaching them, that the latter does not conduct himself as a determinative rule of things of faith, but only as a minister announcing and declaring to others what things are to be believed: whence neither are we bound to believe that he is a true and legitimate minister, nor are those who believe in the things proposed by him moved to this by his authority, but by the credibility of those things which are proposed; so that unless they are sufficiently proposed, and such credibility becomes known to them, they are not bound to believe. But truly the Supreme Pontiff proposes things to be believed as the animate rule of faith, or supreme judge determining what things are to be believed, so that by his authority the faithful are obliged to believe them: whence it is necessary that they believe, not with moral certitude alone, under which something absolutely false can lie, but truly also with the certitude of faith, that this particular Pontiff existing for the time and ruling the Church is the true Pontiff of that same [Church], and legitimate Vicar of Christ and successor of Peter.

I say secondly; it is of faith, even immediately, that

Innocentium XI. esse verum Papam, non solum ab eo tempore quo aliquid de fide determinavit, & Ecclesiae credendum proposuit, sed etiam ab illo tempore quo ejus electionem fuisse validam declaravit Ecclesia.

Probatur primò: Ab eo tempore de fide est immediatè, hunc hominem in particulari esse veram regulam fidei nostrae, subindeque verum Papam à quo acceptatus est ab Ecclesia in talem regulam: Sed à tempore à quo ejus electio valida declaratur ab Ecclesia, acceptatur ab ea in regulam fidei nostrae: Ergo ab eo tempore de fide est immediatè quod sit verus Papa. Minor constat, Major verò probatur. De fide est etiam immediatè quod Ecclesia errare non possit in acceptanda regula fidei nostrae, aliàs enim non esset de fide immediatè quod esset consequenter indefectibilis in acceptandis rebus fidei regulatis per talem regulam: Ergo ab eo tempore quo Ecclesia hunc numero hominem acceptat in regulam fidei nostrae, de fide est etiam immediatè quòd sit verè talis regula.

Probatur secundò: De fide credimus hanc numero Ecclesiam in qua modò sumus esse veram & perfectam Ecclesiam: sed facta electione pacificâ, & acceptatâ, non potest haberi pro vera & perfecta Ecclesia illa quae non fuerit unita cum suo capite visibili, eique subjecta: Ergo oportet quod sicut est de fide, hanc numero Ecclesiam esse veram & perfectam Ecclesiam, ita sit de fide, factâ legitimâ electione, quod iste homo cui tanquam capiti suo unitur, sit verè caput Ecclesiae, & Summus Pontifex.

Nec dici potest, quod sit tantum de fide in Ecclesia esse caput aliquod visibile, non tamen hoc determinatè & in particulari; sed hoc, aut illud, confusè & indeterminatè. Sicut enim nequit intelligi Ecclesia in communi, absque aliquo capite in communi; ita neque hæc determinata Ecclesia, absque determinato capite: nam hæc determinata Ecclesia ita includit hoc determinatum caput morale, sicut hoc determinatum corpus physicum includit hoc determinatum caput

this man in particular, for example Innocent XI, is the true Pope, not only from that time when he determined something concerning faith and proposed it to the Church for belief, but also from that time when the Church declared his election to have been valid.

It is proved firstly: From that time it is immediately of faith that this man in particular is the true rule of our faith, and consequently the true Pope, from which time he has been accepted by the Church as such a rule: But from the time when his election is declared valid by the Church, he is accepted by it as the rule of our faith: Therefore from that time it is immediately of faith that he is the true Pope. The minor premise is evident, but the major premise is proved. It is also immediately of faith that the Church cannot err in accepting the rule of our faith, for otherwise it would not be immediately of faith that it would be consequently indefectible in accepting matters of faith regulated through such a rule: Therefore from that time when the Church accepts this particular man as the rule of our faith, it is also immediately of faith that he is truly such a rule.

It is proven secondly: We believe by faith that this Church in which we now are is the true and perfect Church: but once a peaceful election has been made and accepted, that [church] which has not been united with its visible head and subject to him cannot be held to be the true and perfect Church: Therefore it is fitting that just as it is a matter of faith that this Church is the true and perfect Church, so it should be a matter of faith, once a legitimate election has been made, that this man to whom [the Church] is united as to its head, is truly the head of the Church and the Supreme Pontiff.

Nor can it be said that it is only a matter of faith that there be some visible head in the Church, but not this one determinately and in particular; rather this one or that one, confusedly and indeterminately. For just as the Church in general cannot be understood without some head in general, so neither can this determinate Church exist without a determinate head: for this determinate Church thus includes this determinate moral head, just as this determinate physical body

physicum: Ergo sicut qui credit, Christum habere determinatum corpus physicum, fieri non potest, quin simul credat Christum habere determinatum caput physicum: ita qui credit hanc esse determinatam Ecclesiam, debet simul credere hanc Ecclesiam habere determinatum caput morale, quo mysticè constat. Unde in *Bulla Martini V.* quæ habetur in Concilio Constantiensi, inter eas interrogationes quæ faciendæ sunt suspectis in fide, ad indagandum, an sint hæretici vel non? ponitur ista: *Utrum credant quòd Papa canonicè electus, qui pro tempore fuerit, ejus proprio nomine expresso, sit successor B. Petri, habens supremam auctoritatem in Ecclesia Dei?* Quæ verba intelligi nequeunt de veritate illius propositionis in communi, quòd omnis ritè electus est Summus Pontifex, vel quòd Ecclesia aliquod caput visibile habere debeat, sed in particulari de eo qui pro tempore est Pontifex, exprimendo nomen proprium, v. g. Innocentium XI. Supponit ergo Pontifex, fide divinâ credendum esse, hunc hominem in particulari, quem tota Ecclesia tanquam legitime electum agnoscit & recipit, esse Summum Pontificem: utpotè cùm per negationem vel affirmationem illius quod est tantum de fide humana, discerni nequeat hæreticus à Catholico, & cùm admittere id quod per discursum ex principiis fide divinâ creditis inferitur, non sit credere, sed conclusioni Theologicæ præbere assensum, ut in disputatione proœmiali ad totam Theologiam, declaravimus.

§. III. *Solvuntur objectiones.*

OBjicies primò: Ut aliquid sit immediatè de fide, necesse est quod immediatè à Deo revelatum sit. Sed non est immediatè revelatum à Deo, quòd Innocentius XI. sit verus Papa: Ergo hoc non est immediatè de fide. Major constat, Minor verò probatur. Quæ immediatè à Deo revelata sunt, habentur vel in Scriptura vel in traditione: At nullus Scripturæ locus, nec ulla traditio divina assignari potest, quæ mentionem

includes this determinate physical head. Therefore, just as one who believes that Christ has a determinate physical body cannot but simultaneously believe that Christ has a determinate physical head, so one who believes this to be a determinate Church must simultaneously believe that this Church has a determinate moral head, by which it mystically consists. Hence in the *Bull of Martin V.* which is found in the Council of Constance, among those interrogations which are to be made of those suspect in faith, to investigate whether they are heretics or not, this one is placed: *Whether they believe that the Pope canonically elected, whoever he may be for the time being, with his proper name expressed, is the successor of Blessed Peter, having supreme authority in the Church of God?* These words cannot be understood concerning the truth of that proposition in general, that everyone rightly elected is Supreme Pontiff, or that the Church ought to have some visible head, but in particular concerning him who for the time being is Pontiff, expressing the proper name, for example, Innocent XI. Therefore the Pontiff supposes that it is to be believed by divine faith that this man in particular, whom the whole Church recognizes and receives as legitimately elected, is the Supreme Pontiff: inasmuch as through the negation or affirmation of that which is only a matter of human faith, a heretic cannot be discerned from a Catholic, and since to admit that which is inferred by reasoning from principles believed by divine faith is not to believe, but to give assent to a theological conclusion, as we have declared in the proœmial disputation to all Theology.

§. III. *Objections are resolved.*

YOU will object first: For something to be immediately of faith, it is necessary that it be immediately revealed by God. But it is not immediately revealed by God that Innocent XI is the true Pope: Therefore this is not immediately of faith. The major premise is established, but the minor is proved thus. Those things which are immediately revealed by God are contained either in Scripture or in tradition: But no place in

faciat istius propositionis: *Innocentius XI. est verus Papa*: Ergo illa non est immediatè revelata à Deo.

REspondeo, concessâ Majori, negando Minorem, & ad illius probationem dico, hanc veritatem immediatè à Deo revelatam fuisse, revelatione illa universali, quæ ex una parte Deus revelavit quòd potestas summa Petro collata, transitura est ad successores legitimos, & ex alia Ecclesiam universalem nunquam in rebus fidei erraturam, cùm sit columna & firmamentum veritatis: in illis enim propositionibus universalibus à Deo relatis, continetur formaliter, & ut pars in suo toto, ista: Hic numero Pontifex, quem ut ritè electum acceptat Ecclesia, est verus Pontifex.

Ut hoc magis declaretur, & solvatur instantia quæ posset fieri contra hanc solutionem: Notandum est cum P. Dominico à S. Trinitate, suprâ citato: aliqua revelata fuisse à Deo in genere, ad hoc ut crederentur in genere, cujusmodi sunt, Deum omnia posse quæ non involvunt contradictionem, & similia: hæc enim fideles non tenentur credere in individuo, v. g. nemo tenetur ad credendum quòd Deus possit talem vel talem creaturam producere; sed sufficit quod in communi & generaliter credat, Dei potentiam esse infinitam, & ad id omne quod factibile est posse se extendere. Alia verò Deus revelavit in genere, ad hoc ut crederentur in specie & in individuo, cujusmodi sunt ista: Quodlibet universale Concilium legitimè congregatum, totamque Ecclesiam repræsentans, verum est, & obligat fideles ut ejus definitiones recipiant. Quilibet Pontifex ritè electus, & ab Ecclesia acceptatus, verus est Pontifex, successor Petri, ac Vicarius Christi. Istæ enim generales revelationes obligant fideles ad assensum individuum circa tale Concilium in particulari ab Ecclesia receptum, v.g. Nicænum, vel Tridentinum; & ad credendum hunc numero Pontificem ritè electum, & ab Ecclesia acceptatum, v. g. Innocentium XI. esse verum Pontificem; quia universalis Ecclesiæ acceptatio substituitur collectioni omnium

Scripture, nor any divine tradition can be assigned, which makes mention of this proposition: *Innocent XI is the true Pope*: Therefore that is not immediately revealed by God.

I RESPOND, the Major being conceded, by denying the Minor, and to its proof I say that this truth was immediately revealed by God by that universal revelation, which on one part God revealed that the supreme power conferred upon Peter would pass to legitimate successors, and on the other that the universal Church would never err in matters of faith, since it is the pillar and foundation of truth: for in those universal propositions related by God, there is contained formally, and as a part in its whole, this: This particular Pontiff, whom the Church accepts as duly elected, is the true Pontiff.

In order that this may be more clearly declared, and that the objection which could be made against this solution may be resolved: It must be noted with Father Dominic of the Holy Trinity, cited above: that some things have been revealed by God in general, so that they might be believed in general, of which sort are these: that God can do all things which do not involve contradiction, and similar matters: for the faithful are not bound to believe these in particular, e.g. no one is bound to believe that God can produce this or that particular creature; but it suffices that one believe in common and generally that the power of God is infinite, and that it can extend to everything that is feasible. But other things God has revealed in general, so that they might be believed in species and in particular, of which sort are these: Any universal Council legitimately assembled, and representing the whole Church, is true, and obliges the faithful to receive its definitions. Any Pontiff rightly elected, and accepted by the Church, is the true Pontiff, successor of Peter, and Vicar of Christ. For these general revelations oblige the faithful to individual assent concerning such a Council in particular received by the Church, e.g. Nicaea, or Trent; and to believing that this particular Pontiff rightly elected, and accepted by the Church, e.g. Innocent XI, is the true Pontiff; because the acceptance of the universal Church substitutes for the collection

revelationum individualium, quas non expediebat Deum facere: vel ut ait prædictus Author, vox Ecclesiæ est quasi nova quædam locutio Dei, vel potius explicatio & complementum locutionis divinæ, per quam intelligitur ipsemet Deus revelare hoc objectum in individuo, quod nimirum hic numero Pontifex ritè electus, sit verus Pontifex.

Objicies secundò: Ut sit de fide immediatè, hunc numero hominem esse verum Papam, debet esse certum quod sit capax talis dignitatis: Sed non est certum talem hominem esse subjectum capax Pontificiæ dignitatis: Ergo non est de fide, saltem immediatè, quòd sit verus Papa. Major constat, Minor verò probatur. Ut electus in Summum Pontificem sit capax hujus dignitatis, debet esse validè baptizatus: Sed non est certum tali certitudine cui non possit subesse falsum, quòd fuerit validè baptizatus, maximè cùm non habeatur certitudo de intentione ministri qui ipsum baptizavit: Ergo non est certum tali certitudine cui non possit subesse falsum, talem hominem esse subjectum capax Pontificiæ dignitatis.

Confirmatur: Si in Papam eligatur aliquis qui non est Episcopus, consequenter ad sui electionem consecratur in Episcopum: non est autem magis certum, eum in tali consecratione suscipere characterem Episcopalem, quàm reliquos Episcopos: Ergo sicut hoc non est certum tali certitudine cui non possit subesse falsum de aliis Episcopis, ita nec de eo qui electus est in Summum Pontificem, & acceptatus ab Ecclesia.

Respondeo ad objectionem, distinguendo Majorem: Ut sit certum de fide immediatè quòd hic numero homo est verus Papa, debet esse certum quod sit capax talis dignitatis, certitudine fidei, nego: hoc enim se habet duntaxat per modum prærequisiti & dispositionis ut aliquis acceptetur in Summum Pontificem ab Ecclesia. Certitudine consequentiæ Theologicæ,

of all individual revelations, which it was not expedient for God to make: or as the aforesaid Author says, the voice of the Church is as it were a certain new speaking of God, or rather an explication and complement of the divine speaking, through which it is understood that God himself reveals this object in particular, namely that this particular Pontiff rightly elected, is the true Pontiff.

You will object secondly: In order that it be immediately a matter of faith that this particular man is the true Pope, it must be certain that he is capable of such dignity: But it is not certain that such a man is a subject capable of Pontifical dignity: Therefore it is not a matter of faith, at least not immediately, that he is the true Pope. The major premise is established, but the minor is proved thus. In order that one elected to the Supreme Pontificate be capable of this dignity, he must be validly baptized: But it is not certain with such certitude to which falsehood cannot underlie, that he was validly baptized, especially since there is no certitude concerning the intention of the minister who baptized him: Therefore it is not certain with such certitude to which falsehood cannot underlie, that such a man is a subject capable of Pontifical dignity.

This is confirmed: If someone who is not a Bishop is elected Pope, consequently upon his election he is consecrated as Bishop: but it is no more certain that he receives the Episcopal character in such consecration than other Bishops do: Therefore just as this is not certain with such certitude to which falsehood cannot underlie concerning other Bishops, so neither is it concerning him who is elected to the Supreme Pontificate and accepted by the Church.

I respond to the objection, distinguishing the Major premise: That it be certain by faith immediately that this particular man is the true Pope, it must be certain that he is capable of such dignity, with the certitude of faith, I deny: for this pertains only by way of prerequisite and disposition so that someone may be accepted as Supreme Pontiff by the Church. With the certitude of theological consequence, I make a

subdistinguo: Consequenter ad ipsam acceptationem Ecclesiae, conceditur. Antecedenter ad illam, negatur: tunc enim solâ morali certitudine hoc certum est.

Explicatur solutio. Antequam aliquis acceptetur ab Ecclesia in Summum Pontificem, non nisi morali certitudine constat Ecclesiae, quòd sit subjectum capax talis dignitatis, quòd sit validè baptizatus & c. quia tamen hæc conditio necessariam habet connexionem cum ista propositione: *Acceptatus ab Ecclesia in Summum Pontificem, est verus Papa*, fit inde quod consequenter ad acceptationem Ecclesiae certum sit, certitudine non quidem fidei immediatè, sed conclusionis Theologicæ, quod acceptatus sit verè baptizatus, & subjectum capax Pontificiæ dignitatis: quæ enim connexionem necessariam habent cum veritate de fide, non sunt quidem immediatè de fide, ut patet de risibilitate Christi, necessariò connexa cum ipsius humanitate; sed tamen rectè per consequentiam Theologicam ex ea inferuntur. Et per hoc patet ad confirmationem, negatur enim consequentia & paritas. Ratio disparitatis est, quia cùm alii Episcopi non sint regula suprema fidei, subindeque nec ut tales acceptentur ab Ecclesia; quod sint validè consecrati, non est aliquid necessariam connexionem habens cum veritate fidei, sicut necessariam connexionem habet cum veritate fidei; quod acceptatus ab Ecclesia pro regula suprema fidei, sit vel fuerit validè consecratus in Episcopum.

Objicies tertio: Qui negaret hunc numero Romanum Pontificem esse Petri successorem, modò non negaret legitime electum esse Petri successorem, non esset hæreticus, sed tantùm schismaticus: Ergo non est de fide hunc numero Romanum Pontificem, v. g. Innocentium XI. esse verum Papam, ac legitimum Petri successorem.

Respondent aliqui, negando Antecedens: Cùm enim ille qui negaret Innocentium XI. esse verum Pontificem, ac legitimum Petri successorem, non solùm scinderet unitatem Ecclesiae, dividendo eam à suo capite

subdistinction: Consequently to the very acceptance by the Church, it is granted. Antecedently to that, it is denied: for then this is certain only with moral certitude.

The solution is explained. Before anyone is accepted by the Church as Supreme Pontiff, it is established to the Church only with moral certainty that he is a subject capable of such dignity, that he is validly baptized, etc.; however, since this condition has a necessary connection with this proposition: *One accepted by the Church as Supreme Pontiff is the true Pope*, it follows that consequently to the Church's acceptance it is certain, with certainty not indeed of faith immediately, but of theological conclusion, that the one accepted is truly baptized and a subject capable of pontifical dignity: for those things which have necessary connection with a truth of faith are not indeed immediately of faith, as is evident regarding the risibility of Christ, necessarily connected with his humanity; but nevertheless they are correctly inferred from it by theological consequence. And through this the response to the confirmation is evident, for the consequence and parity are denied. The reason for the disparity is that since other bishops are not the supreme rule of faith, and consequently are not accepted by the Church as such, that they be validly consecrated is not something having necessary connection with a truth of faith, as it has necessary connection with a truth of faith that one accepted by the Church as the supreme rule of faith is or was validly consecrated as bishop.

You will object thirdly: One who would deny that this particular Roman Pontiff is Peter's successor, provided he did not deny that a legitimately elected one is Peter's successor, would not be a heretic, but only a schismatic: Therefore it is not of faith that this particular Roman Pontiff, e.g. Innocent XI, is the true Pope and legitimate successor of Peter.

Some respond by denying the antecedent: Since indeed he who would deny that Innocent XI is the true Pontiff and legitimate successor of Peter would not only rend the unity of the Church by

visibili, sed etiam negaret habendum pro regula fidei illum quem Ecclesia acceptavit pro tali regula, schismati dogma contrarium fidei superadderet, nimirum quod Ecclesia errare possit in rebus ad fidem pertinentibus. Unde tunc maximè haberet locum id quod docet D. Hieronymus super caput 3. ad Titum, & post ipsum D. Thomas 2. 2. quæst. 39. art. 1. ad 3. *Nullum schisma esse, quod non sibi aliquam hæresim confingat, ut rectè ab Ecclesia recessisse videatur.* Hæc solutio probabilitate non caret. Communiter tamen alii respondent, quod ille qui negaret hunc numero Romanum Pontificem, esse verum Papam, non haberetur pro hæretico, sed tantum pro schismatico; quia non constat inter omnes Catholicos id esse de fide, sed plures id negant, existimantes morali tantum certitudine id constare.

Objicies quartò: Si quæ esset ratio ob quam de fide divina, etiam immediatè verum esset hunc hominem in particulari, esse verum Papam, maximè certitudo quæ de illa veritate necessaria est Ecclesiæ: Sed certitudo quæ necessaria est Ecclesiæ de tali veritate, non requirit quod sit immediatè de fide: Ergo &c.* Major constat. Minor verò probatur. *Non minùs necessaria est Ecclesiæ certitudo validitatis Sacramentorum in particulari, v. g. hujus numero Baptismi, hujus numero Eucharistiæ, quàm certitudo hujus numero Papæ; æquè enim illa videtur necessaria ad salutem, ac ista: Sed non est de fide hoc numero Baptisma esse validum, hanc numero Eucharistiam sive hostiam esse consecratam. Ergo idem dicendum est de hoc numero Pontifice.

Confirmatur: Sicut necessarium est ad bonam gubernationem Ecclesiæ, quod sit summus Pontifex; ita necessarium est quod sint alii veri Prælati, Episcopi, & Archiepiscopi: Sed ad bonam gubernationem Ecclesiæ sufficit, quod de istis in particulari moralem certitudinem habeamus, quæ est secundum prudentiam humanam: Ergo & de Summo Pontifice in

dividing it from its visible head, but would also deny that he whom the Church has accepted as such a rule should be held as a rule of faith, he would add to schism a dogma contrary to the faith, namely that the Church can err in matters pertaining to faith. Whence then would most especially take place what Saint Jerome teaches on chapter 3 to Titus, and after him Saint Thomas 2. 2. question 39. article 1. ad 3: *There is no schism which does not devise for itself some heresy, so that it may seem to have rightly withdrawn from the Church.* This solution is not without probability. Generally, however, others respond that he who would deny that this particular Roman Pontiff is the true Pope would not be held as a heretic, but only as a schismatic; because it is not established among all Catholics that this is a matter of faith, but many deny this, judging that it is established only with moral certitude.

You will object fourthly: If there were any reason why it would be true by divine faith, even immediately, that this man in particular is the true Pope, it would be especially the certainty which is necessary to the Church concerning that truth: But the certainty which is necessary to the Church concerning such truth does not require that it be immediately of faith: Therefore etc. The major premise is evident. The minor premise is proved thus: The certainty of the validity of the Sacraments in particular is no less necessary to the Church, for example, of this particular Baptism, of this particular Eucharist, than the certainty of this particular Pope; for the former appears equally necessary for salvation as the latter: But it is not of faith that this particular Baptism is valid, that this particular Eucharist or host is consecrated. Therefore the same must be said concerning this particular Pontiff.

This is confirmed: Just as it is necessary for the good government of the Church that there be a Supreme Pontiff, so it is necessary that there be other true Prelates, Bishops, and Archbishops: But for the good government of the Church it suffices that we have moral certainty concerning these in particular, which is according to human prudence: Therefore also concerning the Supreme Pontiff in

particulari.

Respondeo negando Minorem, ad cujus probationem in primis dico, quòd si daretur unica solùm hostia ritè consecrata successivè, quæ ab universali Ecclesia deberet adorari, sicut datur successivè unicus Pontifex legitimè electus, cui tanquam capiti debet uniri; autoritate Ecclesiæ nobis constaret de fide, non solùm sub omni hostia ritè consecrata, sed etiam sub hac in particulari contineri verum Christi corpus; sicut ejusdem autoritate constat nobis, non solùm in communi omnem Pontificem ritè electum esse verum Pontificem, sed etiam hunc numero pro tempore existentem, ubi semel illum tanquam legitimè & canonicè electum accepit.

Respondeo rursus negando paritatem in Majori contentam: Ratio verò disparitatis est, quia hoc numero Baptisma, vel hæc numero hostia, non est regula fidei, sicut hic homo in particulari, cujus electio in Summum Pontificem valida acceptatur & declaratur ab Ecclesia: hinc enim fit quod major debeat esse certitudo istius propositionis: *Innocentius XI. est verus Papa*, quàm illius: *Nec numero hostia est verè consecrata*; imò quod debeat esse certitudo fidei, aliàs enim impossibile esset concipere quod ea quæ per talem regulam definiuntur, sint certa certitudine fidei. Et per hoc patet ad confirmationem, alii enim Prælati non sunt, sicut Summus Pontifex, regula infallibilis nostræ fidei.

Dices, hoc numero Concilium generale, Nicænum v. g. est regula infallibilis fidei, utpotè cùm omnia ad fidem pertinentia, quæ in eo sunt determinata, sint immediatè de fide, & tamen quod fuerit verum Concilium, non pertinet, immediatè saltem, ad fidem; quia hoc dependet ex historiis dicentibus illud Concilium revera extitisse aliquando, & fuisse legitimè congregatum: quæ historiæ cùm sint purè humanæ, nequeunt causare assensum fidei divinæ, sed solùm

particular.

I respond by denying the Minor [premise], for the proof of which I say first, that if there were given only a single host properly consecrated successively, which ought to be adored by the universal Church, just as there is given successively a single Pontiff legitimately elected, to whom as head [the Church] ought to be united; by the authority of the Church it would be established for us as a matter of faith, not only that under every host properly consecrated, but also that under this one in particular is contained the true body of Christ; just as by the same authority it is established for us, not only in general that every Pontiff properly elected is the true Pontiff, but also that this one existing numerically for the time being [is the true Pontiff], where once [the Church] has accepted him as legitimately and canonically elected.

I respond again by denying the parity contained in the Major [premise]: The reason for the disparity is this, because this particular Baptism, or this particular host, is not a rule of faith, as is this man in particular, whose election to the Supreme Pontificate is validly accepted and declared by the Church: hence it follows that there ought to be greater certitude of this proposition: *Innocent XI is the true Pope*, than of that one: *This particular host is truly consecrated*; indeed, that there ought to be the certitude of faith, otherwise it would be impossible to conceive that those things which are defined through such a rule should be certain with the certitude of faith. And through this the answer to the confirmation is evident, for other Prelates are not, as is the Supreme Pontiff, an infallible rule of our faith.

You say that this particular General Council, for example the Nicene, is an infallible rule of faith, inasmuch as all things pertaining to faith which are determined in it are immediately matters of faith, and yet the fact that it was a true Council does not pertain, at least immediately, to faith; because this depends upon historical accounts stating that this Council actually existed at some time and was legitimately assembled: which historical accounts, since they are purely human, cannot cause assent

humanæ: Ergo similiter, licet hic numero Pontifex sit regula infallibilis fidei nostræ, non tamen sequitur quod sit immediatè de fide, eum esse verum Papam.

Respondeo negando secundam partem Antecedentis, ut enim veritates definitæ in Concilio Nicæno sint immediatè de fide, oportet quod fideles certi sint certitudine fidei de earum revelatione; subindeque & de legitima ipsarum definitione, quandoquidem ideò solùm de revelatione alicujus veritatis certi sumus, quia Ecclesia, sive *Concilium generale*, legitimè declarat & determinat illam esse revelatam: impossibile autem omnino est, quod certitudinem fidei divinæ habeamus de definitione legitima alicujus veritatis, nisi eandem certitudinem habeamus de existentia & autoritate Concilii à quo determina fuit. De fide ergo est, etiam immediatè, Concilium Nicænum fuisse verum Concilium. Ad probationem in contrarium, nego quod veritas Concilii Nicæni dependeat ab historiis purè humanis, dependet enim ex successiva & continua traditione ipsius Ecclesiæ, quæ licet historica sit, non tamen purè humana; quia Ecclesia in ejusmodi traditione specialiter & infallibiliter à Spiritu Sancto dirigitur, sicut in aliis rebus ad fidem pertinentibus.

Objicies ultimò: Non est de fide, saltem immediatè, quòd electio hujus numero Pontificis fuerit valida: Ergo nec quod ipse sit verus Papa. Consequentia patet, cùm enim non sit verus Papa, nisi sit legitimè electus, ut sit immediatè de fide quod sit verus Papa, debet esse immediatè de fide quod fuerit legitimè electus. Antecedens verò probatur: Non est de fide, saltem immediatè, istos numero electores talis in particulari Pontificis, esse legitimos & veros Cardinales, habuisse validam intentionem eligendi, servatam fuisse formam juridicam electionis, in eo consistentem, quòd à duabus partibus Cardinalum, qui dicitur Pontifex, sit electus: has, inquam, & alias circumstantias, sine quibus electio est nulla,

of divine faith, but only of human faith: Therefore similarly, although this particular Pontiff is an infallible rule of our faith, it does not follow that it is immediately a matter of faith that he is the true Pope.

I respond by denying the second part of the Antecedent, for in order that the truths defined in the Council of Nicaea may be immediately of faith, it is necessary that the faithful be certain with the certitude of faith concerning their revelation; and consequently also concerning their legitimate definition, since we are certain of the revelation of any truth only for this reason, that the Church, or the *general Council*, legitimately declares and determines that it is revealed: but it is altogether impossible that we should have the certitude of divine faith concerning the legitimate definition of any truth, unless we have the same certitude concerning the existence and authority of the Council by which it was determined. Therefore it is also immediately of faith that the Council of Nicaea was a true Council. To the proof to the contrary, I deny that the truth of the Council of Nicaea depends upon purely human histories, for it depends upon the successive and continuous tradition of the Church itself, which, although it is historical, is nevertheless not purely human; because the Church in such tradition is specially and infallibly directed by the Holy Spirit, just as in other matters pertaining to faith.

You will object finally: It is not of faith, at least not immediately, that the election of this particular Pope was valid: Therefore neither that he himself is the true Pope. The consequence is evident, for since he is not the true Pope unless he is legitimately elected, in order that it be immediately of faith that he is the true Pope, it must be immediately of faith that he was legitimately elected. But the antecedent is proved: It is not of faith, at least not immediately, that these particular electors of such a Pope are legitimate and true Cardinals, that they had valid intention of electing, that the juridical form of election was observed, consisting in this, that by two parts of the Cardinals, he who is called Pope was elected: these circumstances, I say, and others, without which the

servatas fuisse, non est de fide; quandoquidem id non constat Ecclesiae ex aliqua speciali revelatione, ex Scriptura, vel traditione divina, sed solum ex testimonio ipsorum electorum promulgantium electionem.

Respondeo, concesso Antecedente, negando Consequentiam, quamvis enim non sit verus Papa, nisi sit legitime electus, quia tamen legitima electio est quid praequisitum ad eam definitionem quae Ecclesia declarat hunc numero hominem esse verum Papam, & fides non versatur circa ea quae ad definitionem praequiruntur, sed solum circa ipsam definitionem: illa propositio, *Innocentius XI. rite electus est in Summum Pontificem*, non est immediate de fide, sed solum ista: *Innocentius XI. est verus Summus Pontifex*. Quod explicatur à simili: sicut enim in definitionibus Summi Pontificis, fides non est de iis quae ad tales definitiones praequiruntur, videlicet de eo quod praecesserit diligens inquisitio aut disputatio circa propositiones definitas, sed solum facta definitione, recte inferitur per consequentiam Theologicam, omnia praequisita ad definitionem posita fuisse, atque adeo disputationem & inquisitionem diligentem, eam praecessisse; fides verò ipsa est duntaxat de ipsis definitionibus. Ita in definitione sive declaratione *Innocentii XI. in Summum Pontificem*, ab Ecclesia facta, id quod immediate est de fide, non est aliquid ex praequisitis ad eam, quale est quod fuerit legitime electus, sed solum ipsa definitio, seu declaratio, & illud quod per eam declaratur, nimirum *Innocentium XI. esse verum Pontificem*, quamvis ex hoc recte inferatur per discursum Theologicum, electionem talis Pontificis fuisse validam; subindeque ista propositio, *Innocentius XI. rite electus est in Summum Pontificem*, sit certa certitudine Theologicâ, cui non potest subesse falsum.

election is null, that they were observed, is not of faith; since this is not established to the Church from some special revelation, from Scripture, or divine tradition, but only from the testimony of the electors themselves promulgating the election.

I respond, having conceded the Antecedent, by denying the Consequent, for although one is not a true Pope unless he is legitimately elected, because nevertheless legitimate election is something prerequisite to that definition by which the Church declares this particular man to be the true Pope, and faith does not concern those things which are prerequisite to definition, but only the definition itself: that proposition, *Innocent XI was duly elected Supreme Pontiff*, is not immediately of faith, but only this: *Innocent XI is the true Supreme Pontiff*. This is explained by analogy: just as in the definitions of the Supreme Pontiff, faith is not concerning those things which are prerequisite to such definitions, namely that there preceded diligent inquiry or disputation concerning the propositions defined, but only once the definition is made, it is correctly inferred by theological consequence that all the prerequisites for definition have been established, and therefore that disputation and diligent inquiry preceded it; but faith itself is only concerning the definitions themselves. Thus in the definition or declaration of *Innocent XI as Supreme Pontiff*, made by the Church, that which is immediately of faith is not something from among the prerequisites to it, such as that he was legitimately elected, but only the definition itself, or declaration, and that which is declared through it, namely that *Innocent XI is the true Pontiff*, although from this it is correctly inferred by theological discourse that the election of such a Pontiff was valid; and consequently this proposition, *Innocent XI was duly elected Supreme Pontiff*, is certain with theological certainty, under which no falsehood can lie.