

Bibliotheca Theologica: Septem Libris Distincta, lib III (*Theological Library: Divided into Seven Books, Book III*)

by **F. Dominico a SS.ma Trinitate Carmelita** (Fr. Dominic of the Most Holy Trinity, Carmelite), 1668

[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: March 29, 2025.
- Version: 1.0
- Selection pages: 214-233

Section IV, Chapter X

Latin

CAPUT X.

Utrum sit de fide quod hic numero Pontifex Clemens Nonus, quem tota Ecclesia tanquam legitimè electum agnoscit, & recipit, sit verè Pontifex, & totius Ecclesiae caput.

AD fidem pertinere capite 6. ostendimus, quod supremus Monarcha sit Ecclesiae essentialis; ideoque semper aliquis D. Petro in eadem suprema, Christo tamen subordinata Ecclesiam regendi potestate successerit: Et capite 7. Quod verus, ac legitimus D. Petri successor in tali regimine, sit solus Pontifex Romanus canonicè electus; in quo differt successio aliorum Episcoporum, & Romani, quia de aliis non est de fide, quod succedant Apostolis, licet ex historiis id colligatur; ad illam vero spectat Episcopum Romanum canonicè electum, tam in Episcopatu Romano, quam in suprema Ecclesiae potestate illi coniuncta, Divo Petro successisse (quidquid sit an illa coniunctio iure divino, id est, ex speciali ordinatione, & lege Christi facta sit, nec ne; quod salva

English

CHAPTER X.

Whether it is a matter of faith that this specific Pontiff Clement IX, whom the entire Church acknowledges and accepts as legitimately elected, is truly the Pontiff and the head of the whole Church.

In chapter 6, we have shown that it pertains to the faith that the supreme Monarch is essential to the Church; and therefore someone has always succeeded St. Peter in the same supreme power of governing the Church, though subordinate to Christ. And in chapter 7, that the true and legitimate successor of St. Peter in such governance is only the Roman Pontiff canonically elected. In this respect, the succession of other Bishops differs from that of the Roman Bishop, because it is not a matter of faith that the others succeed the Apostles, although this is gathered from historical accounts. However, it does pertain to faith that the canonically elected Roman Bishop succeeds St. Peter both in the Roman Episcopate and in the supreme power over the Church joined to it (whatever may be said about whether that conjunction exists by divine law, that is, by special

fide inter doctores Catholicos disputatur) ut habetur ex traditione Ecclesiae, Summorum Pontificum, Conciliorumque definitionibus, nec non ex ipsamet scriptura implicate,

tum in communi; quia ibi Christo Domino tradente Divo Petro tam pro ipso, qua pro successoribus dictam potestatem, ut ostendimus, implicite continetur applicatio, & coniunctio eiusdem potestatis cum successione illius, quae de facto futura erat, quamque Christus praesciebat, atque adeo in illis verbis eam sine dubio intelligebat; quocirca Ecclesia viso postea facto Petri, habuit sufficiens fundamentum, ut ex illis verbis *Christi Domini* talem successionem, quae *nunc est*, inclusam crederet.

Tum in speciali ex illo loco 1. Petri cap.5. *Salutat vos Ecclesia, quae est in Babylone coelecta*; nam ex dictis cap. 5. per Babylonem Roma intelligitur, quam dum coelectam appellat, satis significat Petrus Ecclesiam Romanam electam esse a se, & consortem esse electionis suae; quod referri non potest, nisi ad designationem successionis suae. Ibi autem legendum esse, *coelecta*, non autem *collecta*, primum patet, quia sic emendatum est in Bibliis correctis; secundo quia Eusebius lib.2, histor.cap.14. verba Petri referens sic illa scribit; *Salutat vos Ecclesia nostrae electionis consors, quae est Babylon*; Et Cardinalis Caietanus eadem verba explicans, *in Babylone collecta*, sic enim ipse legit, dicta fuisse docet, *pro in Babylone simul electa* quamvis ea ad alium a nostro sensum transferat, quod, inquit, dicitur *simul electa*, alias Ecclesias respicit. Significatur enim quod non sola, sed simul cum aliis Ecclesiis est electa: quod est pars electorum. Unde ex hac scripturae auctoritate probabile dumtaxat argumentum desumi potest iuxta sensum a nobis adductum, pro intenta veritate, quam alias certa fide tenendam esse docet Ecclesiae traditio.

Igitur cum duo praefata ad fidem

ordinance and law of Christ, or not—which is disputed among Catholic doctors while preserving the faith). This is held from the tradition of the Church, from the definitions of the Supreme Pontiffs and Councils, and even implicitly from Scripture itself,

both in general—because when Christ the Lord handed over the said power to St. Peter for himself and for his successors, as we have shown, the application and conjunction of that same power with his succession, which was to occur in fact and which Christ foreknew, is implicitly contained therein, and thus Christ undoubtedly understood it in those words. Therefore, the Church, having later observed the fact of Peter’s role, had sufficient foundation to believe from those words of *Christ the Lord* that such succession, which *now exists*, was included—

and specifically from that passage in 1 Peter ch. 5: *The Church which is in Babylon, co-elect, salutes you*; for from what was said in chapter 5, by Babylon Rome is understood, which when Peter calls it “co-elect,” he sufficiently signifies that the Roman Church has been chosen by him and is a participant in his election; which cannot refer to anything except the designation of his succession. That the reading there should be *co-elect*, not *collected*, is clear first, because it has been corrected thus in the revised Bibles; secondly, because Eusebius in book 2 of his History, chapter 14, referring to Peter’s words, writes them thus: *The Church which shares in our election, which is in Babylon, salutes you*. And Cardinal Cajetan, explaining these same words, *collected in Babylon* (for thus he reads), teaches that they were said *for co-elect in Babylon*, although he transfers them to a meaning different from ours, saying that what is called *co-elect* refers to other Churches. For it signifies that it is not alone, but along with other Churches is elect: that is, a part of the elect. Hence, from this authority of Scripture, only a probable argument can be drawn according to the meaning we have adduced, for the truth we intend, which the tradition of the Church teaches must otherwise be held with certain faith.

Therefore, since the two aforementioned matters

pertineant, nunc iterum quaeritur, an eadem etiam constet verum Pontificem visibilem esse in individuo, & determinate, sive quod idem est, quod hic numero Pontifex v.g. Clemens IX. quem tota Ecclesia tanquam legitimè electum agnoscit, & recipit, sit verè Pontifex, & totius Ecclesiae caput, ita ut non solum credamus esse in Ecclesia unum summum caput, quod Roma suam sedem habeat, sed etiam esse hunc hominem, sive hunc numero Pontificem, quem oculis cernimus; eo proportionali modo, quo superiori sectione diximus de Ecclesia, oportere, non solum in confuso illam esse creditam, verum etiam determinate, & in individuo, hanc esse, vel illam, quam oculis cernimus.

Circa quam difficultatem, quo apud veteres pauciora reperiuntur in terminis, quibus modo disputatur, eo celebrior facta est his temporibus, variisque argumentis agitata. Consentientibus enim omnibus doctoribus Catholicis, practicè, & moraliter esse certissimum, hunc vel illum numero Pontificem, quem Ecclesia pro vero, nullo interveniente dissensu, semel proposuit, & acceptavit, esse verum ac legitimum Pontificem, totiusque Ecclesiae caput; adeo ut, qui id negaret, non solum ut valde temerarius, & scandalosus, sed etiam ut suspectus de haeresi, imo ut errans contra fidem puniri posset; quatenus stante tali consensu universalis Ecclesiae, quae in causa facti generalis, & ad generalem statum omnium fidelium pertinentis, qualis est vera, & Canonica electio Pontificis errare non potest, ille talis praesumi posset, universalem hanc propositionem negare, cum videlicet, qui est legitime electus, esse Vicarium Christi, & Petri successorem, quod qui negat, sine dubio est haereticus. Cum, inquam, Catholici omnes in hoc convenient, an tamen id absolute sit de fide, duae sunt illorum sententiae, prima negans, altera affirmans, pro quarum intelligentia, nec non resolutione probabilioris.

pertain to faith, now it is again asked whether the same faith also establishes that the true visible Pontiff exists in the individual and in a determinate manner, or what amounts to the same thing, whether this particular Pontiff, e.g., Clement IX, whom the whole Church acknowledges and receives as legitimately elected, is truly the Pontiff and the head of the whole Church. This is so that we may believe not only that there is one supreme head in the Church who has his seat in Rome, but also that this man, or this particular Pontiff whom we see with our eyes, is that head—in a manner proportionally similar to what we said in the previous section concerning the Church, where it is necessary not only to believe in the Church in a general and indistinct manner, but also specifically and individually that this is the Church, or that which we see with our eyes.

Concerning this difficulty, the fewer references found among the ancients in the terms in which it is now disputed, the more celebrated it has become in these times, and agitated by various arguments. For while all Catholic doctors agree, practically and morally, that it is most certain that this or that particular Pope, whom the Church has once proposed and accepted as true without any dissent, is the true and legitimate Pontiff and head of the entire Church; to the extent that anyone who would deny this could be punished not only as highly reckless and scandalous, but also as suspected of heresy, indeed as erring against the faith; inasmuch as, given such consensus of the universal Church, which cannot err in matters of general fact pertaining to the general state of all the faithful, such as the true and Canonical election of the Pontiff, such a person could be presumed to deny this universal proposition, namely, that he who is legitimately elected is the Vicar of Christ and successor of Peter, which whoever denies is without doubt a heretic. While, I say, all Catholics agree on this, whether this is absolutely a matter of faith, there are two opinions of theirs: the first denying, the other affirming, for the understanding of which, and also for the resolution of the more probable position.

Observandum est primo, dari veluti duplicem Summorum Pontificum electionem, unam particularem quae fit a Dominis Cardinalibus iuxta prescriptas a Summis Pontificibus regulas; alteram vero universalem, quae fit ab ipsamet Ecclesia universali pacifice acceptando priorem electionem a Cardinalibus factam, & consequenter personam ad Summum Pontificatum per illam designatam. Haec est autem differentia inter utramque electionem, sive inter electionem factam ab Eminentissimis Cardinalibus, & pacificam illius acceptionem ab Ecclesia universali, quod ista secunda fit semper quo ad nos infallibilis, supposito semel, quod hunc hominem esse rite electum, & canonice factum caput Ecclesiae, sit materia ex se determinabilis de fide ab Ecclesia; secus autem primam, quam vitiosam, ac dubiam esse posse manifeste colligitur ex Concilio Constantiensi sess. 39. ubi dum determinat, quod iudicare de electione dubia ad ipsum Concilium pertinet, satis supponit posse dari electionem dubiam, aut vitiosam, de qua iudicare valeat; quamvis etiam ex parte eligentium inhabilitas censurae non possit illi opponi; si quidem ad evitanda schismata, nec non quantum fieri poterat electionis incertitudinem singulari privilegio cautum est in Clementina ne Romani S. caeterum de electione; nullum Cardinalem praetextu alicuius censurae repelli debere ab electione Pontificia; non desunt tamen multae aliae causae ob quas vitiosa, aut dubia reddi possit, tum ex parte ipsius electionis, tum ex parte personae electae iuxta defectus, quos ipsa iura assignant.

Ratio discriminis allati est, quia ex divinis Scripturis, ut superiori sectione vidimus, Ecclesia in rebus ad fidem pertinentibus gaudet privilegio infallibilitatis in credendo; quod Sacrum non habet Cardinalium collegium in eligendo; ergo supposito, quod hunc hominem esse rite electum, & canonice factum Ecclesiae caput, sit de fide quo ad se, ubi accedit ad hoc pacifica acceptatio, universalisque

It should be observed first that there exists, as it were, a twofold election of Supreme Pontiffs: one particular, which is carried out by the Lord Cardinals according to rules prescribed by the Supreme Pontiffs; the other universal, which is carried out by the universal Church itself through peacefully accepting the prior election made by the Cardinals, and consequently the person designated for the Supreme Pontificate through that election. This, moreover, is the difference between both elections, or between the election made by the Most Eminent Cardinals and its peaceful acceptance by the universal Church: that this second election always becomes infallible for us, once it is supposed that this man has been duly elected and canonically made head of the Church, which is a matter in itself determinable of faith by the Church. The first election, however, is different, as it can be flawed and doubtful, as is clearly gathered from the Council of Constance, session 39, where in determining that judging a doubtful election pertains to the Council itself, it sufficiently presupposes that there can be a doubtful or flawed election about which it may judge; although also on the part of the electors, the impediment of censure cannot be brought against the election. Indeed, to avoid schisms, and also as far as possible uncertainty of election, it was provided by a singular privilege in the Clementine “Ne Romani” (§ “Caeterum”) concerning election, that no Cardinal should be rejected from the papal election on the pretext of any censure. Nevertheless, there remain many other causes for which an election can be rendered flawed or doubtful, both on the part of the election itself and on the part of the person elected, according to the defects which the laws themselves assign.

The reason for the distinction brought forward is that, as we saw in the previous section, the Church, according to divine Scriptures, enjoys the privilege of infallibility in matters of faith in what it believes; a privilege which the Sacred College of Cardinals does not possess in its act of election. Therefore, assuming that this man has been duly elected and canonically made the head of the Church, it is a matter of faith in itself. When peaceful acceptance

Ecclesiae consensus, fit etiam tale quo ad nos, secus autem per meram Cardinalium electionem: unde totum praesentis difficultatis punctum in hoc consistere videtur, an praefata propositio quoad se pertineat ad fidem, atque adeo sit materia determinabilis de fide, quo ad nos ab Ecclesia, sive per acceptationem universalem pacificam, sive per definitionem Concilii, si oriatur aliquod dubium circa talem electionem.

Secundo notandum est electionem ab Eminentissimis Cardinalibus factam duplici ex capite vitiosam, vel nullam esse posse: primo defectu conditionum indispensabiliter ad illam requisitarum, sive iuris divini: ut si eligeretur femina, & non vir, aut si eligeretur vir, sed non baptizatus; secundo defectu conditionum ad ius dumtaxat humanum positivum spectantium; sive id oriatur ex malitia electorum, ut quando simoniace eligunt; sive ex ignorantia, ut quando eligunt inhabilem; Haec est autem differentia inter utrumque vitium, aut nullitatem ex illis provenientem, quod secundum auctoritate Ecclesiae suppleri, ac sanari potest, non autem primum...

At loquendo de aliis conditionibus, quae in electione Pontificia pertinent solum ad ius positivum, & quarum defectum consequenter Ecclesia sua potest auctoritate sanare, nec ante, nec post illius acceptationem, maior haberi potest certitudo de illis, quam moralis; etiam si certitudine fidei credatur *hunc numero Pontificem esse verum Pontificem*; quia cum hae conditiones non sint indispensabiliter connexae cum hac veritate, sicut praecedentes; sed stante eorum defectu, & inde nullitate electionis factae a Dominis Cardinalibus, possit Ecclesia sua acceptatione, quasi nova electione illam nullitatem sanare, possumus quidem post illam recte inferre, *hunc numero Pontificem esse verum Pontificem*, nec non omnia alia cum hac veritate necessario, & insupplebiliter coniuncta; non autem quod non sit simoniaca electio

and the universal consensus of the Church are added to this, it also becomes a matter of faith for us, but not through the mere election by the Cardinals. Hence, the crux of the present difficulty seems to consist in this: whether the aforementioned proposition belongs to the faith in itself, and is thus a matter determinable as an article of faith for us by the Church, either through universal peaceful acceptance or through the definition of a Council, if any doubt should arise concerning such an election.

Secondly, it should be noted that an election conducted by the Most Eminent Cardinals can be defective or null for two reasons: first, through the absence of conditions indispensably required for it, whether by divine law—as if a woman were elected instead of a man, or if a man were elected who was not baptized; second, through the absence of conditions pertaining only to positive human law, whether this arises from the malice of the electors, as when they elect someone simoniacally, or from ignorance, as when they elect someone ineligible. There is, however, this difference between the two defects, or the nullity arising from them: that the second can be supplied and healed by the authority of the Church, but not the first...

However, speaking of other conditions which in a papal election pertain only to positive law, and whose defects the Church consequently can remedy by its own authority, neither before nor after his acceptance can there be greater certainty about them than moral certainty; even if it is believed with the certainty of faith that *this particular Pope is the true Pope*; because since these conditions are not indispensably connected with this truth, as were the preceding ones; but despite their defect, and hence the nullity of the election made by the Lord Cardinals, the Church can, by its acceptance, as if by a new election, remedy that nullity. We can indeed, after that, correctly infer that *this particular Pope is the true Pope*, as well as all other things necessarily and irreplaceably joined with this truth; but not that the election is definitely not simoniacal, or something similar; but at most it can be established with certainty under a disjunction:

determinate, aut quid simile; sed ad summum sub disiunctione certo constare potest, vel eam non esse simoniacam, si re vera talis non sit; vel si talis sit, illum ab Ecclesia defectum sanari, & suppleri, ubi talem electionem pacifice, nulloque interveniente dissidio ab illa videremus acceptari, nec non summum Pontificem electum; Cuius ratio est quia impedimenta inducta de iure positivo humano, & reddentia irritam electionem Summi Pontificis, sunt derivata ex talibus legibus, quae numquam loquuntur, nec possunt habere locum nisi respectu illius primae electionis, quae externa specie, & in foro externo fit a Dominis Cardinalibus; quare licet illa electio ex aliquo tali occulto impedimento nulla fuisset, adhuc sequitur alia electio nullo iure positivo irritabilis, quam facit tota Ecclesia acceptando pacifice, ut supponimus, illum hominem electum pro vero Pontifice. Haec enim acceptatio, quamvis fiat ex errore facti praecedenti, non est tamen conditionata sed absoluta: melius quippe est Ecclesiae habere pro Pontifice aliquem, qui fuerit invalide electus, quam ignoranter carere vero Pontifice, & eum pro tali venerari, qui reipsa non sit.

Enim vero si fuit expediens dominia rerum non esse in incerto, & in hunc finem inductae sunt praescriptiones non solum de iure civili, sed aliquae etiam longissimi temporis de iure gentium, & naturali; per quas dependenter ab errore fit dominus rerum ille, qui antea non erat dominus; multo magis expediebat non esse in incerto existentiam & auctoritatem Vicarii Christi, atque adeo de iure divino, & naturali esset, iuxta potestatem ab eodem Christo Ecclesiae commissam eligendi Summum Pontificem, ut quicumque bona ab ea fide acceptaretur pro tali, evaderet talis, etiamsi antea non fuisset; dummodo habeat alias conditiones iuris divini, quae ex hypothesi infallibilitatis Ecclesiae in rebus ad fidem spectantibus, non possunt non esse in acceptato semel ab ea aliquo pro vero Pontifice, ut diximus.

either it is not simoniacal, if indeed it truly is not such; or if it is such, that defect is remedied and supplied by the Church, when we would see such an election peacefully accepted by it without any dissent, and also the Supreme Pontiff elected. The reason for this is that impediments introduced by positive human law, which render the election of the Supreme Pontiff invalid, are derived from such laws that never speak of, nor can they have place except with respect to that first election which in external appearance and in the external forum is made by the Lord Cardinals; wherefore, even if that election was null due to some such hidden impediment, there still follows another election, which cannot be invalidated by any positive law, which the whole Church makes by peacefully accepting, as we suppose, that elected man as the true Pontiff. For this acceptance, although it proceeds from a preceding error of fact, is nevertheless not conditional but absolute: it is indeed better for the Church to have as Pontiff someone who was invalidly elected, than to unknowingly lack a true Pontiff, and to venerate as such one who in reality is not.

Indeed, if it was expedient that the dominion over things not remain uncertain, and to this end prescriptions were introduced not only by civil law, but also some of very long duration by the law of nations and natural law—through which, dependent upon error, one who was previously not the owner becomes the owner of things—how much more expedient was it that the existence and authority of the Vicar of Christ not remain uncertain. Thus it would be in accordance with divine and natural law, according to the power committed by Christ Himself to the Church to elect the Supreme Pontiff, that whoever is accepted in good faith by the Church as such would become such, even if he had not been so before; provided that he possesses the other conditions of divine law which, under the hypothesis of the Church's infallibility in matters pertaining to faith, cannot but be present in one who has once been accepted by the Church as the true

Et huc pertinet ratio, quae adducitur in L. Barbarius. ff. de officio Praetoris, in qua declaratur, quod servus electus ignoranter in Praetorem, & pro tali habitus, non solum fecerit acta valida, sed fuerit etiam verus Praetor, quoniam Populus Romanus, qui eum pro tali habuit, potuit dispensare, & censetur voluisse. Quae lex non est consideranda tanquam constitutio arbitraria, aut proveniens a potestate iuris Civilis, alioquin respexisset futura, & non praeterita super quibus illa decernit, sed tanquam interpretatio prudens, ac declaratio iuris naturalis: si quidem independenter ab omni constitutione positiva, censetur Populus Romanus habuisse in dicto casu illam voluntatem, quam expediebat eum habere. Ita ergo in casu de quo nos agimus, cum penes totam Ecclesiam sit potestas providendi sibi de legitimo capite, ne remaneat acephala, quoties electores ordinarii, vel culpabiliter, vel inculpabiliter neque providet, neque habent curam providendi in futurum, sicut contingit, quando eorum electio fuit irrita, & habetur pro rata, censetur Ecclesia eum eligere, quem acceptat, non obstantibus quibuscumque eius defectibus iuris positivi, quoniam ita expedit. Et quamvis Ecclesia acephala dispensare non valeat contra constitutiones praeteritorum Pontificum, nihil refert, quoniam nulla constitutio inductiva alicuius impedimenti extenditur, vel ex mente, vel ex potestate constituentis in ordine ad talem casum, aut alios similes, quoniam de essentia legis, vel constitutionis valida est, ut sit in bonum commune. Quo autem tempore incipiat ista acceptatio Ecclesiae infra declarabitur.

Also, for clarity, should I format each row to use

Pontiff, as we have said.

And to this pertains the reasoning that is adduced in the law “Barbarius” in the Digest concerning the office of Praetor, wherein it is declared that a slave unknowingly elected as Praetor and regarded as such not only performed valid acts but was also a true Praetor, because the Roman People, who considered him as such, had the power to dispense with the impediment and is deemed to have willed to do so. This law should not be considered as an arbitrary constitution or one deriving from the power of Civil law (otherwise it would have addressed future rather than past matters about which it makes its determination), but rather as a prudent interpretation and declaration of natural law. Indeed, independently of any positive constitution, the Roman People is deemed to have had in the said case that intention which it was expedient for them to have. Thus, therefore, in the case of which we are treating, since the power of providing itself with a legitimate head resides in the whole Church, lest it remain headless whenever the ordinary electors, either culpably or inculpably, neither provide nor have concern for providing in the future—as happens when their election was invalid yet is held to be valid—the Church is deemed to elect him whom it accepts, notwithstanding any of his defects regarding positive law, because it is expedient to do so. And although the headless Church cannot dispense against the constitutions of previous Pontiffs, this is of no consequence, since no constitution introducing any impediment extends, either by the intention or by the power of the one constituting it, to such a case or other similar ones, because it is of the essence of a valid law or constitution that it be for the common good. At what time this acceptance by the Church begins will be explained below.

L (three spaces)

a
t
i
n

t
e

x
t

I. Conclusio: de fide divina est immediate quo ad se, hunc hominem Clementem IX. rite electum, verum esse Pontificem, totiusque Ecclesiae caput. Primum huius sententiae fundamentum desumitur ex Concilio Constantiensi in damnatione errorum Wicleffi, quae habetur sess.8. §. & ultima; ubi Martinus Papa V. ab haereticis, qui reconciliationem petunt; nec non ab aliis de haeresi suspectis, ut probentur eorum fides, exigere praecipit inter alia *Utrum credant; quod Papa canonice electus, qui pro tempore fuerit, eius nomine proprie expresso, sit successor Beati Petri habens supremam auctoritatem in Ecclesia Dei.* Quae verba non loquuntur de veritate illius propositionis in communi; *quod omnis canonice electus est verus Summus Pontifex*, sed in particulari de eo, qui pro tempore est Pontifex, exprimendo nomen proprium, v. g. Clementem IX. & de hoc cuius nomen exprimitur, iubet Martinus V. ut interrogetur suspectus in fide, an credat, quod talis sit, verus Petri successor habens supremam auctoritatem in Ecclesia Dei; ac si huiusmodi propositio non esset de fide divina immediate quo ad se, nec Summus Pontifex exigeret, nec etiam exigere posset actum fidei circa illam, nihil enim de fide credendum proponere potest, quod ad illam non pertinet ut satis constat: Igitur dicendum est praefatam propositionem de fide divina esse immediate quo ad se.

Secunda ratio desumitur, ex hoc quod Summus Pontifex sit supremum Ecclesiae caput, supremusque Monarcha; ergo sicut fide credimus ex dictis superiori sectione, hanc numero Ecclesiam in qua sumus esse veram Christi Ecclesiam; ad eandem quoque fidem pertinere debet, hunc numero hominem legitime electum, cui tanquam capiti suo unitur, verum esse Summum Pontificem. Antecedens est de fide, Summum, videlicet, Pontificem supremum esse caput Ecclesiae, supremumque Monarcham; consequentia ergo probatur,

I. Conclusion: it is of divine faith immediately in itself that this man, Clement IX, duly elected, is the true Pontiff and head of the entire Church. The first foundation of this position is derived from the Council of Constance in its condemnation of Wycliffe's errors, which is found in Session 8, final section, where Pope Martin V orders that heretics who seek reconciliation, as well as those suspected of heresy, should be questioned to test their faith, among other things: "*Whether they believe that the canonically elected Pope, whoever he may be at that time, with his name properly expressed, is the successor of Blessed Peter having supreme authority in the Church of God.*" These words do not speak of the truth of that proposition in general—that anyone canonically elected is the true Supreme Pontiff—but particularly about him who is Pontiff at that time, expressing his proper name, e.g., Clement IX. And concerning this person whose name is expressed, Martin V commands that the person suspected in faith be interrogated whether he believes that such a person is the true successor of Peter having supreme authority in the Church of God. If such a proposition were not of divine faith immediately in itself, neither would the Supreme Pontiff require, nor could he require, an act of faith concerning it, for he cannot propose anything to be believed as a matter of faith that does not pertain to faith, as is sufficiently established. Therefore, it must be said that the aforementioned proposition is of divine faith immediately in itself.

The second reason is derived from the fact that the Supreme Pontiff is the supreme head of the Church and the supreme Monarch; therefore, just as we believe by faith from what was said in the previous section that this particular Church in which we exist is the true Church of Christ, it must also pertain to the same faith that this particular man who has been legitimately elected, to whom the Church is united as to its head, is the true Supreme Pontiff. The antecedent is a matter of faith, namely, that the Supreme Pontiff is the supreme head of the Church and the supreme Monarch; the consequence

quia de essentia huius numero Ecclesiae est, quod sit unita, & coniuncta suo capiti pro tempore existenti, facta semel legitima ipsius electione, imo inde maxime pendet eius veritas & unitas, supposita Christi institutione, quae statum Ecclesiae Monarchicum in perpetuum esse voluit. Ergo oportet, quod sicut est de fide, hanc numero Ecclesiam esse veram Christi Ecclesiam; ita etiam sit de fide, facta legitima electione, quaecumque sit illa, de qua statim, quod hic numero homo Clemens IX. feliciter regnans, cui tanquam capiti suo unitur, sit verus Summus Pontifex: ista consequentia est certissima, supposita semel veritate antecedentis; quod nimirum sit de essentia huius numero Ecclesiae, quod uniatur tanquam capiti huic numero Pontifici legitime electo; quam sic probo: quia sicut ex hoc quod sit de essentia hominis ut sic; & veluti in abstracto rationalitas, inde manifeste sequitur, hanc quoque rationalitatem, sive rationalitatis partem, esse de essentia huius hominis, v. g. Petri; ita similiter ex hoc, quod Christus Dominus voluerit statum Ecclesiae Monarchicum esse, perpetuamque in ea fore Summorum Pontificum successionem, inde quoque necessario consequitur eum voluisse, quod de essentia huius numero Ecclesiae in qua sumus, esset etiam hic numero Pontifex pro tempore existens legitime electus; non enim sufficit quod Ecclesia subiiciat se tanquam suo supremo capiti, cuilibet rite electo in Pontificem, quasi in communi; sed alicui visibili capiti debet esse unita & subiecta: non est autem visibile nisi sit determinatum in particulari; Deinde si certum non esset hunc numero Pontificem rite electum, cuique Ecclesia hic & nunc unitur, esse verum Pontificem; qua ratione possemus dubitare de illo: possemus, & de antecessore, atque adeo de tota retro serie, indeque de veritate Episcoporum, qui ab his creati sunt; igitur ne totam certitudinem verae Ecclesiae; & Hierarchici Ordinis ruere dicamus; fatendum est esse de fide immediate quoad se, hunc numero Pontificem rite electum, verum esse Pontificem: quoad nos vero, ubi tota semel

therefore is proven because it is of the essence of this particular Church that it be united and joined to its head existing at the time, once his legitimate election has been completed. Indeed, its truth and unity depend most especially on this, given Christ's institution, who willed that the Church's Monarchical state would exist in perpetuity. Therefore, just as it is a matter of faith that this particular Church is the true Church of Christ, so also must it be a matter of faith that, once a legitimate election has taken place (whatever that may be, of which more shortly), this particular man, Clement IX, happily reigning, to whom the Church is united as to its head, is the true Supreme Pontiff. This consequence is most certain, once the truth of the antecedent is established—namely, that it is of the essence of this particular Church that it be united as to its head to this particular Pontiff legitimately elected—which I prove thus: just as from the fact that rationality is of the essence of man as such and in the abstract, it manifestly follows that this particular rationality, or part of rationality, is of the essence of this particular man, e.g., Peter; so similarly, from the fact that Christ the Lord willed the Church's state to be Monarchical and that there would be a perpetual succession of Supreme Pontiffs in it, it also necessarily follows that He willed that of the essence of this particular Church in which we exist would also be this particular Pontiff existing at the time, legitimately elected. For it is not sufficient that the Church subject itself as to its supreme head to anyone rightly elected as Pontiff, as if in general; rather, it must be united and subject to some visible head. But it is not visible unless it is determined in particular. Furthermore, if it were not certain that this particular Pontiff, rightly elected, to whom the Church here and now is united, is the true Pontiff, by what reasoning could we doubt him? We could also doubt his predecessor, and thus the entire series going back, and consequently the truth of the Bishops who were created by them. Therefore, lest we say that the entire certainty of the true Church and Hierarchical Order collapses, we must admit that it is immediately a matter of faith in itself that this particular Pontiff, rightly elected, is the true

Ecclesia pacifice illum acceptavit.

Tertia ratio fundatur in hoc; quod hic numero Pontifex rite electus, ita sit Ecclesiae caput, ut simul etiam sit regula fidei, quatenus inter alia gaudet privilegio infallibilitatis, in rebus ad illam spectantibus definiendis; igitur immediate ad fidem pertinet, hunc numero Pontificem legitime electum verum esse Pontificem: Antecedens patebit ex dicendis infra, nunc probatur consequentia; quia quando aliquid est regula fidei, non minus credibile per fidem esse debet, quod sit regula; quam quod sit de fide, id quod determinatur vel regulatur per illam; sicut quando proponitur aliquis Scripturae liber tanquam canonicus; quemadmodum est de fide totum id, quod in illo continetur, ita quoque est de fide, quod talis liber sit canonicus; & per revelationem Dei habitus; alias certi numquam esse possemus de rebus definitis, aut traditis in libro sacro, ut per se patet: Ergo si semel supponatur, quod hic numero Pontifex rite electus sit regula fidei, in rebus ad illam pertinentibus definiendis; ad eandem quoque fidem tanquam quid credibile per illam spectare debet, illum esse verum Pontificem. Haec est solum differentia inter librum canonicum, & Summum Pontificem, prout unusquisque suo modo regula fidei dicitur: quod talis sit temporaliter solum Summus Pontifex; ac dependenter ab aliquibus conditionibus temporalibus, quae de novo fiant; quaeque revelatae cum non sint in particulari, inde oritur ista dubitatio circa certitudinem, qua tenetur de fide hunc numero hominem rite electum, esse verum Pontificem; quae dubitatio non versatur circa librum Canonicum; qui cum sit aliquid permanens, non indiget nova aliqua declaratione, semel ac ab Ecclesia pro authentico fidelibus propositus est; sicut indiget Summus Pontifex, quoniam ita postulat natura talis regulae, quae animata est; & pro tempore eligibilis; ceterum ubi talis accedit declaratio per electionem, & pacificam eius ab universali Ecclesia acceptationem, certa nobis fide tenendum est hunc numero

Pontiff; and for us, once the whole Church has peacefully accepted him.

The third reason is founded on this: that this particular Pontiff, duly elected, is so much the head of the Church that he is simultaneously also the rule of faith, insofar as he enjoys, among other privileges, infallibility in defining matters pertaining to faith. Therefore, it immediately pertains to the faith that this particular Pontiff, legitimately elected, is the true Pontiff. The antecedent will be made clear from what will be said below; now the consequence is proven, because 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 or regulated by it is of faith. Just as when a book of Scripture is proposed as canonical, it is as much of faith that such a book is canonical and received through God's revelation as it is of faith that all it contains is true. Otherwise, we could never be certain about matters defined or handed down in sacred books, as is self-evident. Therefore, if it is once supposed that this particular Pontiff, duly elected, is the rule of faith in defining matters pertaining to it, it must also pertain to that same faith as something credible through it that he is the true Pontiff. This is the only difference between a canonical book and the Supreme Pontiff, insofar as each in its own way is called a rule of faith: that the Supreme Pontiff is such only temporally and dependently on certain temporal conditions that are newly established. Since these are not revealed in particular, there arises that doubt concerning the certainty with which it is held as a matter of faith that this particular man, duly elected, is the true Pontiff—a doubt which does not exist regarding a Canonical book. The latter, being something permanent, does not require any new declaration once it has been proposed to the faithful by the Church as authentic, as the Supreme Pontiff does require, since the nature of such a rule, which is animate and eligible for a time, demands it. Nevertheless, when such a declaration is made through election and its peaceful acceptance by the universal Church, we must hold with certain faith that this particular Pontiff is the true Pontiff, since the Church, being the pillar and foundation of truth,

Pontificem, verum esse Pontificem; si quidem Ecclesia, cum sit columna, & firmamentum veritatis, errare non potest in acceptando, & proponendo pro animata fidei regula, illa quae talis non esset.

Quod huic rationi primo respondent aliqui, infallibilitatem in definiendo non convenire Summo Pontifici, atque adeo quod sit animata fidei regula, nullius est momenti; illa enim procedit ex suppositione huius veritatis, quam infra probabimus: Attamen quia id ita certum multis non est, eundem Pontificem esse supremum Ecclesiae caput, in hoc enim tanquam in aliquo de fide conveniunt omnes Doctores Catholici, licet aliqui eorum dubitent, an eadem fide constet illum gaudere privilegio infallibilitatis in rebus fidei determinandis; secunda ratio in dignitate capitis fundata, videtur esse quo ad nos magis efficax, quam ista tertia, ad probationem nostrae conclusionis.

Secundo respondent alii, adhuc concesso, quod Summus Pontifex sit animata fidei regula, non inde sequi certitudine fidei credendum esse hunc numero Pontificem pro tempore existentem, verum esse Pontificem, sed sufficere certitudinem moralem, cum Pontifex solum se habeat, ut applicans & proponens fidem, ex parte autem proponentis non videtur requiri maior certitudo, quam moralis; ut patet in ministris Evangelicis, quos non tenemur credere de fide, quod sint legitimi Evangelii praedicatores.

Sed haec quoque instantia, vel responsio vim nostrae rationis non enervat, supposito semel quod Summus Pontifex sit animata fidei regula; haec est enim differentia inter Summum Pontificem res fidei sua definitione credendas proponentem, & inter ministrum Evangelicum illas praedicantem: quod iste non se habet tanquam regula determinativa rerum fidei, sed ut minister dumtaxat intimans aliis, ea quae 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 auctoritate, sed ex credibilitate eorum quae proponuntur, ita ut

cannot err in accepting and proposing as an animate rule of faith that which is not such.

What some first respond to this reasoning—that infallibility in defining does not belong to the Supreme Pontiff, and therefore that he is the living rule of faith—is of no consequence; for this proceeds from the supposition of this truth, which we shall prove below. Nevertheless, because it is not so certain to many that the same Pontiff is the supreme head of the Church (for on this point all Catholic Doctors agree as an article of faith, although some of them doubt whether it is established by the same faith that he enjoys the privilege of infallibility in determining matters of faith), the second reason, founded on the dignity of the head, seems to be more effective for us than this third reason for proving our conclusion.

Secondly, others respond that, even if it is conceded that the Supreme Pontiff is the living rule of faith, it does not follow that it must be believed with the certainty of faith that this particular Pontiff existing at a given time is the true Pontiff, but that moral certainty suffices, since the Pontiff only functions as one who applies and proposes the faith, and on the part of the proposer, no greater certainty than moral seems to be required; as is evident in the case of the ministers of the Gospel, whom we are not bound to believe by faith to be legitimate preachers of the Gospel.

But this objection, or response, does not weaken the force of our reasoning, once it is established that the Supreme Pontiff is the living rule of faith; for this is the difference between the Supreme Pontiff proposing matters of faith to be believed by his definition, and an evangelical minister preaching those same matters: that the latter does not function as a determinative rule of matters of faith, but only as a minister announcing to others what ought to be believed; hence we are neither bound to believe that he is a true and legitimate minister, nor are those who believe the matters proposed by him moved to do so by his authority, but rather by the credibility of what is proposed, such that unless these matters

nisi sufficienter proponantur, talisque credibilitas eis innotescat, credere non teneantur. At vero Summus Pontifex, semel ac admittitur eum gaudere privilegio infallibilitatis in rebus ad fidem pertinentibus, proponit illas credendas tanquam animata fidei regula, vel supremus iudex determinans, quatenus credenda sint, ita ut ex eius auctoritate obligentur fideles ad illa credenda; unde necesse est, ut illi non morali solum certitudine, cui absolute falsum subesse potest, verum etiam certitudine fidei credant, hunc numero Pontificem pro tempore existentem, ac Ecclesiam regentem, verum esse illius Pontificem. Alias enim si dubitari contingeret de auctoritate, quam habet hic in particulari definiens; certi esse non possemus, quod res ab eo definitae manerent de fide: sicut si in dubium revocaretur aliquis liber canonicus, an vere sit talis; certitudo haberi non posset de his, quae in illo continerentur.

Tertio tandem respondent alii ad infallibilitatem definitionum fidei Summi Pontificis auctoritate factorum, sufficere, quod sit verus Pontifex, vel realiter, vel putative, id est, quod pro vero habeatur a tota Ecclesia; eo enim ipso gaudet privilegio infallibilitatis in definiendo, Deo illi propter commune bonum Ecclesiae sic assistente; ita ut huius responsionis auctores negantes de fide haberi hunc esse verum Pontificem, nihilominus velint esse de fide hunc numero hominem, qui certitudine dumtaxat morali in tota Ecclesia verus habetur Pontifex, vere & rite efficere omnia, quae efficit verus Pontifex, & gaudere privilegiis omnibus, assistentiaeque Spiritus Sancti D. Petro ac legitimis eius successoribus divinitus promissis. Quemadmodum enim, inquiunt, spectat ad perfectionem divinae providentiae in sua regenda Ecclesia, ne irrepat in omnes Sacrae Scripturae codices aliquid falsum, aut ne aliquis Magus, vel alius Pseudopropheta per daemonum praestigias tantam exhibeat apparentiam pro aliquo errore suadendo, quantam habet ex veris miraculis fides Catholica, ut dicetur infra

are sufficiently proposed, and their credibility made known, they are not bound to believe. But the Supreme Pontiff, once it is admitted that he enjoys the privilege of infallibility in matters pertaining to faith, proposes those matters to be believed as the living rule of faith, or as the supreme judge determining what ought to be believed, so that by his authority the faithful are obligated to believe those things; whence it is necessary that they believe, not merely with moral certainty (which could absolutely admit falsity), but with the certainty of faith, that this particular Pontiff existing at this time and governing the Church is truly its Pontiff. Otherwise, if it happened that the authority which this particular person defining possesses were called into doubt, we could not be certain that the matters defined by him remained matters of faith: just as if a canonical book were called into question as to whether it truly is such, certainty could not be had concerning the things contained in it.

Finally, others respond in a third way concerning the infallibility of definitions of faith made by the authority of the Supreme Pontiff, saying it suffices that he be the true Pontiff, either in reality or putatively—that is, that he be regarded as true by the whole Church. For by this very fact he enjoys the privilege of infallibility in defining, with God assisting him thus for the common good of the Church. The proponents of this response, while denying that it is a matter of faith that this particular person is the true Pontiff, nevertheless maintain that it is a matter of faith that this specific individual, who with merely moral certainty is held throughout the Church to be the true Pontiff, truly and properly performs all that a true Pontiff performs, and enjoys all the privileges and the assistance of the Holy Spirit divinely promised to St. Peter and his legitimate successors. For just as, they say, it pertains to the perfection of divine providence in governing His Church that nothing false should creep into all the codices of Sacred Scripture, or that no Magician or other False Prophet should, through demonic illusions, present such an apparent case for persuading some error as the Catholic faith has from true miracles (as will be discussed below

lib.4.sect.2.cap.6. Ita similiter supposito quod Summus Pontifex tanquam supremus Ecclesiae pastor sit regula fidei per modum proponentis; ad eiusdem providentiae divinae suavitatem pertinet, vel ut numquam permittat aliquem eligi, & acceptari a tota Ecclesia, qui habeat aliquod impedimentum invalidans occultum, & ab ea prorsus insanabile, cuiusmodi esset defectus baptismi, legitimaeve ordinationis, vel si id aliquando permetteret, quod adhuc talis Pontifex, quem pro vero & legitimo tota agnosceret, & susciperet Ecclesia; ratione tituli colorati, concurrente communi errore, infallibilem in suis definitionibus auctoritatem haberet.

At haec etiam responsio nihil valet, auctoresque illius in easdem incidunt difficultates, quas in amplectenda nostra sententia vitare conantur; primo enim unde magis per fidem constat, hunc hominem a nobis existimatum Pontificem gaudere in re ipsa privilegiis Summi Pontificis, quam esse verum Pontificem? Unum si quidem altero magis revelatum esse non videtur; imo in hac solutione involvitur quippiam non revelatum solum, sed etiam falsum, revelatisque contrarium, scilicet privilegia omnia Summi Pontificis propria alicui conferri, qui non sit verus Pontifex; cum illa Christus Dominus non cuicumque, sed soli Petro, ac legitimis eius successoribus promiserit. Deinde ut res magis explicetur, si iuxta hanc responsionem debemus credere, quod omnia quae praestat hic homo in particulari sint rite facta, eo modo quo ab veris Pontificibus fiunt; vel hoc est, quia certo credimus talem hominem, esse verum Pontificem, vel cum talis non sit, sed putative solum, ob aliquem essentialem defectum auctoritate Ecclesiae insupplebilem; credimus tamen eum uti privilegio, ac potestate veri Summi Pontificis; si primum dicatur, ut debet dici, si ob necessariam utriusque rei connexionem consequenter discurrere velimus; nam effectus non potest superare causam suam, unde si Pontifex causa efficiens huiusmodi definitionum, solum

in Book 4, Section 2, Chapter 6)—similarly, supposing that the Supreme Pontiff as the supreme pastor of the Church is the rule of faith by way of proposing it, it pertains to the gentleness of this same divine providence either never to permit someone to be elected and accepted by the whole Church who has some hidden invalidating impediment that is absolutely incurable by the Church (such as a defect in baptism or legitimate ordination), or if this should sometimes be permitted, that such a Pontiff, whom the whole Church would recognize and accept as true and legitimate, would still possess, by reason of a colorable title concurrent with common error, infallible authority in his definitions.

But this response is of no value, and its authors fall into the same difficulties they attempt to avoid by embracing our position. First, how is it more established through faith that this man whom we consider to be Pontiff enjoys in reality the privileges of the Supreme Pontiff, than that he is the true Pontiff? Indeed, one does not seem to be more revealed than the other; in fact, this solution involves something not only unrevealed, but also false and contrary to what has been revealed—namely, that all the proper privileges of the Supreme Pontiff can be conferred upon someone who is not the true Pontiff, when Christ the Lord promised these not to just anyone, but solely to Peter and his legitimate successors. Furthermore, to explain the matter more clearly: if according to this response we must believe that everything this man does in particular is rightly done, in the same manner as true Pontiffs act, either this is because we certainly believe such a man to be the true Pontiff, or, though he is not such but only putatively so due to some essential defect that cannot be supplied by the authority of the Church, we nevertheless believe he uses the privilege and power of the true Supreme Pontiff. If the first position is maintained—as it should be if we wish to reason consistently because of the necessary connection between both matters (for the effect cannot exceed its cause, and thus if the Pontiff, as the efficient cause of such definitions, were only morally certain and not certain by faith, his

moraliter certus esset, non autem ex fide, eius quoque definitiones moraliter tantum certae esse possent; si, inquam, hoc primum concedatur, habemus intentum, si autem responderetur secundum, oportet quod tali non obstante vera Pontificis existentia, iterum credamus a Deo suppleri, quicquid requiritur ut eius acta sint valida, ne Ecclesia in hoc fallatur; quod cum aequae incertum sit, ac illud primum, nam ut statim dicebamus, non est magis revelatum, quod huic homini conferat Deus privilegia Pontificis, & suppleat eius auctoritatem, quam quod in re sit Pontifex, praesertim quia tale supplementum, & concessio extraordinaria non fundatur in ipsa promissione Christi; quae solum facta est Petro, & veris eius successoribus, unde sine nova revelatione constare de illa non potest; necessario concludendum est, eadem fidei certitudine tenendum esse, hunc numero Pontificem pro tempore existentem esse verum Pontificem, ac esse veram fidei regulam, quodve gaudeat veris Pontificis auctoritatis praerogativis; ita ut sit etiam contradictio manifesta, asserere hunc hominem supremam habere potestatem iurisdictionis in Ecclesia, nec non definiendi res fidei ex assistentia Spiritus Sancti; & negare, de fide haberi, eundem esse verum Pontificem; quia iam affirmaretur definitionem convenire in hunc hominem, non autem definitum. Unde quoque intelligitur; qua ratione ipsi negantes haberi de fide, hunc esse verum Pontificem, possint nihilominus credere de fide, quae ab illo definiuntur; nam re ipsa, ac de facto credunt illum esse verum Pontificem, cum credant habere potestatem a vero Pontifice inseparabilem; ex quadam autem ignorantia putant se non credere; qua de causa ex ignorantia incidunt in quamdam veluti contradictionem.

Igitur cum praeadductae rationes satis clare videantur nostram demonstrare conclusionem, tota iam difficultas consistit in explicando, quomodo sit illa obiectum fidei, quandoquidem illud solum tale est, quod ex divinis Scripturis, vel traditionibus revelatum habemus; in quibus illam Deus

definitiones likewise could only be morally certain)—if, I say, this first position is granted, we have achieved our aim. But if the second alternative is offered—that despite the absence of a true Pontifical existence, we again believe that God supplies whatever is required for his acts to be valid so that the Church is not deceived in this matter—this is equally uncertain as the first position. For as we were just saying, it is not more revealed that God confers the privileges of the Pontiff upon this man and supplies his authority, than that he is truly the Pontiff. This is especially true since such supplementation and extraordinary concession is not founded upon Christ's own promise, which was made solely to Peter and his true successors; hence, without a new revelation, this cannot be established. We must necessarily conclude that it is to be held with the same certainty of faith that this particular Pontiff existing at this time is the true Pontiff, that he is the true rule of faith, and that he enjoys the prerogatives of the true Pontiff's authority. Thus, it is a manifest contradiction to assert that this man has supreme power of jurisdiction in the Church and the power to define matters of faith through the assistance of the Holy Spirit, while denying that it is held by faith that he is the true Pontiff—for this would affirm that the power of definition belongs to this man, but not that which is defined. Hence it is also understood by what reasoning those who deny that it is held by faith that this man is the true Pontiff can nevertheless believe by faith what is defined by him. For in reality and in fact, they believe he is the true Pontiff when they believe he has power inseparable from the true Pontiff; but through a certain ignorance, they think they do not believe this. For this reason, through ignorance, they fall into a kind of contradiction.

Therefore, since the previously adduced reasons seem to demonstrate our conclusion clearly enough, the entire difficulty now consists in explaining how it is an object of faith, since only that which we have revealed from divine Scriptures or traditions is such an object; in which God has never revealed this matter.

numquam revelavit.

Primo id explicant aliqui, quia conclusionem Theologicam, ex una propositione de fide, & altera saltem moraliter certa, & evidenti deductam, existimant esse de fide; sed sic se habet in praesenti, ut patet ex subsequenti syllogismo: *Omnis canonice promotus ad Cathedram Apostolicam Petri, verus est, ac Universalis Ecclesiae pastor; sed hic numero Pontifex Clemens IX. rite promotus, & electus fuit ad dictam Cathedram: Ergo hic numero Pontifex Clemens IX. est verus ac Universalis Ecclesiae Pastor.* Ubi maior est de fide, minor autem evidens saltem moraliter; quandoquidem supponitur, de legitima electione constare, irrefragabili Ecclesiae universalis pacifice illam acceptantis testimonio; proceditque quaestio de Pontifice legitime electo; & ut tali ab Ecclesia indubitanter admissio, quamdiu enim dubitatur cum fundamento de validitate electionis, certum est non esse de fide, saltem quo ad nos, quod hic homo sit verus Papa.

Verum haec explicatio precise non est efficax. Etsi enim ex una praemissa de fide, & alia certa vel moraliter, vel physice, vel etiam metaphysice, possit aliquando sequi conclusio certissima, id tamen non sufficit, ut immediate pertineat ad fidem, debeatque credi per illam, nisi aliunde sit revelata; & quo ad nos accedat Ecclesiae definitio, vel acceptatio ita illam credentis; eademque definitio, vel acceptatio assumatur in minori, fiatque proinde syllogismus constans ex duabus praemissis de fide, ut mox dicetur. Et ratio huius rei est, quoniam ea tantum sunt immediate de fide quo ad se, quae fuerunt a Deo revelata, quaeque proinde si non essent vera, Deus esset mendax. Id autem non contingit in Conclusionem Theologicam elicita dependentem ab una praemissa certitudine tantum naturali nota, talis enim conclusio, eiusque certitudo non innitur soli veracitati divinae, sed etiam illi obiecto naturaliter certo, quod Deus non revelavit, ut supponitur, & quod proinde si esset

First, some explain this because they consider a Theological conclusion, deduced from one proposition of faith and another that is at least morally certain and evident, to be a matter of faith; but this is how it stands in the present case, as is clear from the following syllogism: *Everyone canonically promoted to the Apostolic Chair of Peter is the true and Universal Pastor of the Church; but this particular Pope Clement IX was duly promoted and elected to said Chair: Therefore, this particular Pope Clement IX is the true and Universal Pastor of the Church.* Here the major premise is a matter of faith, while the minor premise is at least morally evident; since it is supposed that the legitimate election is established by the irrefutable testimony of the universal Church peacefully accepting it; and the question proceeds concerning a legitimately elected Pontiff who is indubitably admitted as such by the Church, for as long as there is well-founded doubt about the validity of the election, it is certain that it is not a matter of faith, at least for us, that this man is the true Pope.

However, this explanation is not precisely effective. For although from one premise of faith, and another that is certain either morally, physically, or even metaphysically, a most certain conclusion can sometimes follow, this nevertheless does not suffice for it to pertain immediately to the faith, or to be believed through faith, unless it is revealed from elsewhere; and as far as we are concerned, unless the definition or acceptance of the Church believing it in this way is added, and that same definition or acceptance is assumed in the minor premise, thus producing a syllogism consisting of two premises of faith, as will soon be explained. And the reason for this is that only those things are immediately of faith in themselves which have been revealed by God, and which therefore, if they were not true, would make God a liar. But this does not occur in a Theological Conclusion derived dependently from one premise known with merely natural certainty; for such a conclusion and its certainty do not rest on divine truthfulness alone, but also on that naturally certain object which God has not revealed, as is

falsum, nec non falsa etiam conclusio, nil propterea conqueri possemus de Deo tanquam mendace, vel deceptore.

Altera huius difficultatis explicandae via est, quia talis conclusio evidenter inferri potest ex duabus praemissis revelatis, sequenti discursu. *Impossibile est universam Ecclesiam falli, vel decipi in rebus ad communem ipsius religionem pertinentibus; cum ex Dei revelatione sit columna, & firmamentum veritatis 1. Timoth. cap. 2. adversus quam portae inferi numquam praevalerunt: At iudicium, quo universa Ecclesia quempiam acceptat, & habet pro Pontifice, supremoque suo capite, est res ad totius Ecclesiae religionem spectans; Ergo impossibile est universam Ecclesiam in eo falli iudicio; ac proinde de fide est, hunc numero Pontificem, quem tota Ecclesia tanquam legitime electum agnoscit & recipit, esse verum Pontificem, supremumque illius caput.* Ubi maior, & minor propositio cum sint de fide, sequitur quoque conclusionem esse talem, si quidem ex multis sufficit, ut aliqua propositio ad fidem pertinere dicatur, quod evidenter, evidentia nimirum consequentiae, deducatur ex duabus praemissis de fide; quod est maxime verum, quando huiusmodi praemissae se habent solum tanquam conditiones in huiusmodi discursibus Theologicis, ut explicuimus lib.1. sect.3. cap.2. tunc enim non tam sunt conclusiones Theologicae, vel simpliciter deductae, quam explicatae, ideoque ita per discursum Theologicum, per modum applicantis, vel approximantis, sequuntur evidenter ex duabus revelatis, proponunturque intellectui; ut hoc non obstante dici debeant immediate revelatae, atque adeo immediate credi.

Tertio igitur res tota sic explicatur. Illud est de fide divina immediate quo ad se, quod divinitus revelatum est, sed hunc numero Pontificem Clementem IX. aut alium quempiam pro tempore existentem rite electum, verum esse Pontificem, divinitus revelatum est; Ergo talis propositio est de fide divina immediate quo

supposed, and which therefore if it were false, and consequently the conclusion also false, we could not on that account complain about God as being a liar or deceiver.

Another way of explaining this difficulty is because such a conclusion can be evidently inferred from two revealed premises through the following reasoning. *It is impossible for the universal Church to err or be deceived in matters pertaining to its common religion, since by God's revelation it is "the pillar and foundation of truth" (1 Timothy 2),* against which the gates of hell shall never prevail. But the judgment whereby the universal Church accepts someone as Pontiff and its supreme head is a matter concerning the religion of the entire Church. Therefore, it is impossible for the universal Church to err in such judgment; and consequently, it is a matter of faith that this particular Pontiff, whom the whole Church acknowledges and receives as legitimately elected, is the true Pontiff and its supreme head.* Where both the major and minor premises are matters of faith, it follows that the conclusion is likewise such, since among many criteria, it suffices for a proposition to be said to pertain to faith if it is deduced with evident logical necessity from two premises of faith. This is especially true when such premises function merely as conditions in theological discourses of this kind, as we explained in Book 1, Section 3, Chapter 2. For in that case, they are not so much theological conclusions or simply deduced ones as they are explicated ones, and therefore they follow evidently from two revealed premises through theological discourse, by way of application or approximation, and are proposed to the intellect in such a manner that, notwithstanding this process, they ought to be called immediately revealed and thus immediately believed.

Thirdly, therefore, the whole matter is explained thus. That which is of divine faith immediately in itself is what has been divinely revealed. But that this particular Pope, Clement IX, or any other who exists at a given time and has been duly elected, is the true Pontiff, has been divinely revealed. Therefore, such a proposition is of divine faith

ad se.

Maior huius argumenti est evidens; minor autem ostenditur; sive tunc illam fuisse divinitus revelatam quando Christus revelavit Petrum esse caput Ecclesiae, supremumque eius Pastorem; tunc enim pariter idem revelavit generaliter, de omnibus eius successoribus legitime ab Ecclesia electis, ita ut solum quo ad nos deesset sufficiens propositio huius, vel illius contenti sub illa revelatione, quae propositio habetur per universalem testificationem, & approbationem Ecclesiae.

Ad cuius intelligentiam notandum est aliqua revelata fuisse a Deo in genere ad hoc ut crederentur in genere; cuiusmodi sunt, *Deum omnia non involventia contradictionem posse*, & similia: per quas revelationes Deus tantum intendit, ut de ipso cognosceremus eiusmodi perfectiones Universales in genere.

II. Conclusio: Hunc numero Pontificem pro tempore existentem, verum esse Pontificem, non redditur de fide quo ad nos precise, per solam Dominorum Cardinalium electionem.

Probat, quia licet talis propositio quo ad se possit esse plerumque de fide, ubi nimirum talis electio sit cum omnibus conditionibus tam de iure divino, quam humano Ecclesiastico requisitis: tamen cum in illa sacrum Cardinalium collegium non gaudeat privilegio infallibilitatis, nullibi enim legitur illi fuisse concessum, sed Ecclesiae solum, potest aliquando eligere aliquem habentem defectum essentialem, vel si nullum habet, reddere suam electionem alio ex capite invalidam, cui sua auctoritate supplere non potest, sicut de Ecclesia notavimus supra, & mox iterum declarabimus: cum Domini Cardinales, sub nullitatis poena teneantur eligere iuxta formam a Summis Pontificibus praescriptam, ut satis patet ex eorum textibus: Igitur, hunc numero Pontificem pro tempore existentem, verum esse Pontificem non redditur de fide quo ad nos precise, per solam Dominorum Cardinalium electionem, nisi insuper

immediately in itself.

The major premise of this argument is evident; the minor premise, however, is demonstrated, whether it was divinely revealed when Christ revealed that Peter was the head of the Church and its supreme Pastor; for then He likewise revealed the same generally concerning all his successors legitimately elected by the Church, such that only in relation to us would there be lacking a sufficient proposition of this or that content under that revelation, which proposition is obtained through the universal testimony and approval of the Church.

For understanding this, it must be noted that some things were revealed by God in general so that they might be believed in general, such as “God can do all things that do not involve a contradiction,” and similar statements. Through these revelations, God only intended that we should know such universal perfections about Him in general.

II. Conclusion: That this particular Pontiff existing at the present time is the true Pontiff is not rendered a matter of faith for us precisely through the election of the Lord Cardinals alone.

This is proven because, although such a proposition in itself can often be a matter of faith—namely, where such an election occurs with all the conditions required both by divine law and ecclesiastical human law—nevertheless, since the sacred College of Cardinals does not enjoy the privilege of infallibility (for nowhere is it read that this was granted to it, but only to the Church), it can sometimes elect someone having an essential defect, or, if he has no defect, render its election invalid on other grounds, which it cannot remedy by its own authority, as we noted above concerning the Church and will soon explain again. Since the Lord Cardinals are bound, under penalty of nullity, to elect according to the form prescribed by the Supreme Pontiffs, as is sufficiently evident from their texts, therefore, that this particular Pontiff existing at the present time is the true Pontiff is not rendered a matter of faith for us precisely through the election of the Lord Cardinals alone, unless, in addition, the consensus of the universal Church is

accedat universalis Ecclesiae consensus. Unde sequitur illos primos actus, per quos fideles agnoscunt novum electum in Pontificem, non esse quoad hoc actus fidei divinae, sed fidei & prudentiae humanae, ac fallibilis, donec accedente communi Ecclesiae & fidelium acceptatione, resultat in singulis obligatio fidei divinae, ad credendum illum esse verum Pontificem.

Et ratio est, quia fide divina credere non tenemur rem cui potest subesse falsum, vel speculative, vel practice; at supposito quod Domini Cardinales in eligendo Summo Pontifice non gaudeant privilegio infallibilitatis, & propterea nulliter eligere possint, tam ex parte eligibilis, quam ex parte electionis, potest huic propositioni, *quod hic numero Pontifex ab illis electus sit verus Pontifex*, subesse falsum defectu legitimae electionis; Ergo non tenemur illam de fide credere, nisi aliunde quid accedat, per quod de legitima electione certo nobis constet; non enim est de fide, hunc numero Pontificem pro tempore existentem, esse verum Pontificem; sed hunc numero Pontificem rite electum, esse verum Pontificem, quae continetur sub illa propositione universali revelata; *Quod omnes Pontifices Romani rite electi sunt veri Pontifices, divique Petri successores*.

III. Conclusio: Hunc numero Pontificem rite electum, verum esse Pontificem, quod est de fide quo ad se, redditur de fide quo ad nos, per universalem Ecclesiae consensum pacifice, & indubitanter illum acceptantis.

Probatur, ad hoc ut aliqua propositio de fide quo ad se, reddatur talis quo ad nos, nihil aliud requiritur nisi quod proponatur ab habente talem auctoritatem, cui in materia fidei nullum prorsus falsum subesse possit; sed est huiusmodi auctoritas Ecclesiae universalis; Ergo ubi illa semel declarat, & proponit hunc numero Pontificem pro tempore existentem, fuisse canonice, & legitime electum, redditur de fide quo ad nos illum sic rite electum, verum esse Pontificem; sive talis

added. Hence it follows that those first acts by which the faithful recognize the newly elected Pontiff are not, with respect to this, acts of divine faith, but of human and fallible faith and prudence, until, with the common acceptance of the Church and the faithful having been added, there results in individuals the obligation of divine faith to believe that he is the true Pontiff.

And the reason is that we are not bound by divine faith to believe in a matter to which falsehood can be subject, either speculatively or practically; but supposing that the Lord Cardinals in electing the Supreme Pontiff do not enjoy the privilege of infallibility, and therefore can elect invalidly, both on the part of the eligible person and on the part of the election itself, falsehood could underlie this proposition, *that this particular Pontiff elected by them is the true Pontiff*, due to a defect in the legitimate election. Therefore, we are not bound to believe it as a matter of faith, unless something else is added elsewhere, by which we may be certainly assured of the legitimate election; for it is not a matter of faith that this particular Pontiff existing at a certain time is the true Pontiff; but rather that this particular Pontiff who has been rightly elected is the true Pontiff, which is contained under that universal revealed proposition: *That all Roman Pontiffs rightly elected are true Pontiffs and successors of St. Peter*.

III. Conclusion: That this particular Pontiff who has been rightly elected is the true Pontiff, which is a matter of faith in itself, is rendered a matter of faith for us through the universal consent of the Church peacefully and undoubtingly accepting him.

It is proven that, in order for a proposition that is of faith in itself to be rendered such for us, nothing else is required except that it be proposed by one having such authority to which, in matters of faith, no falsehood whatsoever can be subject. But such is the authority of the universal Church. Therefore, when it once declares and proposes this particular Pontiff currently in office to have been canonically and legitimately elected, it becomes a matter of faith for us that he who was thus properly elected is the true Pontiff. Such a declaration or proposition

declaratio, vel propositio fiat per acceptationem pacificam universalis Ecclesiae toto orbe diffusae, sive per definitionem Concilii, si sit aliquod dubium in electione, ut patet ex Concilio Constantiensi; cum enim, maxime ubi electio non est pacifica, & pacifice acceptata, sed rationabiliter dubia, non possit Pontifex electus procedere ad definiendum, vel determinandum de illa, quia stante tali dubio, non potest obligare, ut eius determinationes recipiantur pro legitimis & indubitatis; necesse est quod illa determinatio fiat auctoritate Ecclesiae, sive per acceptationem universalem pacificam, sive per definitionem Concilii universalis: stante cuius infallibilitate in rebus fidei, aut ab ea non acceptabitur electio, si careat aliqua conditione indispensabiliter requisita ad eius validitatem, vel si talis defectus non fuerit, sed alius ex humano dumtaxat iure proveniens, de sua insuper potestatis plenitudine illum sanabit, ut in huius capitis principio praenotavimus; indeque nullum umquam potest suboriri dubium de legitima huius numero Pontificis electione; quem Ecclesia universalis acceptat, & recognoscit pro vero Pontifice; deque illo sic acceptato, & agnito debet intelligi quod ex Concilio Constantiensi superius adduximus ad probationem primae conclusionis; ut mox declarabimus satisfaciendo sequenti quaesito.

Inquiret igitur aliquis quo tempore incipiat dicta Ecclesiae acceptatio, fiatque per illam sufficiens propositio, ut reddatur de fide quo ad nos, hunc numero Pontificem rite electum, verum esse Pontificem; obligenturque fideles ad illud credendum, an eo ipso quod Cardinales electum promulgant illis fidelibus, qui in electionis loco reperiuntur? an vero quando res iam per totum mundum, & Ecclesiam ubicumque diffusam divulgata est? Respondetur ex dictis, statim post concordem Cardinalium electionem, teneri quidem fideles ex praecepto obedientiae, & caritatis obedire Pontifici electo; ita ut non possit quispiam iure ab illo disiungi, sine

may occur either through the peaceful acceptance of the universal Church spread throughout the world, or through the definition of a Council if there is any doubt in the election, as is evident from the Council of Constance. Since indeed, especially when an election is not peaceful and peacefully accepted but reasonably doubtful, the elected Pontiff cannot proceed to define or determine regarding it (because while such doubt stands, he cannot impose an obligation that his determinations be received as legitimate and undoubted), it is necessary that such determination be made by the authority of the Church, either through universal peaceful acceptance or through the definition of a universal Council. Given the Church's infallibility in matters of faith, either it will not accept the election if it lacks some condition indispensably required for its validity, or if there was no such defect but only another stemming merely from human law, it will, moreover, remedy it by the fullness of its power, as we noted at the beginning of this chapter. Thus, no doubt can ever arise concerning the legitimate election of this particular Pontiff whom the universal Church accepts and recognizes as the true Pontiff. Concerning him thus accepted and acknowledged, what we adduced above from the Council of Constance in proof of the first conclusion must be understood, as we shall soon declare in answering the following question.

Someone may therefore inquire at what time the said acceptance by the Church begins, and through it a sufficient proposition is made, so that it becomes a matter of faith for us that this particular Pontiff, duly elected, is the true Pontiff; and the faithful are obligated to believe this—whether this occurs as soon as the Cardinals proclaim the elected one to those faithful who are present at the place of election, or rather when the matter has already been divulged throughout the whole world and the Church spread everywhere. It is answered from what has been said that immediately after the concordant election by the Cardinals, the faithful are indeed bound by the precept of obedience and charity to obey the elected Pontiff, such that no one

schismate; ad hoc enim sufficit certitudo moralis, quae habetur per talem electionem, de persona rite electa: non autem ad assensum fidei, sed ad illum requiritur insuper acceptatio Ecclesiae; quae incipit negative statim dum non contradicit Ecclesia, ubicumque scit talem electionem; positive autem dum statim a praelatis & populis, qui in electionis loco existunt, illi acquiescitur, & paulatim in aliis mundi partibus, a ceteris etiam fidelibus tam praelatis, quam subditis admittitur; ita ut illi qui vident, aut audiunt Papam electum, eique non contradici, sed ab omnibus admitti, teneantur iuxta certiore, quam defendimus sententiam, credere fide divina, & supernaturali, hunc numero Pontificem rite electum, & pro tali ab Ecclesia acceptatum, suae acceptatione propositum, verum esse Pontificem, ac D. Petri successorem.

IV. Conclusio: Hunc numero Pontificem a Dominis Cardinalibus electum, verum esse Pontificem tunc maxime, ac veluti consummative redditur de fide quo ad nos, quando non solum Ecclesia in actu exercito ipsum acceptat in Pontificem, subiiciendo se illi tanquam suo supremo capiti; sed quando insuper ipse Pontifex in exercitio definit aliquid tanquam de fide tenendum.

Ista conclusio sequitur ex dictis, suppositaque Summi Pontificis indefectibilitate in determinandis ex cathedra rebus ad fidem spectantibus; fieri enim non potest, ut fide credamus aliquod obiectum definitum, & non credamus simul ipsam definitionem esse legitimam, & consequenter ipsum definientem hic, & nunc infallibilem auctoritatem habere circa determinandas, ac regulandas res fidei, quod est credere, quod hic homo definiens sit verus Pontifex, supremaque in Ecclesia potestate gaudeat. Unde quando Summus Pontifex ita definit, nullus est fidelis, qui assentiens rebus definitis credendo, simul etiam in actu exercito non credat eum esse

can rightfully separate from him without schism. For this, the moral certainty which is obtained through such an election concerning the duly elected person is sufficient—not, however, for an assent of faith, but for that [assent of faith] the acceptance of the Church is additionally required. This begins negatively as soon as the Church, wherever it knows of such an election, does not contradict it; positively, however, when it is immediately acquiesced to by the prelates and people who are present at the place of election, and gradually in other parts of the world, it is also admitted by the rest of the faithful, both prelates and subjects. Thus, those who see or hear of the elected Pope, and observe that he is not contradicted but admitted by all, are bound according to the more certain opinion which we defend, to believe with divine and supernatural faith that this particular Pontiff, duly elected and accepted by the Church as such, and proposed through its acceptance, is the true Pontiff and successor of St. Peter.

IV. Conclusion: That this numerically specific Pontiff elected by the Lord Cardinals is truly the Pontiff becomes most certainly and definitively a matter of faith for us when not only does the Church accept him as Pontiff in practical terms, subjecting itself to him as its supreme head, but furthermore when the Pontiff himself, in exercising his office, defines something that must be held as a matter of faith.

This conclusion follows from what has been said, and presupposes the Supreme Pontiff's indefectibility in determining matters pertaining to faith when speaking ex cathedra. For it is impossible that we believe by faith some defined object without simultaneously believing that the definition itself is legitimate, and consequently that the one making the definition here and now possesses infallible authority concerning the determination and regulation of matters of faith—which means believing that this man who is defining is the true Pontiff and enjoys supreme power in the Church. Hence, when the Supreme Pontiff defines something in this way, there is no faithful person who, while assenting to the defined

verum Pontificem; quamvis ubi postea haec veritas quasi in actu signato, & speculative seorsum consideratur, non appareat, ob multas circumstantias, & conditiones, quae hunc, vel illum spectant hominem, quomodo sit de fide illum esse verum Pontificem, eo quod non omnia illa in particulari sufficienter attigisse divina revelatio, nobis declarasse videatur.

Licet ex dictis facile obviam iri posset omnibus obiectionibus, quae contra nostras conclusiones fieri solent; nihilominus ut earum veritas magis appareat, breviter illas adducam, & solvam.

Primum ergo obiicitur, illud solum esse de fide immediate quo ad se, quod fuit divinitus revelatum, sed hunc numero Pontificem, quem tota Ecclesia tanquam legitime electum agnoscit, & recipit, verum esse Pontificem, ac Beati Petri successorem, nullibi revelatum reperitur; Ergo non est de fide immediate quo ad se; Maior huius argumenti est certissima, & in definitione rei fundata, Minor autem multipliciter probatur, *primo*, quia nec in Scriptura, nec in traditione talis revelationis fundamentum habetur; *secundo*, quia si hoc divinitus esset revelatum, divinitus quoque revelatae dici deberent conditiones essentialiter requisitae ad legitimam huius Pontificis electionem, ut quod sit vir, & non femina; quod sit baptizatus; riteque ordinatus; quia sicut supponitur, necessario facta est legitima electio, ut sit de fide hunc numero Pontificem esse verum Pontificem, saltem quantum ad conditiones indispensabiliter necessarias, & auctoritate Ecclesiae insupplebiles. *Tertio*, illud solum est divinitus revelatum; ac proinde de fide immediate, cuius oppositum est manifesta, & formalis haeresis, sed qui negat hunc hominem esse Papam non est haereticus, sed solum schismaticus; sicut & qui negaret omnes retro Pontifices fuisse veros Pontifices non esset talis; Igitur non est de fide immediate quo ad se, quod hic numero Pontifex pro tempore existens, quem tota Ecclesia tanquam legitime electum recipit,

matters through belief, does not simultaneously in practical terms believe him to be the true Pontiff; although when this truth is later considered separately in a theoretical and speculative manner, it may not appear, due to the many circumstances and conditions pertaining to this or that particular man, how it could be a matter of faith that he is the true Pontiff, since divine revelation does not seem to have sufficiently addressed or declared to us all those particular details.

Although from what has been said, one could easily counter all objections that are commonly made against our conclusions, nevertheless, so that their truth may appear more clearly, I shall briefly present and resolve these objections.

Therefore, the first objection is raised: only that which has been divinely revealed is immediately of faith in itself. But that this particular Pope, whom the entire Church acknowledges and accepts as legitimately elected, is the true Pontiff and successor of Blessed Peter, is found to be revealed nowhere. Therefore, it is not immediately of faith in itself. The major premise of this argument is most certain and founded on the definition of the matter. The minor premise, however, is proven in multiple ways: *first*, because neither in Scripture nor in tradition is there a foundation for such a revelation; *second*, because if this were divinely revealed, then the conditions essentially required for the legitimate election of this Pontiff would also have to be considered divinely revealed, such as that he is a man and not a woman; that he is baptized; and properly ordained; because, as it is supposed, a legitimate election must necessarily have occurred for it to be of faith that this particular Pontiff is the true Pontiff, at least concerning those conditions that are indispensably necessary and cannot be supplied by the authority of the Church. *Third*, only that which is divinely revealed, and consequently immediately of faith, is that whose opposite constitutes manifest and formal heresy, but one who denies that this man is Pope is not a heretic but only a schismatic; just as one who would deny that all previous Pontiffs were true Pontiffs would not be such [i.e., a heretic]; Therefore, it is not immediately of faith in itself that this particular

& agnoscit, sit verus Pontifex.

Respondetur ad hoc argumentum concedendo Maiorem, & negando Minorem; ad cuius primam probationem dicimus, hanc veritatem immediate a Deo revelatam fuisse revelatione illa universali, quae ex una parte patefecit, omnes rite eligendos, & promovendos ad cathedram Petri, futuros veros Pontifices eius successores, suos vero Vicarios; Et ex alia Ecclesiam universalem numquam in rebus fidei erraturam, cum sit columna, & firmamentum veritatis: in huiusmodi enim propositionibus universalibus a Deo revelatis, continetur formaliter, & ut pars in suo toto, tam quod *hic numero Pontifex rite electus, sit verus Pontifex*; quam quod *Ecclesia in illo acceptando errare non possit*; unde si cum illis propositionibus universalibus, alia iungatur particularis, quod vera nimirum Ecclesia, quam per totum orbem diffusam cernimus, & infallibilitatis privilegio gaudere per fidem credimus, hunc numero Pontificem tanquam rite electum acceptat; redditur statim de fide quo ad nos, illum esse verum Pontificem, ut conclusione prima fusius explicuimus.

Ad secundam probationem respondetur praefatas condiciones, & ex illis efformatas propositiones dupliciter spectari posse, vel antecederet ad hoc quod Ecclesia acceptet, hunc numero Pontificem tanquam rite electum, vel subsequenter. Si considerentur primo modo, fatemur, illas esse quid mere contingens, maioremque certitudinem non habere, quam moralem, cui potest subesse falsum; si autem secundo considerentur modo, ita pertinent ad fidem, non quidem immediate, sed mediate, ut conclusiones Theologicae necessario illatae ex una de fide.

Divina enim revelatio, sicut & ipsa Ecclesiae acceptatio non versantur per se primo, circa requisita, vel condiciones, quae tam in electoribus, quam in persona electa necessario concurrere debent ad legitimam

Pontiff existing at a given time, whom the entire Church receives and acknowledges as legitimately elected, is the true Pontiff.

The response to this argument is given by conceding the Major premise and denying the Minor premise; to the first proof of which we say that this truth was immediately revealed by God through that universal revelation which, on the one hand, made manifest that all who are duly elected and promoted to the Chair of Peter would be true Pontiffs succeeding him and His true Vicars; and on the other hand, that the universal Church would never err in matters of faith, since it is the pillar and foundation of truth. For in such universal propositions revealed by God, it is formally contained, as a part in its whole, both *that this particular Pontiff who has been duly elected is a true Pontiff*, and *that the Church cannot err in accepting him*. Hence, if with those universal propositions another particular one is joined—namely, that the true Church, which we see spread throughout the world and which we believe by faith enjoys the privilege of infallibility, accepts this particular Pontiff as duly elected—it immediately becomes a matter of faith for us that he is the true Pontiff, as we explained more fully in the first conclusion.

To the second proof, the response is that the aforementioned conditions and the propositions formed from them can be viewed in two ways: either antecedently to the Church's acceptance of this particular Pontiff as duly elected, or subsequently. If they are considered in the first way, we admit that they are merely contingent matters, having no more than moral certainty, which may admit of falsehood; but if they are considered in the second way, they pertain to faith, not immediately, but mediate, as theological conclusions necessarily inferred from a premise of faith.

Divine revelation, just as the acceptance by the Church itself, does not primarily concern itself with the requisites or conditions which must necessarily concur in both the electors and the person elected for a legitimate election, and subsequently with the

electionem, & deinde circa ipsum electum, sed vice versa, per fidem, seu revelationem implicite contentam in symbolo, & in promissione facta D. Petro, applicatam autem, ac declaratam in exercitio per pacificam universalis Ecclesiae acceptationem, solum constat hunc numero Pontificem pro tempore existentem esse verum Pontificem; indeque infertur per consequentiam Theologicam, quod a veris legitimisque electoribus, veramque eligendi intentionem habentibus electus fuerit; quodque sit vir, & non femina, quod sit baptizatus, & ordinatus; quod non sit haereticus, si semel fides interna, & externa necessario, & insupplebiliter ab Ecclesia requiratur, ut quis sit verus Pontifex; quod probabilius existimo.

Nam si, ut volunt aliqui, cum haeresi interna sufficeret fidei solum externa professio, posset dici huiusmodi defectu ex solo iure Ecclesiastico originem habentem, suppleri auctoritate Ecclesiae ignoranter illum tolerantis, donec ipsi de eodem constando procedat ad eius depositionem.

Exemplum huius rei habemus in definitionibus Conciliorum, in quibus; licet fides non versetur circa ea, quae ad eorum definitionem prae-requisita sunt, ut quod veritatis definiendae accurata praecesserit indagatio, imo tunc fit quid mere contingens, illa tamen accedente, recte infertur per consequentiam Theologicam, omnia ad legitimam definitionem posita fuisse, & consequenter diligentem veritatis inquisitionem per disputationem praecessisse. Cuius ratio est, quia quando aliquid per se est de fide, non opus est quod ad illam quoque pertineant ea omnia, quae necessariam cum illo connexionem habent; imo in hoc consistit conclusio Theologica, quod versatur circa illa quae necessario cum his, quae sunt de fide connectuntur, & ex illis mere syllogistice inferuntur.

hic homo rite fuit electus, cum illa particula *rite electus*, dupliciter intelligi possit; primo, quasi per illas significetur adhibitae esse omnes conditiones necessarias, ut electio sit legitima antecedenter ad

elect himself, but conversely, through faith, or revelation implicitly contained in the creed, and in the promise made to St. Peter—applied, however, and declared in practice through the peaceful acceptance of the universal Church—it is only established that this particular Pontiff existing at the time is the true Pontiff. From this it is inferred by theological consequence that he was elected by true and legitimate electors having a true intention of electing; and that he is a man, not a woman; that he is baptized and ordained; that he is not a heretic, if internal and external faith is necessarily and irreplaceably required by the Church for someone to be a true Pontiff—which I consider more probable.

For if, as some maintain, alongside internal heresy mere external profession of faith were sufficient, it could be said that such a defect, having its origin in ecclesiastical law alone, could be remedied by the authority of the Church that unknowingly tolerates him, until such time as the Church, having become aware of this defect, proceeds to his deposition.

We have an example of this in the definitions of Councils, in which, although faith is not concerned with those things that are prerequisites for their definition, such as that a thorough investigation of the truth to be defined must have preceded (indeed, this is merely contingent), nevertheless, when such a definition is made, it is rightly inferred through theological reasoning that all conditions for a legitimate definition were met, and consequently that a diligent inquiry into the truth through disputation preceded it. The reason for this is that when something is in itself a matter of faith, it is not necessary that all things which have a necessary connection with it also pertain to faith; rather, this is what constitutes a theological conclusion, which concerns those things that are necessarily connected with matters of faith and are deduced from them through pure syllogistic reasoning.

this man was duly elected, since that phrase *duly elected* can be understood in two ways; first, as if by these words it is signified that all necessary conditions were applied so that the election is

Ecclesiae acceptationem; quo si intelligantur modo, talis propositio maiorem, quam moralem certitudinem non habet nec alia ratione in hanc aliam influet veritatem, aut propositionem, *hic homo est verus Pontifex*, quam per modum dispositionis, *ut sit verus Pontifex*, & in talem ab Ecclesia acceptetur; ita ut faciat hunc sensum: *hic homo rite fuit electus*, id est, *hic homo fuit electus cum requisitis conditionibus, ob quas in verum acceptari debet Pontificem*; secundo, praefatae particulae *rite electus*, non solum intelligi possunt de electione cum omnibus requisitis facta, sed etiam acceptata in particulari ab Ecclesia, & tunc illa propositio est de fide, quod *hic homo recte fuerit electus*; sicuti facta definitione ab universali Concilio, est propositio de fide, quod illa definitio sit legitima; quia, *hunc hominem fuisse rite, vel recte electum*; & *hunc hominem esse verum Pontificem*, non ponunt in numero, acceptatio enim in Pontificem, & esse verum Pontificem idem sunt; sicut & rem aliquam, a Concilio universali fuisse definitam, & definitionem eius esse veram, ac legitimam pro uno, & eodem comparantur.

Ad tertiam denique probationem respondetur ex dictis, quod Ecclesia non acceptat illam electionem, & electi materiam pura obedientia, sed insuper ut materiam ad fidem spectantem; quia ut diximus acceptat illum ut verum caput suum visibile; unde eadem certitudine fidei, qua credimus hanc numero fidelium congregationem toto orbe diffusam, quae Summo Pontifici Romano, tanquam suo capiti visibili adhaeret, veram esse Christi Ecclesiam, tenemur quoque credere hunc numero Pontificem cui sic adhaeret, quemque ut legitime electum acceptat, esse verum Pontificem. Insuper illum, non ut caput tantum, sed ut regulam fidei infallibilem agnoscit, quod ut vidimus supra fieri non potest, nisi sit etiam de fide, quod ipse sic agnitus, sit vere regula fidei. Igitur ille qui negaret hunc hominem esse Papam, quem tota semel Ecclesia pro rite electo acceptavit; non solum esset

legitimate prior to the Church's acceptance; if understood in this way, such a proposition has no more than moral certainty nor does it influence this other truth or proposition, *this man is the true Pontiff*, except by way of disposition, *that he may be the true Pontiff*, and as such be accepted by the Church; so that it makes this sense: *this man was duly elected*, that is, *this man was elected with the requisite conditions, on account of which he ought to be accepted as the true Pontiff*; second, the aforementioned phrase *duly elected* can be understood not only concerning an election conducted with all requisites, but also particularly accepted by the Church, and then that proposition is a matter of faith, that *this man was rightly elected*; just as, once a definition has been made by an ecumenical Council, it is a proposition of faith that that definition is legitimate; because, *this man having been duly or rightly elected; and this man being the true Pontiff*, do not count as separate things, for acceptance as Pontiff and being the true Pontiff are the same; just as a matter having been defined by an ecumenical Council, and its definition being true and legitimate are considered one and the same.

Finally, to the third proof, it is answered from what has been said that the Church does not accept that election and the elected person merely as a matter of pure obedience, but moreover as a matter pertaining to faith; because, as we have said, it accepts him as its true visible head. Hence, with the same certainty of faith by which we believe that this particular congregation of the faithful spread throughout the whole world, which adheres to the Supreme Roman Pontiff as to its visible head, is the true Church of Christ, we are also bound to believe that this particular Pontiff to whom it thus adheres, and whom it accepts as legitimately elected, is the true Pontiff. Furthermore, the Church acknowledges him not only as its head but also as an infallible rule of faith, which, as we have seen above, cannot occur unless it is also a matter of faith that he, thus acknowledged, is truly the rule of faith. Therefore, one who would deny that this man is the Pope, whom the entire Church has once accepted as duly elected, would be not only schismatic but also

schismaticus, sed etiam haereticus; non enim solum scinderet unitatem Ecclesiae sicut illi, qui duos a principio eligerent Pontifices, de quibus ignoratur quis sit verus Pontifex; sed insuper falsum adderet dogma; quia negaret habendum pro vero Pontifice, atque adeo pro vero Ecclesiae capite, veraque fidei regula illum quem universalis Ecclesia pacifice pro tali reciperet. Unde tunc maxime haberet locum id quod docet D. Hieronymus *super cap.3. ad Titum*: & post ipsum D. Thomas 2.2. quaest.39. art.1. ad 3. *Nullum schisma esse, quod non sibi aliquam haeresim confingat, ut ab Ecclesia recessisse videatur.*

Quae responsio non solum intelligitur de hoc numero Summo Pontifice vivente; sed extendi quoque debet ad alios omnes, qui cunctis retro saeculis Ecclesiae legitime praefuerunt: si semel nobis constet eos ab Ecclesia fuisse acceptatos, vel quia id vidimus, vel quia aliqua eorum definitio remansit; in qua declarando aliquid de fide, simul declaratum reliquerunt se fuisse verum Ecclesiae caput; veramque fidei regulam; si enim nullam de tali acceptance certitudinem haberemus, tunc per accidens non esset de fide quo ad nos; sed per historiam duntaxat humanam id teneremus: Nisi mallems dicere semper de hoc nobis sufficienter ad fidem constare posse in illo fidei principio, quod Ecclesia Christi ab initio ad haec usque tempora indesinenter una & eadem perseveraverit, de cuius essentia cum sit habere verum caput, non potuerunt non acceptari ab illa omnes Pontifices pro tempore legitime electi; aut si tales non fuerint, vel etiam dubii, reprobari, ut ad alterius procederetur electionem; ne contra Christi institutionem, & promissionem, remaneret acephala, dicereturque periisse; quomodo argumentantur haeretici contententes a tempore saltem Urbani Papae VI. defecisse verum successorem; hinc enim satis sibi videntur inferre, iam non posse esse certum, an vere Summo Pontifici succedatur, aut ubi gentium vera Ecclesia

heretical. For he would not only rend the unity of the Church like those who from the beginning might elect two Pontiffs, of whom it is unknown which is the true Pontiff, but would additionally profess a false dogma; because he would deny that one whom the universal Church peacefully receives as such should be held as the true Pontiff, and therefore as the true head of the Church and the true rule of faith. Wherefore then that which St. Jerome teaches in his commentary on the third chapter of Titus would especially apply, and after him St. Thomas in the *Secunda Secundae*, question 39, article 1, reply to objection 3: “No schism exists that does not contrive some heresy for itself, so that it may appear to have withdrawn from the Church with justification.”

This response is understood not only concerning the current Supreme Pontiff during his lifetime, but must also be extended to all others who legitimately presided over the Church in all past ages: if we are once assured that they were accepted by the Church, either because we witnessed it ourselves, or because some definition of theirs remains, in which, by declaring something concerning the faith, they simultaneously left declared that they were the true head of the Church and the true rule of faith. For if we had no certainty of such acceptance, then it would not be a matter of faith for us except incidentally, but we would hold it merely through human historical record. Unless we would prefer to say that we can always have sufficient certainty of faith in this matter through that principle of faith which holds that the Church of Christ has persevered continuously as one and the same from the beginning until these times; and since it is of the essence of the Church to have a true head, all Pontiffs legitimately elected in their time must have been accepted by the Church. Or if they were not legitimate, or even doubtful, they were rejected so that the Church could proceed to another election, lest, contrary to Christ’s institution and promise, the Church remain headless and be said to have perished. This is how heretics argue when they contend that at least from the time of Pope Urban VI, the true succession has failed; from this they think they sufficiently infer that it can no longer be

visibilis extet; inter cuius praecipuas notas reponitur ex nobis legitima Summorum Pontificum ad haec usque tempora successio, nec non perpetua eiusdem cum illis unio, & adhaesio, tanquam cum suo supremo, & universali capite.

Si inter aliquos, non omnem Ecclesiam acceptare hanc veritatem, tanquam materiam de fide, cum plures sint Doctores Catholici, qui illam non admittunt, nec propterea tamen censentur haeretici; Respondetur non omnes illam acceptare, tanquam materiam de fide speculative, & in actu signato, seu inadequate illam considerando satis esse putantes ad munus in Ecclesia Pontificium, morali quadam, aut naturali certitudine haberi, quod hic numero Pontifex sit verus Pontifex; virtualiter tamen omnes illam acceptant, dum se in unam, Sanctam, Catholicam & Apostolicam Ecclesiam credere profitentur; cuius hic numero Pontifex rite electus pro tempore existens, verum est caput ex omnibus, & iuxta veriore sententiam vera in illa fidei regula; unde solum ex ignorantia, ut supra notavimus, existimant se non credere, quod reipsa, & de facto credunt, & ita sibi ipsis quasi contradicunt; quo circa nec pro haereticis habendi, nec pro talibus sunt puniendi; secus tamen si qui publice, & pertinaciter negarent hanc veritatem, iuxta nostram sententiam, quam ad fidem pertinere putamus, docentque omnes fere Theologi, & Canonistae, quamvis in modo eam explicandi aliquantum differant.

Obicitur secundo, praecipua ratio, eaque magis universalis nostrae assertionis desumitur ex hoc quod Summus Pontifex sit supremum Ecclesiae caput; unde sicut fide credimus, hanc numero Ecclesiam in qua sumus, esse veram Christi Ecclesiam, eiusdem quoque fidei certitudine tenere debemus, hunc numero hominem legitime electum, cui *tanquam suo capiti visibiliter unitur*, verum esse *Summum Pontificem*; sed haec ratio non videtur efficax; siquidem in hac numero Ecclesia non videtur minus necessaria certitudo

certain whether there is a true succession to the Supreme Pontiff, or where in the world the true visible Church exists—among whose principal marks we place the legitimate succession of Supreme Pontiffs continuing to these times, as well as the perpetual union with them and adherence to them as to the supreme and universal head.

If, among some, not the entire Church accepts this truth as a matter of faith, since there are many Catholic Doctors who do not admit it, and yet are not considered heretics on that account; I respond that not all accept it as a matter of faith speculatively, and in explicit terms, or considering it inadequately, thinking it sufficient for the Pontifical office in the Church to have a certain moral or natural certainty that this particular Pope is the true Pope; nevertheless, all accept it virtually, while they profess to believe in one, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church, of which this particular duly elected Pope, existing for the time being, is truly the head of all, and according to the more true opinion, the true rule of faith in it; hence only from ignorance, as we noted above, do they think they do not believe what in reality and in fact they do believe, and thus they contradict themselves as it were; wherefore they are neither to be considered heretics, nor to be punished as such; however, it would be different if some publicly and obstinately denied this truth, according to our opinion, which we think pertains to the faith, and which almost all Theologians and Canonists teach, although they differ somewhat in the manner of explaining it.

It is objected secondly, the principal reason, and that which is more universal, for our assertion is derived from this, that the Supreme Pontiff is the supreme head of the Church; whence just as we believe by faith that this particular Church in which we are is the true Church of Christ, we ought also to hold with the same certainty of faith that this particular man legitimately elected, to whom *the Church is visibly united as to its head*, is the true *Supreme Pontiff*; but this reasoning does not seem effective; since in this particular Church, the

Sacramentorum; exempli gratia, Baptismi, vel Eucharistiae; quam sit necessaria certitudo huius capitis in particulari; pro certitudine autem Sacramentorum sufficit, ut per fidem credamus eorum veritatem in communi; in particulari vero certitudine tantum morali nobis constet de veritate huius, aut illius Sacramenti; nec enim est de fide, hunc hominem fuisse vere baptizatum, aut hanc hostiam in particulari fuisse consecratam, licet sit de fide, omnem hostiam rite consecratam realiter continere in se corpus Christi, sicut habetur ex Divo Thoma 2.2. quaest.1. art.3.ad 3. Igitur eodem modo satis esse videtur, credere quidem esse de fide, *omnem hominem rite electum esse verum Pontificem*, non autem, *quod hic numero Pontifex rite electus, & ab Ecclesia acceptatus sit verus Pontifex*; sed sufficit ad hoc ultimum certitudo moralis, quodve inferatur tanquam conclusio Theologica ex principiis fidei.

Respondetur ad hoc argumentum concedendo maiorem, & negando minorem; ad cuius probationem, primo negatur paritas; disparitas consistit in hoc, quod Sacramenta in particulari sumpta, vel ut hic & nunc procedant ab aliquo ministro, non se habent ut regula fidei, neque ex eorum unitate visibili, aut unione cum ipsis pendet essentialiter unitas Ecclesiae; sed se habent ut medicinae peccatorum, & divinae instrumenta gratiae: unde circa ipsa Sacramenta in particulari nulla Ecclesiae acceptatio, aut definitio versatur, sed solum circa illa in specie, vel in communi, v.g. credendo: *vere esse Sacramenta, quae debito modo fiunt, corpus & sanguinem Christi Domini contineri vere realiter, & substantialiter sub speciebus panis, & vini rite consecratis*, non autem, *quod hae species in particulari sint rite, & debito modo consecratae*; Sacramentorum si quidem natura, & virtus definitioni fidei subest, secus autem eorum usus, & exercitium.

At in Summo Pontifice non ita se habet, sed pluribus modis versatur fides circa

certainty of the Sacraments, for example, of Baptism or the Eucharist, does not seem less necessary than the certainty regarding this particular head; but for the certainty of the Sacraments, it is sufficient that we believe their truth in general through faith; in particular cases, however, we are assured of the truth of this or that Sacrament only by moral certainty; for it is not a matter of faith that this particular man was truly baptized, or that this particular host was consecrated, although it is a matter of faith that every properly consecrated host really contains in itself the body of Christ, as is held according to Saint Thomas, Summa Theologica 2.2, question 1, article 3, reply to objection 3. Therefore, in the same way, it seems sufficient to believe indeed that it is a matter of faith that *every properly elected man is a true Pontiff*, but not that *this particular Pontiff who has been properly elected and accepted by the Church is the true Pontiff*; but for this latter point, moral certainty suffices, or that it be inferred as a theological conclusion from principles of faith.

One responds to this argument by conceding the major premise and denying the minor premise; to the proof of which, first, the parity is denied; the disparity consists in this: that the Sacraments, taken in particular, or as they proceed here and now from a certain minister, do not function as a rule of faith, nor does the visible unity of the Church, or its union with them, depend essentially on their unity; rather, they function as medicines for sins and divine instruments of grace. Hence, no acceptance or definition of the Church concerns the Sacraments in particular, but only concerns them in species or in common, e.g., by believing: *that those Sacraments which are performed in the due manner are true Sacraments, that the body and blood of Christ the Lord are contained truly, really, and substantially under the species of bread and wine when properly consecrated*, but not *that these particular species have been properly and duly consecrated*; for the nature and virtue of the Sacraments are subject to the definition of faith, but not their use and exercise.

But in the case of the Supreme Pontiff, it is not so, for faith relates to his Apostolic power in several

Apostolicam eius potestatem; hoc est tam in communi, credendo, *omnem Pontificem rite electum, & ab Ecclesia indubitanter acceptatum, verum esse Pontificem*; quam in particulari, *quod hic numero Pontifex rite electus, & ab Ecclesia indubitanter acceptatus sit verus Pontifex*; quia, ut diximus, acceptatur ab ea, ut regula fidei iuxta veriore sententiam, unde debet in particulari de fide credi, sicut quaecumque alia regula fidei; insuper iuxta omnes acceptatur, ut supremum universalis Ecclesiae caput; de quo proinde ita constare debet de fide, quod sit verum eius caput; sicut de hac numero fidelium congregatione constat, eam esse veram Christi Ecclesiam, quia veritas, & unitas Ecclesiae, pendet essentialiter ex unione cum suo vero capite; etsi enim Sede vacante talis actu non sit dependentia, sed aptitudine, quia scilicet est apta, & de se, polita Christi institutione essentialiter petit ista congregatio subesse uni capiti in particulari, quod tunc actu non habet; attamen ubi actu illud habet, quo in casu loquimur, & acceptavit eius electionem tanquam legitimam, tunc nisi illi in particulari uniatur, periret unitas, statusque Ecclesiae Monarchicus, ut explicuimus supra c.6.

Quod dixi de Sede vacante, idem asseri debet schismatis tempore, si sint plures de quibus rationabile dubium sit, quisnam eorum sit verus Pontifex; tunc enim est idem, ac si non haberet actu caput, quia nondum illud habet determinate, & pacifice secundum ius. Si autem unus eorum determinate sit Pontifex, & alii irrationabiliter hanc dignitatem usurpent, tunc sicut debet Ecclesia verum caput acceptare, & illi uniri, ita & de fide est, quod ille, & nullus alter sit Pontifex.

Secundo respondetur ad hoc argumentum admittendo, proportionem servata, paritatem inter Sacramenta in particulari, v.g. hanc, vel has hostias rite consecratas, quod sint obiectum fidei, sicut hic numero Pontifex

ways; that is, both generally, by believing that *every Pontiff duly elected and unquestioningly accepted by the Church is the true Pontiff*; and particularly, that *this specific Pontiff who has been duly elected and unquestioningly accepted by the Church is the true Pontiff*; because, as we have said, he is accepted by the Church as the rule of faith according to the more correct opinion, whence he must be believed as a matter of faith in particular, just like any other rule of faith. Moreover, according to all, he is accepted as the supreme head of the universal Church; concerning whom, therefore, it must be established as a matter of faith that he is its true head, just as it is established concerning this specific congregation of the faithful that it is the true Church of Christ, because the truth and unity of the Church depends essentially on its union with its true head. For even though during a vacant See such dependence does not exist actually but potentially—because, that is, this congregation is suited and, by its nature, given Christ’s institution, essentially requires subjection to one particular head, which it does not actually have at that time—nevertheless when it actually has that head, which is the case we are discussing, and has accepted his election as legitimate, then unless it is united to him in particular, the unity and monarchical state of the Church would perish, as we explained above in chapter 6.

What I have stated regarding a vacant See must likewise be asserted during a time of schism, if there are multiple claimants about whom reasonable doubt exists as to which of them is the true Pontiff. For in such a case, it is the same as if the Church actually had no head, because she does not yet have one definitively and peacefully according to law. However, if one of them is definitively the Pontiff, while others irrationally usurp this dignity, then just as the Church must accept the true head and unite with him, so too it is a matter of faith that he, and no other, is the Pontiff.

Secondly, it is answered to this argument by admitting, with due proportion maintained, the parity between the Sacraments in particular, e.g., this or these properly consecrated hosts, that they are objects of faith, just as this specific Pontiff

rite electus, & ab Ecclesia acceptatus; praesuppono enim quod omnes huiusmodi hostiae rite consecratae possint considerari dupliciter, vel divisive, vel collective, ut superiori sectione de Ecclesia cap.10. diximus de fidelibus. Si primo sumantur modo, nullam earum in particulari credendum est de fide, fuisse rite consecratam, sed assensu tantum moraliter certo; secus autem si considerentur collective, ne dicamus totam ubique Ecclesiam, quamvis materialiter, & ignoranter, esse idololatram per augustissimi Eucharistiae Sacramenti adorationem, quod est omnino absurdum, & contra promissam illi a Deo in rebus fidei, & morum indefectibilitatem loco statim citato. Et si enim non sit inconueniens, quod in aliquo particulari loco haec & haec hostia divisive, quae non est rite consecrata, pro tali nihilominus adoretur, inde enim universalis Ecclesiae defectibilitas non sequitur, sicut sequeretur, si omnes hostiae collective sumptae ab Ecclesia universali adorarentur, absque eo quod in illis ita sumptis realiter, ac substantialiter contineretur corpus Christi Domini; Igitur ad fidem pertinere puto, quod omnes hostiae collective sumptae ab Ecclesia Catholica toto orbe diffusa adoratae sint rite consecratae, ita ut respectu huius veritatis se habeat quo ad nos talis Ecclesiae adoratio, sicut eiusdem acceptatio, respectu huius numerosi Pontificis rite electi; cum in causa facti generalis, & ad generalem statum omnium fidelium pertinentis, qualis est per universum orbem Sanctissimi Eucharistiae Sacramenti adoratio, veraque & canonica supremi capitis ipsius electio, errare non possit. Huius rei satis clarum potest esse exemplum, in collectione Episcoporum Concilium Generale legitimum componentium, quam de fide credimus repraesentare Ecclesiam, & auctoritative esse veram Ecclesiam, eo modo quo est de fide illud esse legitimum Concilium; quamvis de fide non sit unumquemque Episcopum, aut omnes divisive esse veros Episcopos, quia nullus eorum in particulari, nec omnes divisive se habent, ut regula

properly elected and accepted by the Church; for I presuppose that all such properly consecrated hosts can be considered in two ways, either separately or collectively, as we said about the faithful in the previous section on the Church, chapter 10. If they are taken in the first way, none of them in particular must be believed as a matter of faith to have been properly consecrated, but only with morally certain assent; the opposite is true, however, if they are considered collectively, lest we say that the entire Church everywhere, albeit materially and ignorantly, is idolatrous through the adoration of the most august Sacrament of the Eucharist, which is entirely absurd and contrary to the indefectibility promised to it by God in matters of faith and morals, as cited in the place just mentioned. For even if it is not improper that in some particular place this or that host taken separately, which is not properly consecrated, is nevertheless adored as such, the defectibility of the universal Church does not follow from this, as it would follow if all hosts collectively taken were adored by the universal Church without the body of Christ the Lord being really and substantially contained in them when taken together. Therefore, I consider it a matter of faith that all hosts collectively taken, adored by the Catholic Church spread throughout the whole world, are properly consecrated, so that in respect to this truth, such adoration by the Church relates to us just as its acceptance does in respect to this specific Pontiff properly elected; since in a matter of general fact pertaining to the general state of all the faithful, such as the adoration of the Most Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist throughout the world, and the true and canonical election of the supreme head himself, it cannot err. A sufficiently clear example of this can be in the collection of Bishops composing a legitimate General Council, which we believe by faith represents the Church and is authoritatively the true Church, in the way that it is a matter of faith that it is a legitimate Council; although it is not a matter of faith that each Bishop, or all taken separately, are true Bishops, because none of them in particular, nor all taken separately, serve as a rule of faith, but only collectively. Hence it is only a matter of faith that their collection is a

fidei, sed solum collective, unde solum est de fide, eorumdem quoque collectionem esse legitimam congregationem, aut Concilium in quo tota sit representative, & auctoritative Ecclesia. Ita similiter, cum nulla hostia consecrata in particulari, seu divisive sumpta, sit terminus adorationis universalis Ecclesiae, non est opus quod sit de fide, unamquamque hostiam in particulari, aut omnes divisive sumptas, rite fuisse consecratas; secus autem si sermo sit de earundem collectione, cum sit terminus praefatae adorationis universalis Ecclesiae, ne illam saltem materialiter in perpetua versari idololatria dicamus; quod est impium & sacrilegum.

Eadem quoque paritas assignari posset, inter hanc numero hostiam, & hunc numero Pontificem; si daretur unica solum hostia rite consecrata successive, quae ab universali Ecclesia deberet adorari, sicuti de facto datur successive unicus Pontifex legitime electus, cui tanquam capiti debet uniri; tunc enim Ecclesia, aut illam hostiam non adoraret, eo quod rite consecrata non esset, aut si tanquam talem adoraret, auctoritate ipsius nobis constaret de fide, non solum sub omni hostia rite consecrata, sed etiam sub hac in particulari contineri verum Christi corpus, sicut eiusdem auctoritate constat nobis non solum in communi *omnem Pontificem* rite electum esse *verum Pontificem*, sed etiam hunc numero pro tempore existentem; ubi semel illum tanquam legitime, & canonice electum accepit.

Cum eadem sit contrariorum disciplina, postquam egimus de prima Summi Pontificatus institutione facta a Christo Domino, in Divi Petri persona, nec non de via, qua eius successores ad eandem dignitatem pervenire debent, superesset iam agere de modis, quibus ab illa Summus Pontifex etiam dum vivit *cadere potest*; verum huic materiae pertractandae *libenter supersedeo*; tum quod parum *referat* ad praesentis mei instituti rationem & finem; tum quod sit de raro contingentibus. Cum enim Summus Pontifex dum vivit

legitimate congregation or Council in which the whole Church is representatively and authoritatively present. Similarly, since no consecrated host in particular, or taken separately, is the object of adoration of the universal Church, it is not necessary that it be a matter of faith that each host in particular, or all taken separately, were properly consecrated; the opposite is true, however, if we speak of their collection, since it is the object of the aforementioned adoration of the universal Church, lest we say that the Church at least materially persists in perpetual idolatry, which is impious and sacrilegious.

The same parity could also be assigned between this host in particular and this Pope in particular; as if there were only one properly consecrated host given successively, which ought to be adored by the universal Church, just as in fact there is successively only one legitimately elected Pontiff, to whom the Church must be united as to its head. For then the Church would either not adore that host because it was not properly consecrated, or if it did adore it as such, we would know with certainty by the Church's own authority as a matter of faith, not only that the true body of Christ is contained under every properly consecrated host, but also under this particular one. Likewise, by the same authority, it is established for us not only in general that *every Pope* who is duly elected is *the true Pope*, but also this specific one existing at a given time; once the Church has accepted him as legitimately and canonically elected.

Since the discipline of contraries is the same, after we have discussed the first institution of the Supreme Pontificate established by Christ the Lord in the person of St. Peter, as well as the way by which his successors ought to attain the same dignity, it would now remain to address the ways in which the Supreme Pontiff, even while living, *can fall* from that office. However, I *willingly refrain* from treating this matter, both because it *pertains* little to the purpose and end of my present undertaking, and because it concerns rare occurrences. For while the Supreme Pontiff, during

Pontificiam dignitatem dupliciter amittere possit. Primo per voluntariam cessionem, ut habetur *in cap.7. de renuntiatione in sexto*, id semel tantum contigit in Caelestino V. Estuensi, qui cum ex Abbate sui Monasterii creatus fuisset Papa, quarta die Septembris, anno Christi 1294, abdicavit se Pontificatu sponte, amore vitae solitariae, idibus Decembris eiusdem anni. In Concilio enim Constantiensi duo quidem Pontifices, sed dubii, Gregorius XII. & Ioannes XXIII. sponte suo iuri renuntiaverunt; cumque Benedictus XIII. idem praestare noluisset, ad tollendum schisma depositus fuit; & in eorum locum electus Martinus V. cuius auctoritate idem Concilium fuit postea confirmatum. Ut autem ad hanc Pontificatus, cuius quis pacificam possessionem habet, renuntiationem, aliqua rationabilis causa requiri videtur, alioqui sine causa renuntiare, suamque sic operam Ecclesiae subtrahere, alienum esset a caritate Christi, qui propter ovem perditam quaerendam vitam suam impendit; nihilominus ubi iusta suppetit causa, Pontifex non expectato Ecclesiae consensu potest suam dignitatem quantavis pacifice possessam dimittere; quoniam Pontifex non respicit Ecclesiam tanquam superiorem, cuius obedientia astrictus sit, ne renuntiet, sicut alii Episcopi; qui tamen ad renuntiandum, non suae Ecclesiae, sed Pontificis, qui superior est, consensum expectant.

Alter modus amittendi Pontificatum per depositionem, adhuc est praecedenti rarior; cum enim duo sint casus praecipui, in quibus depositio Pontificis indubitati locum habet (non enim agimus in praesenti de casu, ubi dubitatur de valore electionis, sed de illo erit sermo infra cap.14.), Primus est casus perpetuae amentiae, Secundus haeresis, seu infidelitatis. Nullum proprie ob hos duos casus, legitur huc usque depositum fuisse ab Ecclesia Summum Pontificem. Tandem, quia haec materia potius est Canonistarum, quam Theologorum, ad illos lectorem remitto; ex Theologis tamen praeclare hanc materiam versarunt Caietanus *De auctoritate Papae*

his lifetime, can lose the Pontifical dignity in two ways—first, through voluntary cession, as stated *in chapter 7 on renunciation in the sixth [book of Decretals]*, this has happened only once, in the case of Celestine V of Estuia, who, having been created Pope from being an Abbot of his monastery on the fourth day of September in the year of Christ 1294, voluntarily abdicated the Pontificate, out of love for the solitary life, on the Ides of December [13th] of that same year. For in the Council of Constance, indeed two Pontiffs, but doubtful ones, Gregory XII and John XXIII, voluntarily renounced their rights; and when Benedict XIII refused to do the same, he was deposed to end the schism, and Martin V was elected in their place, by whose authority that same Council was afterwards confirmed. However, for such a renunciation of the Pontificate which one peacefully possesses, some reasonable cause seems to be required; otherwise, to renounce without cause and thus withdraw one's service from the Church would be contrary to the charity of Christ, who gave His life to seek the lost sheep. Nevertheless, where just cause exists, the Pontiff may relinquish his dignity, however peacefully possessed, without awaiting the Church's consent, since the Pontiff does not regard the Church as a superior whose obedience would bind him from renouncing, as is the case with other Bishops, who nevertheless, in order to renounce, await the consent not of their Church but of the Pontiff, who is superior.

Another mode of losing the Pontificate through deposition is even rarer than the preceding one; for there are two principal cases in which the deposition of an undoubted Pontiff takes place (we are not at present discussing the case where the validity of an election is in doubt, but this will be addressed below in chapter 14). The first case is that of perpetual insanity, the second is heresy, or infidelity. Properly speaking, no Supreme Pontiff has been recorded up to this point as having been deposed by the Church for these two reasons. Finally, because this matter belongs more to Canonists than to Theologians, I refer the reader to them; nevertheless, among Theologians who have brilliantly treated this matter are Cajetan in *On the*

cap.18. & 19., Sotus in *4. Sentent. Distinct.* 22., Gregorius de Valencia 2.2., Suarez, Tannerus, Ioannes a Sancto Thoma, aliique plures ibidem, Bellarminus *lib.2. de Romano Pontifice* cap.30., Driedo *De libertate Christiana* cap.14., ubi videri possunt, & alii ab ipsis citati, Andreas Duvallius Doctor Sorbonicus *De disciplina Ecclesiastica* part.3. quaest.9. & 19.

Authority of the Pope, chapters 18 and 19, Soto in the *4th Book of Sentences, Distinction 22*, Gregory of Valencia in 2.2., Suarez, Tanner, John of St. Thomas, and many others in the same place, Bellarmine in *Book 2 on the Roman Pontiff*, chapter 30, Driedo in *On Christian Liberty*, chapter 14, where these matters can be examined, along with others cited by them, Andreas Duval, Doctor of the Sorbonne, in *On Ecclesiastical Discipline*, part 3, questions 9 and 19.