

Opera Omnia, Tomus Duodecimus Complectens
 Commentaria in Secundam Secundae Divi Thomae,
 Scilicet, Viginti Quatuor De Fide, Duas De Spe, Tredecim
 De Charitate Disputationes, Cum Indicibus Necessariis
 (*Complete Works, Volume Twelve Containing
 Commentaries on the Second Part of Thomas Aquinas’
 Second Part, Namely, Twenty-Four Disputations on Faith,
 Two on Hope, Thirteen on Charity, With Necessary
 Indexes*)

by **Francisco Suarez S.J., 1583**

[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 20, 2025.
- Version: 1.0
- Selection pages: 161-165, 312-315

Latin

SECTIO VIII.

Utrum Summus Pontifex etiam sine Concilio generali sit infallibilis regula fidei?

1. Distinctio. — Instituisse Christum monarchiam Ecclesiae, est de fide. — De Summo Pontifice duplex est potissima disputatio, una de dignitate et primatu ejus, an fuerit ex institutione Christi, et consequenter sit de jure divino: sed haec pars supponenda potius nunc est quam disputanda, quia revera non est hujus loci propria^[^1], neque datur temporis commoditas; legi ergo possunt citati auctores, praesertim Turrecremat., Cano, et

English

Tractatus Primus, Disputatio V, Sectio VIII

Whether the Supreme Pontiff, even without a General Council, is an infallible rule of faith?

1. Distinction. — That Christ instituted the monarchy of the Church is a matter of faith. — Concerning the Supreme Pontiff, there are two principal disputes: one regarding his dignity and primacy, whether these were instituted by Christ, and consequently whether they exist by divine law. But this matter should now be presupposed rather than disputed, because it is not properly within the scope of our present discussion^[^1], nor does time permit its treatment. Therefore, one may read the

Bellarminus, et Cajetanus, in opusc. de hac re. Nos ergo supponimus tanquam de fide certum, Christum Dominum instituisse Ecclesiam suam, ut esset una spiritualis respublica, habens monarchicum regimen, quod ipsemet Christus in Petro inchoavit, ut perpetuo duraret in successoribus ejus. Ita constat ex promissione Christi, Matth. 16: *Super hanc petram aedificabo Ecclesiam meam*; nam est moraliter evidens, per illum articulum, *hanc*, Petrum designasse; præmiserat enim: *Tu es Petrus*; et statim subjungit: *Et portæ inferi non prævalebunt adversus eam*, significans perpetuitatem ædificii fundati in illa petra, et consequenter illam petram fore perpetuam, non in persona, sed in cathedra et successione. Et illi eodem modo statim promisit, peculiari et singulari excellentia, claves Ecclesiæ, dicens: *Tibi dabo claves regni cælorum*. Denique, promissionem hanc prope ascensionem suam Christus implevit, Joan. 21, dicens Petro: *Pasce agnos*, et: *Pasce oves meas*, id est, rege et gubernare (hoc enim in similibus locis significat verbum *pascendi* in Scriptura, juxta phrasim hebraicam) totum gregem meum, a minimo usque ad magnum, qui per agnos et oves significatur; itaque, ex consonantia horum locorum, et verborum proprietate, et ex rei necessitate, et materiæ gravitate, et ex communi sensu ac traditione Ecclesiæ et Patrum omnium, constat Christum ibi instituisse primatum Ecclesiæ in persona Petri, ut in successoribus ejus perpetuo duraret; et ita est hic articulus tenendus, non solum tanquam de fide, sed tanquam unum ex præcipuis fundamentis fidei, et maxime necessarium ad tollendas hæreses et schismata, ut citati auctores latissime prosequuntur, referendo Patres quos breviter et erudite colligit Maldonat. in utrumque locum Matth. et Joan., satis accurate illa exponendo.

2. *Recensentur variæ Pontificis potestates.* - *Præsens quæstio est solum de potestate definiendi.* — Altera pars hujus disputationis est de potestate Pontificis,

cited authors, especially Torquemada, Cano, Bellarmine, and Cajetan, in their treatises on this matter. We therefore presuppose as a certainty of faith that Christ the Lord instituted His Church to be one spiritual commonwealth, having a monarchical government, which Christ Himself established in Peter, so that it might endure perpetually in his successors. This is evident from Christ's promise in Matthew 16: "*Upon this rock I will build my Church*"; for it is morally evident that by the article "*this*", He designated Peter; for He had premised: "*You are Peter*"; and immediately adds: "*And the gates of hell shall not prevail against it*", signifying the perpetuity of the edifice founded on that rock, and consequently that this rock would be perpetual, not in person, but in the chair and succession. And to him in the same manner He immediately promised, with particular and singular excellence, the keys of the Church, saying: "*I will give you the keys of the kingdom of heaven*". Finally, Christ fulfilled this promise near the time of His ascension, John 21, saying to Peter: "*Feed my lambs*", and: "*Feed my sheep*", that is, rule and govern (for this is what the verb "*to feed*" signifies in Scripture in similar passages, according to the Hebrew idiom) my entire flock, from the least to the greatest, which is signified by the lambs and sheep. Thus, from the harmony of these passages, and the propriety of the words, and from the necessity of the matter, and the gravity of the subject, and from the common understanding and tradition of the Church and all the Fathers, it is established that Christ there instituted the primacy of the Church in the person of Peter, so that it might endure perpetually in his successors. And so this article must be held not only as a matter of faith, but as one of the principal foundations of faith, and most necessary for the elimination of heresies and schisms, as the cited authors most extensively pursue, referencing the Fathers whom Maldonat briefly and eruditely collects in his commentaries on both passages of Matthew and John, explaining them quite accurately.

2. *Various powers of the Pontiff are enumerated.* - *The present question concerns only the power of defining.* — The second part of this disputation

quæ plura membra complectitur ad varias materias pertinentia; habet enim supremam potestatem jurisdictionis in foro sacramentali, de qua dictum est in materia de Pœnitentia, disput. 16; habet deinde supremam jurisdictionem in externo foro spirituali et ecclesiastico, quæ legislativa est, seu directiva, et consequenter etiam est dispensativa, et de illa tractavimus in materia de Legibus, lib. 4, a principio, et lib. 3 Defensionis fidei, a cap. 6, et multa in tractatu de Voto, libro sexto, capite nono, et de Juramento, libro secundo, capite trigesimo; est etiam potestas coactiva, de qua in tomo de Censuris, disputatione prima, sect. 2, dictum est. Extenditur etiam ad dispensandum indulgentiarum thesaurum, ut in tomo de Pœnitentia, disp. 39, declaratum est. Solum ergo superest dicendum de potestate definiendi, seu docendi Ecclesiam cum infallibilitate, quæ propria est hujus loci; et quia de Pontifice, ut definiente simul cum Concilio generali, jam dictum est, solum superest inquirendum, utrum si solus definiat absque generali Concilio, eamdem habeat infallibilitatem, et sit regula fidei, vel possit errare; quia non solum hæretici affirmant errare posse, quod mirum non est, cum primatum ejus negent; verum etiam aliqui catholici dubii sunt; quia, licet primatum agnoscant supra singulos de Ecclesia, non tamen supra totam Ecclesiam collectivè, et in Concilio generali congregatam, quod etiam fundamentum falsum est, et ideo illo omisso,

3. Partis negative argumentum primum. — Secundum. — Tertium. — Ratio dubitandi esse potest, primo, quia una regula viva sufficit Ecclesiæ, et hæc jam assignata est, scilicet, Concilium generale legitimum et approbatum: ergo Pontifex per se non est regula. Probatur consequentia, tum quia in potestate tam singulari et excellenti non oportuit dari multitudinem, tum maxime quia in negotio tam gravi, non expediebat Ecclesiæ ut solus Pontifex sine supremo examine, quale fit in Concilio generali, possit res definire. Unde argumentor secundo, quia alias, quidquid Pontifex

concerns the power of the Pontiff, which comprises several components pertaining to various matters; for he has supreme power of jurisdiction in the sacramental forum, which was discussed in the material on Penance, disputation 16; he then has supreme jurisdiction in the external spiritual and ecclesiastical forum, which is legislative, or directive, and consequently is also dispensative, and we treated this in the material on Laws, book 4, from the beginning, and in book 3 of the Defense of the Faith, from chapter 6, and many things in the treatise on Vows, book six, chapter nine, and on Oaths, book two, chapter thirty; there is also coercive power, which was discussed in the volume on Censures, disputation one, section 2. It also extends to dispensing the treasury of indulgences, as was explained in the volume on Penance, disputation 39. Therefore, it only remains to speak about the power of defining, or teaching the Church with infallibility, which is proper to this place; and since we have already spoken about the Pontiff as defining together with a General Council, it only remains to inquire whether, if he defines alone without a General Council, he has the same infallibility and is a rule of faith, or whether he can err; because not only do heretics affirm that he can err, which is not surprising since they deny his primacy; but even some Catholics are doubtful; because, although they acknowledge his primacy over individuals in the Church, they do not acknowledge it over the whole Church collectively and gathered in a General Council, which is also a false foundation, and therefore setting that aside,

3. First argument for the negative position. — Second. — Third. — The reason for doubting may be, first, because one living rule suffices for the Church, and this has already been designated, namely, a legitimate and approved General Council: therefore, the Pontiff by himself is not a rule. The consequence is proven, both because in a power so singular and excellent, a multiplicity ought not to be given, and especially because in a matter so grave, it was not expedient for the Church that the Pontiff alone, without supreme examination such as occurs in a General Council, should be able to define matters. Whence I argue secondly, that otherwise,

definiret, etiamsi temere et sine debito Concilio id faceret, esset de fide credendum, quod durissimum est. Tertio est communis difficultas, quia definitio semper fit a particulari persona, ut constat; sed nunquam est de fide hanc personam quæ loquitur, esse verum Pontificem: ergo potest nunquam esse de fide quod definit.

4. *Assertio affirmativa Catholica.* — *Probat* primo *ex Scriptura.* - Nihilominus veritas Catholica est, Pontificem definientem ex cathedra esse regulam fidei, quæ errare non potest, quando aliquid authentice proponit universæ Ecclesiæ, tanquam de fide divina credendum: ita docent hoc tempore omnes Catholici Doctores, et censeo esse rem de fide certam, quæ imprimis probari potest ex testimoniis proxime citatis. Nam Christus dedit Petro et successoribus ejus auctoritatem pascendi Ecclesiam, maxime in doctrina, et singulari modo, id est, non tantum per auctoritatem prædicandi, quam omnibus Apostolis indifferenter tribuit, cum dicit: *Euntes, docete omnes gentes, et predicate Evangelium omni creaturæ*; sed per potestatem jurisdictionis, interpretandi, seu proponendi veritates credendas, et sub obligatione illas credendi; ergo hæc potestas habet necessario adjunctam infallibilitatem et assistentiam Spiritus Sancti, ut non erret. Consequentia probatur, quia hoc necessarium est propter infallibilitatem Ecclesie in credendo, quam supra ostendimus; nam, si Pontifex docens illo modo, eam posset decipere, etiam ipsa posset decipi; imo cogeretur ad errorem, quia credere teneretur. Antecedens autem patet ex verbis Christi supra ponderatis, et ex traditione Pontificum et Patrum: hac enim ratione docent Ecclesiam Romanam esse matrem et magistram omnium Ecclesiarum. Unde Damasus Papa, epistola ad Stephanum, vocat Pontificem doctorem Orthodoxæ et immaculatae fidei, quod etiam agnoscit Hieronymus, in Epist. ad eundem Damasum, de nomine *hypostasis*. Atque ita idem probat alter locus de fundatione et aedificatione Ecclesiae super Petrum; nam, si Petrus vel successor ejus

whatever the Pontiff might define, even if he did so rashly and without due Council, would have to be believed as a matter of faith, which is most severe. Third is the common difficulty, because definition is always made by a particular person, as is evident; but it is never a matter of faith that this person who speaks is the true Pontiff: therefore, what he defines can never be a matter of faith.

4. *Catholic Affirmative Assertion.* — *Proved first from Scripture.* - Nevertheless, it is Catholic truth that the Pontiff defining ex cathedra is a rule of faith which cannot err when he authentically proposes something to the universal Church as to be believed with divine faith. This is taught in our time by all Catholic Doctors, and I judge it to be a matter certain by faith, which can first be proven from the testimonies just cited. For Christ gave to Peter and his successors the authority of shepherding the Church, especially in doctrine, and in a singular manner—that is, not only through the authority of preaching, which He granted indifferently to all the Apostles when He said: *Go, teach all nations, and preach the Gospel to every creature*; but through the power of jurisdiction, of interpreting, or proposing truths to be believed, and under the obligation of believing them. Therefore this power necessarily has joined to it infallibility and the assistance of the Holy Spirit, that it may not err. The consequent is proven because this is necessary on account of the infallibility of the Church in believing, which we demonstrated above; for if the Pontiff, teaching in that manner, could deceive the Church, the Church itself could be deceived; indeed, it would be compelled to error, because it would be bound to believe. The antecedent, moreover, is clear from the words of Christ considered above, and from the tradition of the Pontiffs and Fathers: for by this reasoning they teach that the Roman Church is the mother and teacher of all Churches. Hence Pope Damasus, in his epistle to Stephen, calls the Pontiff the teacher of Orthodox and immaculate faith, which Jerome also acknowledges in his Epistle to the same Damasus, concerning the name *hypostasis*. And thus the other passage proves the same regarding the foundation and building of the Church upon

posset Ecclesiam decipere, non esset firmum, et stabile aedificium, cum a fide pendeat, et ipsa fides respectu Ecclesiae, etiam pendeat ex hoc fundamento. Unde etiam concluditur ita esse intelligendam aliam Christi promissionem, Luc. 22: *Ego rogavi pro te, Petre, ut non deficiat fides tua*; intelligitur enim de Petro, non pro illo tantum, sed ut erat futurus petra, et perpetuum Ecclesiae fundamentum, et ita durat in successoribus, saltem quatenus Pontifices sunt, ut exposuit Leo Papa, serm. 1 et 2 de Assumptione sua, et Innocentius III, in cap. *Majores*, de Baptismo; et multi alii Pontifices, in suis Epistolis decretalibus.

5. *Probatur secundo ex consensu et traditione Ecclesiae.* Secundo igitur et principaliter probatur assertio ex consensu et traditione Ecclesiae; nam imprimis, ut dicebam, Pontifices a principio hanc potestatem in se agnoverunt, et illa usi sunt, et non est verisimile illam usurpasse, tum propter eorum multitudinem et magnam sanctitatem, tum propter consensionem et obedientiam Ecclesiae. Deinde ipsaemet Concilia generalia approbata hanc in Pontifice potestatem recognoscunt, ut patet ex Concilio Viennensi, in Clement. unica de Summa Trinitate et ex Concilio Florentino, sessione 25, in fin.; et ex Lateranensi, sub Leone X, qui articulum vigesimum quartum Lutheri, hanc veritatem negantis, tanquam haereticum damnavit. Item Concilia provincialia a Pontificibus confirmata recipiuntur ab Ecclesia tanquam regula fidei infallibilis, ut patet ex Concilio Milevitano et Arausicano, et ex multis Toletanis et Carthaginensibus, et praecipue de Romanis seu Lateranensibus, de quibus ita sentiunt omnes Catholici Doctores; ergo signum est Pontificem sine Concilio generali posse aliquid de fide constituere, et consequenter sine Concilio provinciali; nam est eadem vel major ratio, quia potest alio modo sufficientem diligentiam adhibere. Denique ita etiam senserunt omnes Patres antiqui quos refert Walden.,

Peter; for if Peter or his successor could deceive the Church, the edifice would not be firm and stable, since it depends on faith, and faith itself, with respect to the Church, also depends on this foundation. From this it is also concluded that Christ's other promise in Luke 22 is to be understood in this way: *I have prayed for thee, Peter, that thy faith fail not*; for it is understood concerning Peter, not for him alone, but as he was to be the rock and perpetual foundation of the Church, and thus it endures in his successors, at least insofar as they are Pontiffs, as Pope Leo explained in his 1st and 2nd sermons on his Assumption [to the papacy], and Innocent III in the chapter *Majores*, on Baptism; and many other Pontiffs in their decretal Epistles.

5. *It is proven secondly from the consensus and tradition of the Church.* Secondly and principally, the assertion is proven from the consensus and tradition of the Church; for in the first place, as I was saying, the Pontiffs from the beginning recognized this power in themselves, and made use of it, and it is not likely that they usurped it, both because of their great number and significant holiness, and because of the consensus and obedience of the Church. Furthermore, the approved general Councils themselves recognize this power in the Pontiff, as is evident from the Council of Vienne, in the single Clementine [constitution] on the Most Holy Trinity, and from the Council of Florence, session 25, at the end; and from the Lateran [Council], under Leo X, which condemned as heretical the twenty-fourth article of Luther that denied this truth. Likewise, provincial Councils confirmed by the Pontiffs are received by the Church as an infallible rule of faith, as is evident from the Council of Milevis and the Council of Orange, and from many Councils of Toledo and Carthage, and especially concerning the Roman or Lateran [Councils], about which all Catholic Doctors hold this opinion; therefore it is a sign that the Pontiff without a general Council can establish something concerning the faith, and consequently without a provincial Council; for there is the same or greater reason, because he can apply sufficient diligence in another manner.

libr. 3 Doctrinalis; Hosius, in Confess. Fidei, cap. 53; Cano, libr. 5 et 7 de Locis; Turrecrem., lib. 2 Sum., cap. 109, et sequentibus; et Bellarminus, libr. 3 de Pontifice; Salmeron, super Matth. 16, et super alia testimonia citata; et ibi expositores moderni: et videri etiam potest Directorium Inquisitorum, secunda parte quæst. 2 et 7 us-que ad 17; et Penna, in scholiis ad illas.

6. *Tertio ratione, quod non expediat Ecclesie potestatem capitis alligare Concilio. Id ostenditur primo.*—Tertio, possumus hanc veritatem ratione explicare, quia in primis non expediebat Ecclesie, propter quam hæc potestas data est Pontifici, ut illa daretur quasi alligata, et dependens a Concilio generali; ergo verisimile non est ita fuisse datam, ac subinde poterit Pontifex sine tali Concilio veritatem definire, sine periculo erroris. Antecedens ostenditur primo, quia difficillimum est Concilium generale congregare, et ordinarie fieri non potest sine magno labore et dispendio Ecclesie, et aliquando potest esse moraliter impossibile, propter persecutiones, bella, vel alia impedimenta. Aliunde vero potest sæpe instare necessitas damnandi novam insurgentem hæresim, vel declarandi veritatem aliquam necessariam, quæ in dubium revocatur; ergo oportuit Summum Pontificem habere hanc potestatem independentem a Concilio generali. Secundo, quia ita erat utilius ad maiorem Ecclesie unitatem, quia nisi caput Ecclesie haberet in omnibus superiorem potestatem, facile posset oriri schismata. Tertio, nunquam legimus hanc potestatem datam esse Pontifici dependenter a Concilio; sed potius, e converso, datam esse Concilio dependenter a Papa. Unde ratione illius habet infallibilitatem, et ideo ante confirmationem ejus non habet dictam auctoritatem; ergo Pontifex per se habet illam, unde de facto solent Concilia generalia illius sequi iudicium, ut videre

Finally, this was also the opinion of all the ancient Fathers cited by Waldensis, in book 3 of the Doctrinale; Hosius, in the Confession of Faith, chapter 53; Cano, in books 5 and 7 on Theological Loci; Torquemada, in book 2 of the Summa, chapter 109, and the following [chapters]; and Bellarmine, in book 3 on the Pontiff; Salmeron, on Matthew 16, and on the other testimonies cited; and there the modern expositors: and one may also see the Directory of Inquisitors, second part, questions 2 and 7 up to 17; and Peña, in the scholia to those [questions].

6. *Third argument, that it is not expedient for the Church to bind the power of the head to a Council. This is demonstrated first.*—Thirdly, we can explain this truth by reason, because primarily it was not expedient for the Church, for whose sake this power was given to the Pontiff, that it should be given as if bound to and dependent upon a General Council; therefore it is not plausible that it was given in such a manner, and consequently the Pontiff can define truth without such a Council, without danger of error. The antecedent is demonstrated first, because it is most difficult to convene a General Council, and ordinarily it cannot be done without great labor and expense to the Church, and sometimes it can be morally impossible, due to persecutions, wars, or other impediments. On the other hand, the necessity of condemning a newly arising heresy, or of declaring some necessary truth which is called into doubt, can often be urgent; therefore it was necessary that the Supreme Pontiff have this power independent of a General Council. Secondly, because it was more useful for the greater unity of the Church, since unless the head of the Church had superior power in all matters, schisms could easily arise. Thirdly, we never read that this power was given to the Pontiff dependently on a Council; but rather, conversely, that it was given to the Council dependently on the Pope. Hence by reason of him it [the Council] has infallibility, and therefore before his confirmation it does not have the said authority; therefore the Pontiff has it by himself, whence in fact General Councils are accustomed to follow his judgment, as may be seen in the First Ephesine, and in the

licet in Ephe-sino primo, et in Chalcedonensi, et in Nicæno secundo. Et videri etiam potest Innocentius I, epistol. 26; et Gregorius, libr. 4, epistol. 32; et Gelasius in epistola ad Faustum.

7. *Corollarium primum de præceptis morum.* — *De fide esse putatur ab Antonio et Cano.* — Et ex hac generali assertione, sequitur primo Pontificem non posse errare in præceptis, seu rebus moralibus quas tradit vel approbat pro universa Ecclesia. Hoc intelligendum quantum ad substantiam seu quantum ad honestatem morum; nam quoad circumstantias, vel multiplicandi præcepta, vel rigorem aut nimias pœnas, non est inconveniens aliquando committere aliquem humanum defectum, quia hoc non est contra Ecclesiæ sanctitatem; approbare autem turpia pro honestis, vel, e converso, damnare honesta tanquam iniqua, repugnat veritati et sanctitati Ecclesiæ; et ideo in his etiam non potest errare Pontifex. Quod dixit esse de fide Antoninus, 3 part., tit. 12, cap. 8, § 2; Cano vero, lib. 5 de Locis, cap. 5, dixit parum distare. Alii vero recentiores paulo minus rem hanc exaggerant: Molina, de Justit., disputat. 325; Bellarminus, libr. 5 de Roman. Pontif., cap. 5. Declaratur exemplo. Nam Ecclesia approbavit communionem laicorum sub una specie, tanquam sufficientem ad salutem, et ideo hoc habetur tanquam certum de fide, juxta Concilium Tridentinum, sess. 22, cap. 1; sed in hac et simili materia, ut Ecclesia id teneat, sufficit approbatio Pontificis, imo illam tenetur Ecclesia sequi; ergo, ut Ecclesia non erret, necesse est ut Pontifex in tali materia errare non possit; et ita sensit etiam Innocentius III, in capit. *Per venerabilem*, Qui filii sint legitimi. Denique omnia adducta in assertione hoc corollarium confirmant; præsertim quia, ut supra dicebam, decreta morum includunt doctrinam moralem, non minus necessariam ad salutem quam sint aliæ veritates fidei.

8. *Corollarium secundum, de canonizatione Sanctorum.* — *Ejus ratio.* — *Temerarium est sentire contra præcedens*

Chalcedonian, and in the Second Nicene [Councils]. And one may also see Innocent I, epistle 26; and Gregory, book 4, epistle 32; and Gelasius in his epistle to Faustus.

7. *First Corollary concerning moral precepts.* — *This is believed to be a matter of faith by Antoninus and Cano.* — From this general assertion, it follows first that the Pontiff cannot err in precepts or moral matters which he delivers or approves for the universal Church. This is to be understood with respect to substance or with respect to the moral integrity; for as regards circumstances, or the multiplication of precepts, or severity or excessive penalties, it is not inappropriate that he might sometimes commit some human failing, because this is not contrary to the holiness of the Church; however, to approve shameful things as honorable, or conversely, to condemn honorable things as iniquitous, contradicts the truth and holiness of the Church; and therefore in these matters the Pontiff cannot err. Antoninus, in Part 3, title 12, chapter 8, § 2, stated this to be a matter of faith; Cano, however, in book 5 of De Locis, chapter 5, said it differs little [from a matter of faith]. Other more recent authors somewhat less exaggerate this matter: Molina, in De Justitia, disputation 325; Bellarmine, in book 5 of De Romano Pontifice, chapter 5. This is explained by example. For the Church has approved communion for the laity under one species, as sufficient for salvation, and therefore this is held as certain of faith, according to the Council of Trent, session 22, chapter 1; but in this and similar matters, for the Church to hold this, the approval of the Pontiff is sufficient, indeed the Church is bound to follow it; therefore, so that the Church may not err, it is necessary that the Pontiff cannot err in such a matter; and thus Innocent III also understood it, in the chapter *Per venerabilem*, Qui filii sint legitimi. Finally, all things brought forward in the assertion confirm this corollary; especially because, as I was saying above, decrees concerning morals include moral doctrine, no less necessary for salvation than other truths of faith.

8. *Second Corollary, concerning the canonization of Saints.* — *Its reasoning.* — *It is temerarious to*

corollarium. — Secundo inferitur non posse errare Pontificem in Sanctorum canonizatione [²], ut recte docuit D. Thomas, Quodlib. 9, artic. ultimo; Anton. et Cano, supra; et Bellarminus, libr. 1 de Sanctorum beatitudine, cap. 5; Azor, tom. 2, lib. 5, cap. 6, quæst. 5; Valent., tom. 3, distinct. 1, quæst. 1, punct. 7, § 40, versic. *Itaque quod ad*; Sylv., v. *Canonizat.*, quæst. 3, ubi refert Joannem de Napoli absolute damnantem contrarium de hæresi; Turrecrem., l. 2 Sum., cap. 110. Sumitur vero nostrum corollarium ex Gregorio, in cap. *Sicut*, distinct. 15; et Bernardo, epistol. 174 ad Lugdunenses. Ratio vero est, quia hæc est pars quædam materiæ moralis, et valde necessaria ut Ecclesia non erret in cultu, et adoratione religionis, alias contingere posset ut coleret hominem damnatum, et ad illum preces funderet, quod est etiam contra puritatem et sanctitatem Ecclesiae. Item non licet fidelibus dubitare de gloria Sancti canonizati; id enim sub præcisa obligatione præcipiunt Pontifices in ipsa canonizatione; ergo oportet ut illi præcepto non possit subesse error, alias deficeret Deus in re maxime necessaria Ecclesiae, quod est contra providentiam, et promissiones ejus; et ideo, quamvis hæc illatio non sit de fide, censeo esse satis certam, et contrariam esse impiam ac temerariam (Lege, si placet, Walden., tom. 3 Doctrin., tit. 14, cap. 22 et sequent.; Castr., libro 1 de Justa haeret. punit., capite 6; Anconitanum, quæst. 14 et sequentibus).

9. *Corollarium tertium de approbatione religionum.*—*Cant error circa hoc corollarium.*—*Ratio pro eodem corollario.* — Tertio, infero non posse Pontificem errare in approbatione religionis; ita tradimus etiam ac latius tom. 3 de Religione, lib. 2, cap. 17, et amplectuntur recentiores communiter: Azor, tom. 2, lib. 5, cap. 7, quæst. 2; Valentia supra, et quos dicto loco citamus, quod intelligendum est quoad substantiam ejus, quidquid sit de

hold an opinion contrary to the preceding corollary. — Secondly, it is inferred that the Pontiff cannot err in the canonization of Saints [²], as St. Thomas correctly taught in Quodlibet 9, final article; Antoninus and Cano, cited above; and Bellarmine, book 1 on the beatitude of Saints, chapter 5; Azor, volume 2, book 5, chapter 6, question 5; Valencia, volume 3, distinction 1, question 1, point 7, § 40, verse *Thus as regards*; Sylvester, under the word *Canonizat.*, question 3, where he references John of Naples who absolutely condemns the contrary opinion as heresy; Torquemada, Summa, book 2, chapter 110. Our corollary is derived from Gregory, in chapter *Sicut*, distinction 15; and Bernard, epistle 174 to the people of Lyons. The reason indeed is that this is a certain part of moral doctrine, and highly necessary so that the Church does not err in worship and religious adoration, otherwise it could happen that she might venerate a damned man and pour out prayers to him, which is also contrary to the purity and sanctity of the Church. Likewise, the faithful are not permitted to doubt the glory of a canonized Saint; for the Pontiffs command this under precise obligation in the canonization itself; therefore it is necessary that error cannot underlie that precept, otherwise God would be deficient in a matter most necessary to the Church, which is contrary to His providence and promises; and therefore, although this inference is not of faith, I judge it to be sufficiently certain, and the contrary to be impious and temerarious (Read, if you please, Waldensis, volume 3 of Doctrine, title 14, chapter 22 and following; Castro, book 1 on the Just Punishment of Heretics, chapter 6; Anconitanus, question 14 and following).

9. *Third Corollary concerning the approval of religious orders.* — *Cano's error regarding this corollary.* — *Argument for the same corollary.* — Thirdly, I infer that the Pontiff cannot err in the approval of a religious order; we also teach this more extensively in Volume 3 on Religion, Book 2, Chapter 17, and more recent authors commonly embrace this view: Azor, Volume 2, Book 5, Chapter 7, Question 2; Valentia above, and those whom we cite in the aforementioned place. This

circumstantiis, ut esse possunt, vel in approbatione religionis non necessariae, vel in nimia multitudine earum, quamvis etiam in his non sit temere ferendum iudicium; substantiam autem voco, quod religio approbata non solum non sit noxia vel inutilis, sed etiam simpliciter sit via ad perfectionem; in quo graviter erravit Cano, dicto libr. 5, cap. 5, contrarium sentiens; nam illud temerarium reputavit divus Thomas, opusc. 19, cap. 4; et dicta assertio est valde consentanea Concilio Tridentino, sess. 25, cap. 16 de Regularibus, et Concilio Constant., quod damnavit Wiclephum et Joannem Huss, quia male sentiebant de religionibus a Sede Apostolica approbatis, quos refellit Walden. supra, tit. 9, praesertim a cap. 83; Bellarminus, lib. de Monachis, et alii scribentes contra haereticos. Denique favet communis sensus Ecclesiae, ita sentientis de religionibus approbatis, et contrarium tanquam scandalosum et impium damnantis. Ratio vero est, quia haec etiam est magna pars materiae moralis; oportet enim ut Ecclesia habeat securitatem et certitudinem, non tantum in praeceptis, sed etiam in consiliis, et in via perfectionis. Item, quia approbare religionem est quasi canonizare tale institutum ut sanctum; ergo ad providentiam Spiritus Sancti spectat ut in hoc non permittat errare Ecclesiam quam specialiter regit; erraret autem Ecclesia si Pontifex posset errare; ergo credendum non est id accidere posse.

10. *Ad primum argumentum in numero tertio.* — Primum argumentum ex dictis solutum est: nam revera in Ecclesia non sunt duae regulae infallibiles vivae, sed una tantum, quae est Summus Pontifex, qui potest variis modis uti ad definiendum sua potestate, prout opportunitas tulerit, et Ecclesiae fuerit expediens, et ideo unus illorum modorum est, definire cum Concilio generali, quia interdum expedit ad majorem Ecclesiae satisfactionem, utque

should be understood regarding the substance of the matter, whatever may be said about circumstances, such as might exist either in the approval of a non-necessary religious order, or in an excessive multitude of them, although even in these matters judgment should not be rashly pronounced. By substance, I mean that the approved religious order is not only not harmful or useless, but is also simply a path to perfection. On this point, Cano gravely erred in the aforementioned Book 5, Chapter 5, holding the contrary opinion; for St. Thomas deemed that view rash, in his Opusculum 19, Chapter 4. And the said assertion is very much in agreement with the Council of Trent, Session 25, Chapter 16 on Regulars, and with the Council of Constance, which condemned Wycliffe and John Huss because they held wrong views concerning religious orders approved by the Apostolic See. Walden refutes them above, in Title 9, especially from Chapter 83 onwards; as do Bellarmine in his book on Monks, and others writing against heretics. Finally, the common sense of the Church favors this view, judging thus concerning approved religious orders, and condemning the contrary opinion as scandalous and impious. The reason indeed is that this also forms a great part of moral matter; for it is necessary that the Church have security and certainty, not only in precepts, but also in counsels and in the way of perfection. Likewise, because to approve a religious order is, as it were, to canonize such an institute as holy; therefore, it pertains to the providence of the Holy Spirit not to permit the Church, which He specifically governs, to err in this matter. The Church would err if the Pontiff could err; therefore, it must not be believed that this can happen.

10. *To the first argument in number three.* — The first argument has been resolved by what has been said: for truly in the Church there are not two living infallible rules, but only one, which is the Supreme Pontiff, who can use his power to define in various ways, as opportunity may present itself and as may be expedient for the Church. And therefore one of these ways is to define with a General Council, since at times it is expedient for the greater satisfaction of the Church, and so that its common

magis constat de communi consensu ejus, et ad majorem confusionem hæreticorum, vel quorumcumque contradicentium, ut recte nobis declararunt Apostoli exemplo suo, Actor. 15, et ad Galat. 2.

11. *Ad secundum.* — In secundo vero argumento, postulatur quam diligentiam debeat Pontifex adhibere ad definiendum quando Concilium generale non congregat ; ad quod breviter respondeo, aliquam sine dubio esse necessariam, quia Deus non vult ut homines temere judicent vel gubernent ; quanta vero futura sit, nullo jure, saltem divino, definitum est, sed prudentiæ ipsius Pontificis relinquitur. Solet autem quæri quid sit futurum si Pontifex sine præmissa diligentia definiat : aliqui dicunt posse tunc Pontificem errare, et Ecclesiam posse tunc non assentiri : sed hoc periculosum est, quia Ecclesiæ non poterit constare an Pontifex adhibuerit sufficientem diligentiam necne, vel relinquetur singulorum arbitrio, ut judicent an diligentia sufficiens fuerit, et ideo melius, ut existimo, respondetur non admittendo casum ; nam Spiritus Sanctus, qui regit Ecclesiam, non permittet Pontificem tam imprudenter definire ; et ideo, quoties absolute definit, credendum est sufficientem diligentiam præmisisse.

12. *Ad tertium.* — In ultimo argumento, petitur quæstio superioribus annis valde controversa, an sit de fide hunc Pontificem esse verum Pontificem, quam non possum nunc pro dignitate disputare; breviter tamen, multi sentiunt non esse hoc de fide, sed vix poterunt sustinere certitudinem fidei in rebus definitis a Pontifice, nisi consequenter dicant non solum Pontificem verum, sed etiam nec reputatum ab Ecclesia, posse errare definiendo, quod censet Bellarminus supra. Ego tamen fere ante triginta annos, hoc est anno Domini 1585, docuit Romæ esse de fide, hunc Pontificem esse verum Pontificem, postquam sufficienti consensu totius Ecclesiæ receptus est, et ita approbatus, ut

consensus may be more evident, and for the greater confusion of heretics or of any who contradict, as the Apostles rightly declared to us by their example in Acts 15 and in Galatians 2.

11. *Ad secundum.* — To the second argument. — In the second argument, it is asked what diligence the Pontiff must exercise when defining [matters of faith] when a general Council is not convened; to which I briefly respond that some diligence is undoubtedly necessary, because God does not wish men to judge or govern rashly. How much diligence is required, however, has not been defined by any law, at least divine law, but is left to the prudence of the Pontiff himself. It is customarily asked what would happen if the Pontiff were to define something without exercising preliminary diligence: some say that in such a case the Pontiff could err, and the Church could then withhold its assent. But this position is dangerous, because the Church would have no way of knowing whether the Pontiff had employed sufficient diligence or not, or it would be left to the judgment of individuals to decide whether the diligence was sufficient. Therefore, I believe it is better to respond by not admitting such a case as possible; for the Holy Spirit, who governs the Church, will not permit the Pontiff to define matters so imprudently. And therefore, whenever he defines something absolutely, it should be believed that he has exercised sufficient preliminary diligence.

12. *On the third point.* — In the final argument, a question is raised that was highly controversial in previous years: whether it is a matter of faith that this Pontiff is the true Pontiff. I cannot now discuss this with the thoroughness it deserves; briefly, however, many believe this is not a matter of faith, but they can scarcely maintain the certainty of faith in matters defined by the Pontiff unless they consequently say that not only a true Pontiff, but also one who is merely recognized as such by the Church, cannot err in defining, which Bellarminus affirms above. I myself, however, nearly thirty years ago, that is, in the year of our Lord 1585, taught in Rome that it is a matter of faith that this Pontiff is the true Pontiff, after he has been received

omnes illi obedire teneantur, etiam in definitionibus fidei, quia hæc obligatio necessario supponit illam certam fidem, et illa veritas particularis est sufficienter contenta in universali dogmate fidei, *quod successor Petri est verus Pontifex*; et tunc sufficienter applicatur, et fidelibus proponitur. Quam sententiam postea nostri vel publicis disputationibus defenderunt, vel typis etiam nonnulli mandarunt. Ex quibus consuli potest Alphonsus Salmeron, lib. 4 in Epistol. Pauli, parte secunda, disputat. de Ecclesia, satis ante medium, a § *Angeli etiam*: Albertinus, tom. 1, coroll. 3 Theologico, ex tertio principio philosophico, quæst. 3, a num. 10; Valentia, supra, in § 38, versic. *Secunda ratio*, licet ipsius probatio parum concludat. Reliqua videri possunt in supra citatis auctoribus.

SECTIO V.

An certa fide constare possit hunc hominem esse verum Pontificem et Ecclesiæ caput.

1. Sensus quæstion's.—Pars negans suadetur primo.—Secundo.—Tertio.—Quarto.—Sicut in superiori disputatione de Ecclesia, sectione 9, diximus, ut esse possit utilis et infallibilis fidei regula, oportere non solum in confuso illam esse creditam, sed etiam determinate, et in individuo hanc esse, vel illam, quam oculis cernimus, et hoc sensu appellari *visibilem*; ita nunc quærimus an simili modo verus Pontifex visibilis sit in individuo, et determinate, ita ut non solum credamus esse in Ecclesia unum summum caput, quod Romæ suam sedem habet, sed etiam esse hunc hominem quem oculis cernimus. Videtur ergo non posse, quia Deus nunquam id revelavit. Secundo, quia est res humana et contingens, pendens ex testimonio paucorum hominum, et ex multis circumstantiis valde dubiis, ut an sit baptizatus, an rite ordinatus, etc. Tertio, quia est res cui potest subesse falsum; accidit enim aliquando esse reputatum Pontificem qui talis non erat. Quarto, usu

by sufficient consensus of the whole Church and so approved that all are bound to obey him, even in definitions of faith, because this obligation necessarily presupposes that certain faith, and that particular truth is sufficiently contained in the universal dogma of faith, *that the successor of Peter is the true Pontiff*; and then it is sufficiently applied and proposed to the faithful. This opinion was subsequently defended by our scholars either in public disputations or some even committed it to print. Among these, one may consult Alphonsus Salmeron, book 4 on the Epistles of Paul, second part, disputation on the Church, well before the middle, from the section *The angels also*; Albertinus, volume 1, corollary 3 Theological, from the third philosophical principle, question 3, from number 10; Valentia, above, in § 38, verse *Second reason*, although his proof is not very conclusive. The remaining points can be seen in the authors cited above.

Tractatus Primus, Disputatio X, Sectio V

Whether it can be known with certainty of faith that this particular man is the true Pontiff and head of the Church.

1. The meaning of the question.—The negative position is supported first.—Second.—Third.—Fourth.—Just as in our previous disputation concerning the Church, section 9, we stated that for it to be a useful and infallible rule of faith, it must not only be believed in general terms, but also specifically and individually as this or that Church which we see with our eyes, and in this sense is called *visible*; so now we ask whether in a similar way the true Pontiff is visible individually and specifically, such that we not only believe there is in the Church one supreme head who has his seat in Rome, but also that it is this particular man whom we see with our eyes. It seems, therefore, that this cannot be known with certainty, first, because God has never revealed this. Second, because it is a human and contingent matter, depending on the testimony of a few men and on many highly dubious circumstances, such as whether he was baptized, whether he was properly ordained, etc. Third, because it is a matter in which falsehood may be present; for it has sometimes happened that

Ecclesiæ constat eos, qui verum Pontificem negant in individuo, non existimari hæreticos; unde a Patribus dicuntur non errare contra fidem, sed contra charitatem, scindentes unitatem.

2. *Ejus sequaces Cano, Vega et alii.*—*Verior assertio.*—*Ostenditur primo, ex Conciliis.*—*Secundo, ex ratione, ab incommodo.*—*Tertio, ex potestate ipsa papali.*—Propter hæc argumenta aliqui ex Catholicis negant posse immediate fide teneri, hunc esse verum Pontificem, sed solum certitudine quadam morali, quam sufficere dicunt, ut teneamur illi obedire in omnibus, etiam credendis rebus quas de fide esse definierit. Hi sunt Turrecremata, lib. 4 Summæ, part. 2, c. 9, ad finem; Albertin., de Agnoscend. assert., etc., quæst. 3, ad fin.; Cajetanus 2. 2, quæst. 1, a. 3, in respons. ad 4; Bannez, 2. 2, quæst. 1, art. 10, in prioribus commentariis, dub. 2, ad 2; Cano et Vega, quos retuli, disput. 6, sect. 4, n. 3; Cordub., lib. 1, quæst. 17, § 2; Castro, lib. 1 contra Hæres., c. 9, circa medium, a Christian. Axiomata, lib. 2, art. 6, c. 11, et alii. Est vero in his auctoribus nonnulla differentia, saltem in modo loquendi. Quidam^[3] enim, etsi negent haberi immediate de fide, hunc Pontificem, verbi gratia, Gregorium XIII, esse verum Pontificem, volunt tamen esse mediate, eo quod ex una de fide, quod rite electus sit verus Pontifex, et altera naturaliter nota, quod hic sit rite electus, colligatur. Verum nos distinctionem hanc alibi confutavimus. Alii dictam conclusionem fidem sapere aiunt ex eodem fundamento, quod ex una de fide, et altera naturaliter cognoscibili eruatur. Itaque uno verbo appellare possunt Theologicam. Alii tandem simpliciter pronunciant ad fidem non pertinere. Mihi tamen placet contraria sententia; atque dico, sicut Christi Ecclesia visibilis est hæc numero, ita habere posse hoc numero caput visibile, atque adeo de fide esse, hunc hominem, qui communi Ecclesiæ consensione acceptus est ut caput Ecclesiæ, cui ipsa tenetur obedire, esse verum

someone was considered to be Pontiff who in fact was not. Fourth, by the practice of the Church it is established that those who deny a particular individual to be the true Pontiff are not considered heretics; hence the Fathers say that such persons do not err against faith, but against charity, by causing division in unity.

2. *His followers Cano, Vega and others.*—*The truer assertion.*—*Demonstrated first, from Councils.*—*Second, from reason, by inconvenience.*—*Third, from papal power itself.*—Because of these arguments, some among Catholics deny that it can be held immediately by faith that this particular person is the true Pontiff, but only with a certain moral certainty, which they say is sufficient to obligate us to obey him in all things, even in believing matters which he has defined to be of faith. These are Turrecremata, in book 4 of his Summa, part 2, ch. 9, at the end; Albertinus, in De Agnoscendis assertionibus, etc., question 3, at the end; Cajetan in II-II, question 1, art. 3, in response to the 4th; Bannez, II-II, question 1, art. 10, in his earlier commentaries, doubt 2, to the 2nd; Cano and Vega, whom I cited, disputation 6, section 4, n. 3; Corduba, book 1, question 17, § 2; Castro, book 1 against Heresies, ch. 9, near the middle, from Christian Axiomata, book 2, art. 6, ch. 11, and others. There is, however, among these authors some difference, at least in their manner of speaking. For some^[3], although they deny that it is immediately of faith that this Pontiff, for example, Gregory XIII, is the true Pontiff, nevertheless maintain that it is mediately of faith, because from one premise of faith, that he who is rightly elected is the true Pontiff, and another naturally known, that this man has been rightly elected, the conclusion follows. But we have elsewhere refuted this distinction. Others say that this conclusion savors of faith from the same foundation, because it is deduced from one premise of faith and another naturally knowable. Thus in a word they could call it Theological. Others finally simply pronounce that it does not pertain to faith. I, however, prefer the contrary opinion; and I say that, just as Christ's visible Church is this particular one, so it can have this particular visible head, and

Ecclesiae Pontificem Petri successorem. Probatur primo ex Conciliis, atque ante omnia in Bulla Martini V, apud Concilium Constantien. disponitur, ab haereticis, qui Ecclesiae Catholicae reconciliari volunt, primum omnium exigendum esse, an credant Papam canonice electum, qui pro tempore fuerit (ejus nomine expresso), esse successorem Petri, et habere supremam potestatem in Ecclesia Dei; est ergo hoc, ut Pontifex supponit, de fide credendum, neque infra certitudinem fidei proponitur res immediate credenda a Pontificibus. Deinde Concilia non distinguunt inter verum Pontificem in communi, et hunc qui nunc sedet cum omni consensione Ecclesiae, sed eadem veneratione et fide complectuntur; sic certe Chalcedonense Concilium recipit nominatim Leonem Papam; sexta Synodus, Agathonem.; Milevitani., Innocentium I; et sic de caeteris. Secundo, si nunquam constat catholica fide hunc esse verum Pontificem, consequenter neque constare potest hoc esse verum Concilium, quod non minus haereticum esset, quam negare vera esse quatuor Evangelia, ut dixit Magnus Gregorius; siquidem verum Concilium formaliter includit verum Pontificem, atque ob talem inclusionem dicimus nos, tam immediate de fide esse, Christum esse animal, viventem substantiam, atque esse hominem; quare si de fide catholica nunquam esset hunc esse verum Pontificem, neque de tali fide essent unquam ejus decreta, quod est haereticum. Videatur decretum Leonis Papae cap. *De libellis*, d. 20. Imo neque catholica veritas et certitudo hujus numero Ecclesiae posset recte consistere, quia haec maxime pendet ex conjunctione cum vero capite, requiritque veros ac legitimos sacerdotes, pastores, et ecclesiasticam hierarchiam; at haec omnia pendent ex eo quod verus et legitimus Pontifex in individuo sit certus, et qua ratione possum dubitare de hoc Pontifice, potero et de antecessore, atque adeo de tota retro serie; ergo de veritate Episcoporum et Cardinalium qui ab his creati sunt; atque ita ruet tota certitudo verae Ecclesiae et hierarchici ordinis:

therefore it is of faith that this man, who has been accepted by the common consensus of the Church as the head of the Church, whom the Church herself is bound to obey, is the true Pontiff, the successor of Peter. This is proven first from Councils, and above all in the Bull of Martin V, at the Council of Constance, it is ordered that from heretics who wish to be reconciled to the Catholic Church, it should first of all be demanded whether they believe that the canonically elected Pope, whoever he may be at the time (his name being expressly stated), is the successor of Peter, and has supreme power in the Church of God; this therefore, as the Pontiff supposes, is to be believed by faith, nor is anything proposed by Pontiffs for immediate belief with less than the certainty of faith. Moreover, Councils do not distinguish between the true Pontiff in general and this one who now sits with the full consensus of the Church, but embrace them with the same veneration and faith; thus certainly the Council of Chalcedon received Leo the Pope by name; the Sixth Synod, Agatho; the Council of Milevis, Innocent I; and so for the rest. Secondly, if it can never be established by Catholic faith that this is the true Pontiff, consequently it cannot be established that this is a true Council, which would be no less heretical than to deny that the four Gospels are true, as Gregory the Great said; since a true Council formally includes a true Pontiff, and because of such inclusion we say that it is just as immediately of faith that Christ is an animal, a living substance, as it is that He is a man; wherefore if it were never of Catholic faith that this is the true Pontiff, neither would his decrees ever be of such faith, which is heretical. See the decree of Pope Leo, chapter *De libellis*, distinction 20. Indeed, not even the Catholic truth and certainty of this particular Church could properly stand, because this depends greatly on connection with the true head, and requires true and legitimate priests, pastors, and ecclesiastical hierarchy; but all these things depend on the fact that the true and legitimate Pontiff in the individual case is certain, and by whatever reasoning I could doubt about this Pontiff, I could also doubt about his predecessor, and thus about the whole series going back; therefore about the truth

quomodo argumentantur haeretici, contententes a tempore saltem Urbani Papae defecisse veram successionem; hinc enim satis sibi videntur inferre jam non posse esse certum, an vere Summo Pontifici succedatur, aut ubi gentium vera Ecclesia visibilis extet. Unde praeterea arguitur tertio ex potestate definiendi res fidei, et obligandi ad credendum definita; impossibile enim est teneri me ad credendum ea quae hic homo definit ut dicta a Deo, nisi etiam teneam ad credendum de fide hunc hominem habere a Deo po-testatem definiendi, et assistentiam Spiri-tus Sancti, potestatemque ad me obligandum ut credam quæ ipse definit; hoc autem est plane credere hunc hominem Summum esse Pontificem.

3. Adversariorum evasio. — Rejicitur. — Nec vero intelligi potest, quod quidam respondent, sat esse certitudine morali credere hunc esse verum Pontificem, cum Pontifex solum se habeat ut applicans et proponens fidem, dixerimusque in superioribus, ex parte proponentis sufficere certitudinem moralem ad credendum; illud enim verum est consi-derando res propositas in ratione credibi-lium, et quatenus alias jam definitæ ac certæ a proponente proximo seu ministro Evange-lij prædicantur; secus vero est de eo quem oportet me amplecti, ut infallibilem regulam fidei, ejus scilicet materias definiensem. Quod declaratur a simili; ut enim, quæ in Scrip-tura continentur fide divina credantur, non sat est certitudine morali, sed fide catholica oportet credere ipsam Scripturam esse divi-nam; tam est autem regula fidei Pontifex quam Scriptura, ut patet ex disput. 5, sect. 5. Ratio vero est, quia quæ in Scriptura con-tinentur vel a Pontifice definiuntur, ut vera sint, non pendent tantum ex eo quod credi-bile sit, etiam evidenter, hanc esse Scriptu-ram, vel hunc esse Summum Pontificem, sed ex hoc quod vere ita sit ac infallibiliter; oportet ergo tanta certitudine credere vere ita esse, quanta creduntur ea quæ ipse de-finit.

of the Bishops and Cardinals who have been created by these; and thus the whole certainty of the true Church and hierarchical order would collapse: as heretics argue, contending that at least from the time of Pope Urban the true succession has failed; for from this they think they sufficiently infer that it can no longer be certain whether one truly succeeds the Supreme Pontiff, or where in the world the true visible Church exists. From which, furthermore, I argue, thirdly, from the power of defining matters of faith, and of obligating to believe what has been defined; for it is impossible that I am bound to believe those things which this man defines as spoken by God, unless I am also bound to believe by faith that this man has from God the power of defining, and the assistance of the Holy Spirit, and the power to oblige me to believe what he himself defines; but this is plainly to believe that this man is the Supreme Pontiff.

3. The Evasion of Adversaries. — It is Rejected. — Nor indeed can we accept what some respond, that it is sufficient to believe with moral certainty that this person is the true Pontiff, since the Pontiff merely serves as one who applies and proposes the faith, and we have said in previous discussions that, on the part of the one proposing, moral certainty is sufficient for belief. That statement is true when considering matters proposed as objects of belief, and insofar as they are proclaimed by the proximate proposer or minister of the Gospel as matters already defined and certain elsewhere. But the case is different regarding the person whom I must embrace as the infallible rule of faith, that is, the one who defines the matters of faith. This is illustrated by an analogy: for in order to believe by divine faith what is contained in Scripture, it is not enough to believe with moral certainty, but one must believe with Catholic faith that Scripture itself is divine. The Pontiff, however, is as much a rule of faith as Scripture, as is evident from disputation 5, section 5. The reason is that the things contained in Scripture or defined by the Pontiff, in order to be true, do not depend merely on the fact that it is credible, even evidently so, that this is Scripture or that this is the Supreme Pontiff, but on the fact that it is truly and infallibly so. Therefore, one must

4. Aliorum evasio prima. — Expugnatur. — Propter hæc ergo alii negantes etiam, de fide haberi hunc esse verum Pontificem, volunt nihilominus esse de fide hunc hominem, qui certitudine quadam morali in tota Ecclesia habetur verus Pontifex, vere et rite efficere omnia quæ efficit verus Pontifex, et gaudere privilegiis omnibus assistentiaque Spiritus Sancti Petro et legitimis successoribus ejus promissis. At hæc sententia in easdem incidit difficultates quas vitare conatur. Et præterea, ut mihi videtur, propriam vocem ignorat, et contradictoria dicit. Explico singula: primo, unde quæso magis constat hunc hominem, a nobis existimatum Pontificem, gaudere in re ipsa privilegiis Summi Pontificis, quam esse vere Summum Pontificem? Non enim unum magis altero revelatum esse dicitur, et utrumque pendet ab existimatione quadam hominum morali. Imo involvit hæc sententia quippiam non revelatum solum, sed etiam falsum, scilicet, privilegia omnia Summi Pontificis et potestatem alicui dari, qui non sit verus Pontifex; nam Christus Dominus non cuicumque, sed Petro, et successoribus legitimis dixit: *Quodcumque ligaveris* etc. Deinde, ut hæc ipsa sententia ponit, dari valet Pontifex existimatus tantummodo; demus vero ita esse, poterit ergo etiam esse non Sacerdos; numquid igitur ille, si sacramentaliter absolvere tentet aut consecrare, id perficiet? Nullo modo: contrarium enim astruere hæreticum esset; non ergo habet potestatem omnem quam habuit Petrus per illa verba: *Quodcumque ligaveris*, etc.

5. *Effugium aliud praecluditur multipliciter.* Dicent forte habere omnem potestatem quoad actus solius jurisdictionis, non autem ordinis. Sed obest primo, quia plenaria jurisdictionis potestas fundatur modo aliquo in potestate ordinis, ita ut necessario illam prærequirat, neque consistere valet plena Summi Pontificis potestas, quæ ad Ecclesiae gubernationem pertinet, separata

believe with as much certainty that this is truly the case as one believes those things which the Pontiff himself defines.

4. The first evasive argument of others. — Refuted. — Because of these [difficulties], therefore, others who also deny that it is a matter of faith that this man is the true Pontiff, nevertheless wish to maintain that it is a matter of faith that this man, who with a certain moral certainty is held throughout the whole Church to be the true Pontiff, truly and validly performs all that a true Pontiff performs, and enjoys all the privileges and the assistance of the Holy Spirit promised to Peter and his legitimate successors. But this opinion falls into the same difficulties it attempts to avoid. And furthermore, as it seems to me, it is unaware of its own meaning and states contradictions. I explain each point: first, I ask, whence is it more certain that this man, whom we consider the Pontiff, enjoys in reality the privileges of the Supreme Pontiff, than that he is truly the Supreme Pontiff? For one is not said to be more revealed than the other, and both depend on a certain moral judgment of men. Indeed, this opinion involves something not only unrevealed, but even false, namely, that all privileges of the Supreme Pontiff and his power are given to someone who is not the true Pontiff; for Christ the Lord did not say to just anyone, but to Peter and his legitimate successors: “Whatsoever thou shalt bind,” etc. Then, as this same opinion supposes, there can be a merely presumed Pontiff; but let us grant this to be so, could he then also be not a Priest? Would he therefore, if he attempted to absolve sacramentally or to consecrate, accomplish this? By no means: for to maintain the contrary would be heretical; he does not, therefore, have all the power which Peter had through those words: “Whatsoever thou shalt bind,” etc.

5. *The other escape is precluded in multiple ways.* Perhaps they will say that [the Pope] has all power with respect to acts of jurisdiction alone, but not of orders. But this is opposed, first, because the plenary power of jurisdiction is founded in some manner on the power of orders, such that it necessarily presupposes it, nor can the full power of the Supreme Pontiff, which pertains to the

a potestate interiori, et in poenitentiae foro; imo in Pontifice proprie non duae sunt potestates, sed unica eminens, atque utramque comprehendens. Unde tandem concludo contradictionem involvi, asserendo hunc hominem habere supremam potestatem jurisdictionis in totam Ecclesiam, ac negando de fide haberi eundem esse Summum Pontificem; quia jam affirmaretur definitionem, ut ita loquar, convenire in hunc hominem, non autem definitum; idemque pronuntio de credendo hunc hominem habere potestatem definiendi, seu actu vere definivisse ex assistentia Spiritus Sancti, nam haec omnia pertinent ad jurisdictionem inseparabilem a vero Pontifice. Unde etiam intelligitur quomodo ipsi negantes haberi de fide hunc esse verum Pontificem, possint nihilominus credere fide quae ab illo definiuntur, nam re ipsa ac de facto credunt illum esse Pontificem, cum credant habere potestatem ac Summi Pontificis privilegium: ex quadam autem ignorantia putant se non credere. Unde ex ignorantia incidunt in quamdam veluti contradictionem.

6. *Ad primum argumentum in num. 1.* Ad primum argumentum in principio factum, respondemus illud esse a Deo revelatum, quo modo revelatum est hanc esse Ecclesiam veram; quare cum revelavit Petrum esse caput Ecclesiae, pariter revelavit generaliter de omnibus ejus successoribus, solumque deest sufficiens propositio hujus vel illius contenti sub illa revelatione; talis vero propositio habetur per universalem testificationem, approbationem Ecclesiae; quod plane explicatur et confirmatur a simili casu; nunquam enim videtur Deus revelasse Episcopum Romanum esse potius Pontificem Summum quam Alexandrinum, quia nunquam hoc expressit Deus, sed in confuso tantum dixit, quando revelavit Petro dignitatem et successionem, quia talis revelatio sese ostendit et cadit in eos Episcopos, vel in eorum episcopatum, in quo Petro succeditur, postquam illa successio sufficienter est Ecclesiae proposita per traditionem, vel universalem

governance of the Church, exist separated from the interior power and in the forum of penance; indeed, in the Pontiff there are not properly two powers, but a single eminent one, comprehending both. Whence I finally conclude that it involves a contradiction to assert that this man has supreme power of jurisdiction over the whole Church, while denying that it is held by faith that he is the Supreme Pontiff; because one would already be affirming that the definition, so to speak, applies to this man, but not the thing defined; and I pronounce the same concerning belief that this man has the power of defining, or has truly defined in act with the assistance of the Holy Spirit, for all these things pertain to jurisdiction inseparable from the true Pontiff. From this it is also understood how 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 him to be the Pontiff, since they believe he has the power and privilege of the Supreme Pontiff: yet from a certain ignorance they think they do not believe. Whence from ignorance they fall into a kind of contradiction.

6. *To the first argument in number 1.* To the first argument made at the beginning, we respond that it is revealed by God in the same way that it is revealed that this is the true Church; wherefore when He revealed that Peter is the head of the Church, He likewise revealed generally concerning all of Peter's successors, and all that is lacking is a sufficient proposition about this or that person contained under that revelation. Such a proposition, however, is provided through the universal testimony and approval of the Church. This is clearly explained and confirmed by a similar case: for God never seems to have revealed that the Bishop of Rome rather than the Bishop of Alexandria is the Supreme Pontiff, because God never expressly stated this, but only stated it in a general way when He revealed to Peter his dignity and succession. For this revelation manifests itself and falls upon those Bishops, or upon their episcopate, in which Peter is succeeded, after that succession has been sufficiently proposed to the Church through tradition or universal consensus.

consensionem; quando vero intelligendum sit dari sufficientem propositionem, ita ut omnes obliget, quibusdam videtur tunc dari, cum rite et vere electus, atque adeo verus Pontifex proponitur; et hoc quidem sufficiens est ut ex praecepto obedientiae et charitatis teneamur tali Pontifici obedire, atque ut non possit quispiam jure ab illo disjungi sine schismate; attamen loquendo, ut re ipsa loquimur, de assensione per fidem, fortasse non erit sufficiens propositio, donec moraliter constet illum esse acceptatum a tota Ecclesia, et pacifice possidere suum primatum, atque adeo posse obligare omnes fideles ad credendum quicquid definierit; tunc enim certissime credendum est non posse accidere errorem in universali Ecclesia in re adeo gravi, qualis esset deceptio in ipsa viva regula fidei credenda, nam is error aequipararetur errori in fide; si enim regula posset esse falsa, etiam regulatum, atque si intolerabilis error esset in Ecclesia, quando tota crederet librum aliquem esse canonicum, qui vere non esset, cum tamen ille sit quaedam regula fidei inanimata, multo intolerabilius esset errare in viva regula; quin potius, si circa hanc posset semel dari error in universali Ecclesia, nunquam esset verum illam habere certam et infallibilem regulam vivam fidei sibi loquentem, Christi nomine.

7. *Ad secundum argumentum ibid.* — Ad secundum respondetur ita pendere hanc veritatem ab humano testimonio, sicut pendet fides a proponente, et ideo nihil derogare certitudini fidei; de aliis porro conditionibus requisitis, dicendum illas per se primo non pertinere ad fidem, sed esse quasi conclusiones theologicas, quae consecutione quadam inferuntur; sicut enim ex fine sequuntur media, ita ex eo quod Deus contulit Ecclesiae ut nunquam erret, et vera semper utatur regula in rebus fidei credendis, consequenter speciali cura disponit, ut is qui ad talem dignitatem eligitur, eas omnes condiciones habeat, quae ad illam vere suscipiendam sunt necessariae.

When, however, it should be understood that a sufficient proposition is given, such that it obliges all, it seems to some that it is given when one who is duly and truly elected, and therefore the true Pontiff, is proposed. And this indeed is sufficient so that we are bound by the precept of obedience and charity to obey such a Pontiff, and so that no one can rightfully separate from him without schism. Nevertheless, speaking, as we are in reality speaking, of assent through faith, perhaps the proposition will not be sufficient until it is morally certain that he has been accepted by the whole Church and peacefully possesses his primacy, and thus can oblige all the faithful to believe whatever he may define. For then it is most certainly to be believed that an error cannot occur in the universal Church in a matter so grave as deception in the living rule of faith itself that is to be believed, for such an error would be equivalent to an error in faith. For if the rule could be false, so also could that which is ruled, and if it would be an intolerable error in the Church when the whole Church believed some book to be canonical which truly was not, since that book would be a certain inanimate rule of faith, much more intolerable would be an error in the living rule. Indeed, if concerning this there could once be given an error in the universal Church, it would never be true that it has a certain and infallible living rule of faith speaking to it in the name of Christ.

7. *To the second argument in the same place.* — To the second, it is answered that this truth depends on human testimony just as faith depends on the one who proposes it, and therefore nothing detracts from the certainty of faith. Concerning the other required conditions, it must be said that they do not per se primarily pertain to faith, but are, as it were, theological conclusions which are inferred by a certain logical sequence. For just as means follow from ends, so from the fact that God has granted to the Church that she may never err and that she may always use a true rule in matters of faith to be believed, He consequently, by special care, arranges that he who is elected to such a dignity should have all those conditions which are necessary for truly assuming it.

8. *Ad tertium ibid.* — Ad tertium negatur antecedens, nulla enim de ea re extat historia fide digna; accidit quidem aliquando Ecclesiam non agnoscere pro tempore aliquo verum et certum pastorem; conspirasse autem totam in unum falsum caput, existimando scilicet verum esse Papam qui verus non esset, nunquam accidit; neque ex priori incommodo potest argumentum sumi ad posterius, non enim sunt paria; quod enim Ecclesia aliquo tempore non agnoscat certum pastorem, est quidem non parvum Ecclesiae detrimentum, tamen non exponit illam periculo falsorum dogmatum, et perpetui cujusdam et quasi irreparabilis damni, quia omnia illa quae per id tempus efficiuntur a Pontificibus dubiis, valida esse nequeunt sine vera auctoritate pontificia. Unde non existimantur certa, donec per indubitatum Papam stabiliantur; si vero falsus Pontifex indubitatus haberetur, omnia ab illo definita et facta certissima existimarentur, cum tamen infallibilia non essent.

9. *Ad quartum ibid.*—Ad quartum respondetur id fortasse contingere, quia nostra haec sententia de fide non est. Secundo dicitur omnia schismata fere semper nasci, priusquam verus Pontifex absque controversia ab universa Ecclesia receptus sit; si tamen homo aliquis vel Ecclesia particularis nunc negaret obedientiam, verbi gratia, Gregorio XIII, negando simul esse illum verum Pontificem, Petri successorem, non video quomodo posset ab haeresi excusari, magis quam si negaret Romanum Episcopum Petri successorem esse.

[^1]: Vide l. 1 Defensionis fidei, c. 10, et infra, disp. 10, sect. 3.

[^2]: De qua in Defens. fidei, l. 2, c. 8, nonnulla.

[^3]: Vide supra disp. 3, sect. 11; disp. 6, sect. 5; n. 10, et sect. 4, n. 5 et 7; Azor., tom. 2, l. 5, c. 5, q. 4, et c. 21, § Objicies.

8. *To the third point ibid.* — To the third, the antecedent is denied, for there exists no history worthy of faith concerning this matter. It has indeed sometimes happened that the Church did not recognize a true and certain pastor for some time; but that the entire Church conspired in favor of one false head, specifically believing to be a true Pope one who was not true, has never happened. Nor can an argument be drawn from the former inconvenience to the latter, for they are not equivalent. That the Church might not recognize a certain pastor for some time is indeed no small detriment to the Church; however, it does not expose her to the danger of false dogmas and of some perpetual and, as it were, irreparable damage, because all those things which are enacted during that time by doubtful Pontiffs cannot be valid without true pontifical authority. Hence, they are not considered certain until they are established by an undoubted Pope. But if a false Pontiff were held to be undoubted, all things defined and done by him would be considered most certain, when they would not, in fact, be infallible.

9. *To the fourth point ibid.* — To the fourth, it is answered that this perhaps occurs because this opinion of ours is not a matter of faith. Secondly, it is said that all schisms almost always arise before a true Pontiff is received without controversy by the universal Church. However, if some person or particular Church now denied obedience to, for example, Gregory XIII, while simultaneously denying that he is the true Pontiff and successor of Peter, I do not see how such a one could be excused from heresy any more than if they denied that the Roman Bishop is the successor of Peter.

[^1]: {org. 1} See Book 1 of Defense of the Faith, chapter 10, and below, disputation 10, section 3.

[^2]: {org. 1} Concerning which some matters [are discussed] in Defense of the Faith, book 2, chapter 8.

[^3]: See above disputation 3, section 11; disputation 6, section 5, number 10, and section 4, numbers 5 and 7; Azor, tome 2, book 5, chapter 5, question 4, and chapter 21, § Objicies.

