

# Selectae Disputationes Scholasticae, et Dogmaticae (*Selected Scholastic and Dogmatic Disputations*)

by Fr. Antonius Arbiol O.F.M. (Fr. Antonio Arbiol), 1702

[Online Location of Text Here](#)

- OCR of the original text by AI (*claude-3-7-sonnet-20250219*).
- Translation of the original text performed by AI (*claude-3-7-sonnet-20250219*).
- Last Edit: April 1, 2025.
- Version: 1.0
- Selection pages: 73–79

## Tractus I, Disp. II, Art. XI

*WHETHER IT IS THE MATERIAL OBJECT OF divine Faith that the Roman Pontiff currently existing is the true Pope?*

**207.** Three matters are usually questioned here. 1. Whether it is a matter of Faith that there must be a Pope in the Church of God? 2. Whether it is a matter of Faith that the true Pope is the Vicar of Christ? 3. Whether this particular Pontiff who has been Canonically elected is the true Pope, Head of the Church, and Vicar of Christ? Regarding the 1st question, I respond affirmatively, based on the Council of Constance against article 29 of John Hus. And by reason, since just as a perfect physical Body must have a physical Head, so a perfect moral Body, which the Church of God is, must have a moral Head. Regarding the 2nd question, the affirmative position is also certain, since it is a matter of Faith that St. Peter was the Vicar of Christ, according to the passage: *Feed my sheep*; but it is also a matter of Faith that Peter's successor has the same power and Office as Saint Peter, as we have proved above, and as established by Leo IX in his first epistle, chapter 13, and by the Council of Constance against article 12 of the Heretic John Hus: Therefore, etc.

**208.** Regarding the third [point], there is greater difficulty, and Catholic Doctors vary [in their opinions]. Some affirm that the affirmative position is a Conclusion that is not of Faith, but Theological, derived from one premise of Faith and another natural. Others hold that it is of Faith, because from one premise of Faith and another natural, a Conclusion of Faith follows. Still others defend that it is absolutely of Faith, since it is implicitly revealed in that statement of Christ: "*Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock, etc.*"

**209.** Let our Conclusion be this: That this particular Pontiff Canonically elected is the true Pope, Head of the Church, and Vicar of Christ, is the material object of divine Faith. Thus commonly [hold] the Scotists and many others, and it is now the common [opinion], as the

recent [authors] Lumbier, Sendin, and Oxea admit, and as our Perez Lopez dogmatically maintains in volume 2, distinction 8, on Faith to Peter, question 5.

**210.** It is proven, firstly, from the Bull of Martin V in the Council of Constance, in which it is decreed that Heretics returning to the Church are bound to believe that the Canonically elected Pope, whoever he may be at the time, mentioning his name expressly, is the legitimate successor of Saint Peter; otherwise they are to be punished as Heretics and Followers of the Heresiarch John Hus. But they would not be bound to believe this unless it were already a matter of Faith; therefore [it is of Faith]. The minor [premise] is clear, for we are not so bound to believe anything except what is actually of Faith.

**211.** It is proven secondly. From the formula of the Profession of Faith, prescribed in Constitution 89, which all those to be awarded degrees are obliged to make, as enjoined by Pius IV, where toward the end it states: *“I promise and swear true obedience to the Roman Pontiff, successor of Blessed Peter, Prince of the Apostles, and Vicar of Jesus Christ”*; but this is promised in the Profession of Faith; Therefore, etc.

**212.** It is proven thirdly. It is of divine Faith that the Catholic Church now existing is the true Church; therefore it is also of Faith that the Pope who has been canonically elected, universally accepted and venerated by the Church, is the true Pope. The antecedent is proven, for Christ revealed that His Church would endure until the consummation of the world in these words: *“upon this rock I will build my Church... and behold, I am with you always, until the end of the age”*. Now thus: if it is of Faith that the true Catholic Church founded by Christ perseveres, it will also be of Faith that the Pontiff canonically elected and universally received by the Church is the true Pope and Head of the Church. The consequence is demonstrated: With the same certainty that we know of the existence of a true and perfect body, we know of the existence of the Head of that Body; but by divine Faith we know of the existence of the Body of the true Catholic Church founded by Jesus Christ; Therefore, etc.

**213.** You will respond that this only proves it is a matter of Faith that there exists a Head of the Church, but not that this particular Pontiff, who is called Innocent XII, is the Head of the Church. But against this, I argue: Therefore it is already a matter of Faith that in this true Church there exists a true Head, but no other than this particular Pontiff who is called Innocent XII; therefore [my point stands]. I prove the minor premise: This particular individual, and no other, has been received and venerated by the universal Church as its Head; but in this matter the universal Church cannot err, and this pertains to divine providence, as I will explain below. Otherwise, the true Church would receive and venerate someone who is not the true Head: Therefore, etc. Moreover, a vague, indeterminate person, unknown to the Church, cannot be the certain and determinate Head of the universal Church; therefore either it is not an object of divine Faith that the universal Church now actually has a visible Head, or this Head must be this particular Pope who has been canonically elected and universally received by the Church.

**214.** Proof 1. We believe by divine faith that the Council of Trent and other General Councils legitimately convened were true Councils defining dogmas of Faith; but they

cannot be true Councils without a true Pope: therefore, while we believe by divine faith that they were true Councils, by the same divine faith we simultaneously profess that such numbered Pontiffs legitimately convening such Councils were true Popes. The minor premise is sufficiently clear, for if the Pope convening a Council were not a true Pope, neither would the Council convened by him be a true Council, as is self-evident; therefore, etc. Moreover, if we did not believe by divine faith that this numbered Pontiff universally received by the Church is the true Pope, neither could we believe by divine faith that his Decrees issued ex Cathedra would be to be believed by divine faith; but this is false, as we proved above; therefore, etc. The major premise is proven by the superior reasoning recently adduced.

**215.** Subsequently, the conclusion is persuaded by a sufficiently efficacious reason. It is a heresy of the accursed Luther that a Pope Canonically elected and universally received by the Roman Church is not the Vicar of Christ, nor the true successor of Peter; therefore its opposite is of divine Faith. The consequence is proven from opposites. For if it is heresy to say: *Christ is not true man*, then the opposite proposition is of divine Faith: *Christ is true man*. Therefore, etc.

## CONTRARY ARGUMENTS.

**216.** Argument 1. It is not revealed by God that this particular man, namely, Innocent XII, is the true Pope: therefore it cannot be believed by divine Faith. The antecedent is proved thus: There is not found any passage of Scripture where this is stated either explicitly or implicitly: therefore, etc. Response: I deny both antecedents. For in these words, *upon this rock I will build my Church*, where the permanence of the Church is clearly enough stated, it is implicitly revealed that Peter's successors, who are properly and canonically elected, are true Pontiffs, the Head of the Church, etc.

**217.** You will insist: but this canonical election is not so evident either to the Electors or to us that it can establish the assent of divine Faith: Therefore, etc. The minor is proved thus: The election is naturally known to the Cardinals who elect, but natural knowledge does not establish the assent of divine Faith: therefore. Moreover, with respect to ourselves, whatever we know about such canonical election, we receive from human testimony; but this testimony does not establish the assent of supernatural and infallible Faith: Therefore.

**218.** In this instance, many things have been said briefly: we shall respond by parts. I respond by denying the minor premise in both its parts. As to the proof of the first part, we freely concede that the Cardinal electors naturally know that the election is Canonical; but this does not prevent them from simultaneously believing that the one elected will be the true Pope, successor of Peter, and Vicar of Christ. The reasoning is compelling. For what is naturally known and seen is one thing; and what is believed by Faith is another. The Canonical election is naturally known to the electors; but that the elected person has received from God the Supreme spiritual power on earth, as the true Pope, successor of Peter, and Vicar of Christ, this is not seen, and this is what is believed by Faith by us and by the Electors. For this reason Pope Anacletus, in *Epistle 2*, which is Canon *Electionem*,

*distinction 79, said: God has reserved to Himself the election of Roman Pontiffs, although He has conferred the power of electing upon the Electors.* Therefore, what is seen is one thing; and what is believed by divine Faith is something entirely different.

**219.** From these points, the solution to the proof of the second part of the minor premise is sufficiently clear. By human faith, we know from the testimony of the Electors that this particular Pope was canonically elected; by divine faith, however, we believe that this canonically elected Pope possesses divine power as the Vicar of Christ and successor of Peter. These are indeed very different matters; the first is known naturally and by human faith; the second is believed on the basis of that divine revelation: “Upon this rock I will build, etc.” From this, it is a matter of Faith that: “Every duly and canonically elected Bishop of Rome is the true Pope.”

**220.** You will reply: The electors naturally and evidently know that the election is Canonical, since they evidently know that all the requirements proceeding from Canon Law have been observed: therefore, it is naturally known to them that the one elected is the true Pope. I respond by distinguishing the conclusion: That he is the true Pope, by the truth of Canon Law, I concede; by the truth of Divine Law, I deny. The truth of Canon Law consists in the fact that the election was conducted according to the disposition of Canon Law; and this the Electors possess: But the truth of Divine Law consists in the fact that this person so elected is one to whom God confers the Supreme power and the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven; and this the Electors believe, and we believe; since it is not seen, nor naturally known. St. Peter naturally knew that Christ had said to him: “*You are Peter, and upon this Rock I will build my Church*”; and at the same time he believed that the spiritual power of the Head of the Church had been given to him, which he did not see, nor naturally know: therefore, one is very different from the other.

**221.** Arg. 2. Although it has been defined that submission to the Pope is necessary for salvation, as stated in the Extravagant [Constitution] *Unam Sanctam*, concerning Majority and obedience, etc., it has never been defined that it is necessary for salvation to believe that this particular Roman Pontiff is the true Pope, etc. Therefore, this is not a matter of divine Faith. I respond by denying the consequence, because this Conclusion was not [previously] a matter of Faith, but was disputed among Theologians, as Oxea correctly notes, disp. 1, sect. 7, num. 48. However, after the Council of Constance, it does not seem possible that it would not be a matter of Faith, as Laurea observes, disp. 6, art. 6, num. 232, since to deny that the Pope is the successor of Peter is the heresy of Wycliffe and Luther. Or one might say that there is no positive precept given to believe this, but there is a negative one not to dissent from it.

**222.** Arg. 3. The truth of the Pontificate and the Vicariate of Christ in an elected Pope depends on many contingent factors: therefore, etc. The antecedent is proven thus: It could happen that the elected person is a woman, is not baptized, is a heretic, etc., but all these conditions, or any one of them, renders the election null; therefore, etc. I respond by denying the antecedent, and to its proof, I deny the major premise. For it pertains to God’s providence that the electors are not deceived, nor does the Church proceed to the

reception and public adoration of one who is not truly Pope, since the Church, according to the Apostle, *Is the pillar and foundation of truth*: and according to Christ's testimony, *The gates of hell shall not prevail against it*, and He promises to be with it *until the consummation of the age*. More on this below, in the disputation on the Formal Object, where we address the Circles alleged against us by Heretics, who assert that we believe the Church because of Scripture, and Scripture because of the Church.

**223.** You will insist: It is not a matter of Faith that the elected Pontiff is baptized; yet without this circumstance, he is not a true Pontiff: therefore. The major premise is proven thus: Before the election it was not a matter of Faith that he was baptized, since this depends on the intention of the Minister, etc. But the election does not confer upon him the state of being baptized if he was not so before: therefore. I respond by denying the major premise: For once a Canonical election has occurred, along with the Church's recognition, it becomes a matter of Faith what previously was not; indeed, it can also be said that the Canonical election, which before the peaceful acceptance of the Church was only morally certain, becomes, after this peaceful acceptance, a Canonical election that is certain by Faith, since it pertains to God's providence that the universal Church does not err. For this reason, it is now a matter of Faith that the election by the Cardinals was Canonical, that the Elected is baptized, that he is not a woman, etc. Here one typically refutes the fabulous story invented and nurtured by heretics, about a woman elected as Pontiff who gave birth in the amphitheater called *Roman Callistus*. But this fable seems more worthy of contempt than of further refutation.

**224.** Arg. 4. That Innocent XII is the true Pope is derived from theological reasoning, namely from one premise of Faith and another of natural reasoning; but such an assent is purely theological and not of divine Faith, otherwise every theological conclusion would be of Faith: Therefore, etc. The major premise is supported thus. For it is founded on that familiar syllogism: *Every person rightly elected as Bishop of Rome is the true Pope; but Innocent XII has been rightly elected as Bishop of Rome: therefore Innocent XII is the true Pope*; but this reasoning is purely theological: therefore I respond by distinguishing the major premise. It is derived from theological reasoning that necessarily infers, I concede; contingently or probably inferring, I deny. Similarly I distinguish the minor premise: it is purely theological when it is clearly recognized that the Conclusion is necessarily deduced from a principle of Faith, I deny; when it is otherwise less clearly recognized, let it pass.

**225.** You will insist: Therefore a Theologian clearly recognizing that the Conclusion is deduced necessarily from a principle of Faith is bound to believe it as a matter of Faith: therefore no merely theological conclusion would exist. I respond by conceding the first consequence and denying the second, since there are few Theologians, or perhaps none, who are completely certain that they cannot be deceived in that necessary deduction. On this matter, see above.

**226.** You may reply: In whatever way one is a Theologian, natural cognition and natural inferential power contribute to the conclusion drawn: therefore, the assent cannot be of Faith, nor supernatural. I respond by distinguishing the antecedent. Natural cognition

contributes as apprehension of terms, I concede; as a motive for assenting, I deny. Similarly, I distinguish the other part: Natural inferential power contributes to forming the subject about which the revealed predicate is stated, I concede; it contributes as a motive for assent, I deny. Even for this proposition of Faith: *Heaven is created*, the natural cognition of Heaven contributes; however, it contributes to designating Heaven as the subject about which the revealed predicate is stated, namely, being created. Therefore, natural cognition and the assent of Faith have different objects, although natural cognition intervenes in the assent of Faith.

**227.** To that objection regarding compulsive force (which appears more difficult, since it seems to have influence on assent to the conclusion), I respond that the minor premise, naturally known, serves no other purpose than to manifest the subject about which the revealed predicate is affirmed. Therefore, in this syllogism: *Every canonically elected Bishop of Rome is the true Pope; but Innocent XII was canonically elected as the Roman Bishop; therefore Innocent XII is the true Pope*: I do not believe on the strength of the minor premise, which is naturally known and only serves to manifest the subject about which the revealed predicate is predicated. Rather, I believe on the strength of the universal major premise, which is revealed, and in which all particular cases are implicitly contained. These particular cases are believed on account of the revealed universal, even though the subject to which that revealed predicate is attributed may otherwise be known naturally.

**228.** Since this is indeed a difficult point, let us use a clearer example. In this syllogism: *Every man is redeemed by Christ; but Peter is a man; therefore Peter is redeemed by Christ*; it is one thing for me to know naturally that Peter is a man, and another thing for me to know that Peter is redeemed by Christ. This second proposition I believe by virtue of the revealed major premise, and the minor premise only serves for the recognition of Peter, who is contained in the major premise by reason of his humanity. Thus, I naturally know that Peter is a man, and I supernaturally believe that he is redeemed—not by virtue of inference, nor by the motive of natural knowledge, but by the supernatural motive of the revealed major premise; namely, because it has been revealed that every man is redeemed. Similarly, therefore, it is one thing for me to know naturally that Innocent XII has been canonically elected as Bishop of Rome, and another thing for me to believe that Innocent XII is the true Pope, etc.

**229.** Argument 5. One who denies that an elected Pontiff is the true Pope would not be a Heretic: therefore. The antecedent is proven thus: In no schism have those denying that an elected Pontiff is the true Pope been regarded as heretics: therefore. *This is confirmed.* One who denies a theological conclusion evidently deduced by himself or by another is not called a heretic, but erroneous: therefore. I respond to the argument by distinguishing the antecedent. If someone were to deny it by asserting that the Pope was not canonically elected, I concede; if someone were to deny it while simultaneously conceding that he was canonically elected as Bishop of Rome and yet is not the true Pope, I deny; because in this way he would oppose the Council of Constance and the Decree of Martin V cited above. For there is a distinction between being a heretic and being schismatic. Those who divide into factions are called schismatics; either because the electors elected two persons, or

because they object that the election was not canonical, and in this nothing is denied against the Faith. But indeed, one who holds that the election was canonical, and simultaneously denies that such an elected person is the true Pope and Vicar of Christ, is undoubtedly a Heretic; because the Council of Florence has already defined that the Roman Pontiff canonically elected succeeds to the entire power of Saint Peter. Thus Laurea explains more fully.

**230.** To the Confirmation, I respond by distinguishing the antecedent. If the conclusion is necessarily and evidently deduced, one would not be a heretic in the external forum, I concede; since it has not been proposed by the Church as a matter of Faith; One would not be a heretic in the internal forum, I deny; since, given the aforementioned evidence from all perspectives, one is bound to believe, as we have proven above.

**231.** Argument 6. If it were necessary to believe by Faith that Innocent XII is the true Pope, it would be so because otherwise those things which he defines could not be matters of Faith; but this is false: therefore, etc. The minor premise is proven thus: Although Parents, or Preachers, or Parish Priests who instruct us in matters of Faith are not infallible in their statements, we can exercise acts of Faith regarding those mysteries which they teach us: therefore, although it might not be a matter of Faith that Innocent XII is the true Pope, we would be able to exercise acts of Faith regarding those things which he defines. I respond by denying the major premise. For this is not the most compelling reason, although it was presented by us in proving our conclusion. For even if it were not a matter of Faith that Innocent XII is the true Pope, if nevertheless this were morally certain, we would be bound to believe everything defined by him, since these would be sufficiently proposed, as Oviedo holds in controversy 4, point 7, number 87. If perhaps you ask why we proved our Conclusion with this ineffective reasoning, I respond that it is not necessary that all reasons be effective, nor should they be omitted on this account, according to the saying: *Individual arguments which do not avail separately may help when taken together.* Moreover, if with moral certainty that Innocent XII is the true Pope, it stands that the mysteries defined by him are believable by divine Faith, how much more will they be so when we profess by divine Faith that he is the true Pontiff, successor of Peter, and Vicar of Jesus Christ.

**232.** Arg. 7. This proposition: *Innocent XII is the true Pope*, has not been defined by any Council, nor confirmed by a Pontiff, nor sufficiently proposed to the faithful as something to be believed by Faith: therefore [it is not a matter of faith]. I prove the antecedent. For immediately after the election of a Pope, there is no Ecumenical Council convened in the Church, nor is there another Pontiff besides himself: therefore [the proposition cannot be confirmed by either source]. I respond by distinguishing the antecedent. It has not been confirmed by a proper and rigorous Council through an express definition, I concede; it has not been defined by a similitudinary Council and through the fact itself, I deny. For the Conclave of electing Cardinals, although not rigorously a Council for defining matters of Faith, nevertheless when thus assembled constitutes a kind of Council by the authority of Papal Constitutions, just as when they gather to elect a true Pope in cases of schism, with both elected candidates renouncing [their claims], and in that case it is not called by the

Pope, and the one thus elected is proposed to the entire Church by the Electors themselves; apart from the fact that the elected Pope himself presents himself to the Universal Church as the Vicar of Christ.

**233.** You will insist: This proposition of the Cardinals is not infallible; therefore... Proof of the antecedent: Infallibility is not granted to the Cardinals, but to the Pope; therefore... I respond by distinguishing the antecedent: The proposition of the Cardinals alone is not infallible, let this pass [I grant this]; and it could be denied in the present case, because God assists them at that time; but I deny that the proposition of the Cardinals together with the acceptance of the Pontiff, who conducts himself as Pope, is not infallible; for the very acceptance, enthronement, and actions as Pope by the elected Pontiff constitute sufficient proposition for the faithful to believe.

**234.** You will reply: In a schismatic election of two, each one accepts and conducts himself as Pope, and is proposed and proclaimed by a faction of Cardinals; but the Faithful are not bound to believe that either of them is the true Pope: therefore neither the proposition of the Cardinals nor the acceptance of the Pope constitutes a sufficient proposition. I respond by distinguishing the consequent: A schismatic and divided proposition concerning the judgment of a Canonical election, I concede; a conforming proposition, or one sufficiently approved concerning a Canonical election, I deny: since there exists a true proposition, and the faithful are bound to believe, when the Church is certified of the Canonical election, and our solution is understood to refer to one certainly elected, who conducts himself as the true Pope.

**235.** Argument 8. If this particular proposition, *Innocent XII is the true Pope*, were a matter of Faith, it would be so especially because this universal proposition is a matter of Faith: *Everyone canonically elected as Bishop of Rome is the true Pope*; but a universal proposition can be a matter of Faith without the particular proposition thereby being a matter of Faith: therefore. The minor is proved. This universal proposition is a matter of Faith: *Whatever God reveals is true*; but from this universal matter of Faith, this particular proposition is not a matter of Faith: *The Mystery of the Incarnation is true*: therefore. The minor is proved. For if the Mystery of the Incarnation were not particularly revealed, that common revelation would not suffice for us to believe it: therefore. Response: I distinguish the minor. A universal proposition can be a matter of Faith without a particular proposition being a matter of Faith if the containment of the latter in the former is unknown, I concede; if the particular proposition is known with sufficient certainty to be contained under the universal, I deny.

**236.** You will insist: Without a particular revelation of the Incarnation, one cannot know that this particular proposition, *“The Mystery of the Incarnation is true”*, is contained under that general one: *“Whatever God reveals is true”*. Therefore, without a particular revelation of the Papacy of Innocent XII, we cannot know that this particular proposition: *“Innocent XII is the true Pope”* is contained under that universal one: *“Everyone canonically elected as Bishop of Rome is the true Pope.”* I respond by denying the consequence and the parity; For the condition explaining the containment of this particular proposition: *“Innocent XII is*



the Supreme Pontiff” under that common one, “Everyone canonically elected as Bishop of Rome is the Supreme Pontiff,” is the canonical election, which we can know naturally and without revelation. However, the condition explaining the containment of that particular proposition, “The Mystery of the Incarnation is true,” under that common one, “Whatever God reveals is true,” is God’s revelation, from which it follows that without revelation we cannot know that this particular is contained under the universal. This doctrine is made manifest by these two syllogisms: “Everyone canonically elected as Bishop of Rome is the true Pope; but Innocent XII is canonically elected as Bishop of Rome; therefore, Innocent XII is the true Pope.” Note how the canonical election explains that the particular is contained under the common, and the canonical election is naturally knowable. Let us proceed to the other: “Whatever God reveals is true; but God reveals the Mystery of the Incarnation; therefore, the Mystery of the Incarnation is true.” Note how the particular divine revelation explains that the particular proposition is contained under the common one; the disparity between the two is therefore quite clear.

**237.** Argument 9. It is merely probable that this proposition is a matter of Faith: “Innocent XII is the true Pope.” Therefore, there is only a probable revelation concerning it; but with merely probable revelation, an assent of divine Faith cannot stand, according to Innocent XI’s condemned proposition, number 21. Therefore, etc. The antecedent is proven thus: For many Catholic Authors hold the contrary opinion; therefore, it is merely probable that this proposition is a matter of Faith. I respond by distinguishing the antecedent: It is merely probable that Innocent XII is the true Pope before the peaceful acceptance of the Church, let this pass; after such acceptance, I deny it. For after the peaceful acceptance of the Church, as I said above, even the fact that his election was Canonical becomes a matter of Faith, as does the fact that the Elected is baptized, and many other things which before were not matters of Faith; since it pertains to divine providence that the universal Church does not err, and all this is implicitly revealed in that promise of Christ: “And I am with you until the end of the age”; and in this one: “Upon this Rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.” Moreover, the said particular proposition is immediately revealed in that universal one: “Everyone Canonically elected as Bishop of Rome is the true Pope,” since the truth of a universal proposition is the same truth as that of its particulars. Therefore, given the peaceful acceptance of the universal Church, it is no longer merely probable that such a proposition is a matter of Faith. Nor do the Catholic Authors mentioned in the argument dissent from this; rather, they are to be understood as speaking about a Pope elected before the aforementioned peaceful acceptance of the universal Church, at which point even those conditions that were not previously matters of Faith are elevated to the level of Faith.

**238.** To some Reverend Fathers it seems harsh to assert that, after the peaceful acceptance of the universal Church, it is elevated to the certainty of divine Faith that the elected Pontiff, universally received and venerated, is not a woman, is baptized; that the Minister of Baptism had the intention, etc. Indeed, they shudder at the thought that so many significant matters would be elevated to the level of Faith. However, apart from the fact that this very position is defended by the most grave Theologians (among them Arriaga, Castropalao, Oxea, and from our own, Perez Lopez, cited), they are constrained by reason;

for when someone affirms something about a subject, they at least implicitly affirm all those things which on the part of the subject are inevitably connected as presuppositions; but Innocent XII could not be the true Pontiff if he were not baptized, if he were a woman, etc. Therefore, while we believe with divine Faith that Innocent XII is the true Pope, we profess with the same certainty of Faith that he is not a woman, that he is baptized, etc., without which conditions he could not be the true Pope.

**239.** Others, however, to avoid elevating all the aforementioned conditions to the sphere of Faith, reduce that universal proposition to a conditional one: “Every canonically elected [person], etc.,” that is, “Every man, if he is legitimately elected as Bishop of Rome, is the Supreme Pontiff.” Since, they argue, a conditional proposition neither affirms nor denies the condition, therefore the aforementioned conditions of canonical election, true baptism, etc., are not elevated to the certainty of divine Faith, but rather left to be investigated from other sources. However, this method of reasoning already seems precluded by the foregoing arguments; first, because that revealed universal statement, “Every canonically elected Bishop of Rome, etc.,” appears to be absolute; and secondly, because the Universal Church does not conditionally recognize Innocent XII as the true Pope; nor is this proposition: “Innocent XII is the true Pontiff,” said to be conditionally of Faith after the recognition of the Universal Church—that is, under the condition that he is canonically elected, baptized, etc.—but it is said to be absolutely of Faith. Therefore, in him the condition is fulfilled. The consequence is proven thus: In the same manner by which a predicate is affirmed of a subject, the capacity of the subject for that predicate is affirmed; but after the peaceful acceptance by the Universal Church, it is absolutely predicated of Innocent XII that he is the true Pontiff, and this is now absolutely of Faith. Therefore, it is also absolutely of Faith that Innocent XII is a subject capable of true Pontificate. It should be noted, however, that there are two elections of the Supreme Pontiff: one by the Cardinals, and another through peaceful acceptance and recognition by the Universal Church. In this second election lies the sought-after firmness, by virtue of which the aforementioned conditions are elevated to the level of Faith.