

Summa apologetica de Ecclesia Catholica ad mentem S. Thomae Aquinatis, Pars I (*Apologetic Summary of the Catholic Church According to the Mind of St. Thomas Aquinas, Part I*)

by Vincens Groot, 1890

[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 3, 2025.
- Version: 1.0
- Selection pages: 330–335

Quaestio IX, Art. VI

Latin

Qua fide veritates ab ecclesia propositae credi debeant.

I. Multiplex fides. Fides est 1° divina; 2° divina et catholica; 3° ecclesiastica; 4° humana.

1° *Fides divina* seu *theologica* dicitur assensus, qui revelatione divina immediate innititur; hujusmodi autem fidei objectum sunt veritates revelatae, propter veritatem Dei revelantis creditae.

2° *Fides divina et catholica*, seu simpliciter *fides catholica*, refertur ad veritates revelatas, quae in doctrina ecclesiae manifestantur; quod autem veritates revelatae per ecclesiam manifestentur, id per accidens, ex parte scilicet nostri, fidei convenit; ex quo apparet, inter fidem divinam et fidem catholicam essentialiter nihil differre.

3° *Fides ecclesiastica* innititur assistentia Spiritus sancti, qua Christi ecclesia in custodiendo fidei deposito ab errore quocumque immunis servatur; unde dubitari non potest, eam firmissimam esse ac certissimam.

English

With what faith the truths proposed by the Church must be believed.

I. Multiple types of faith. Faith is 1° divine; 2° divine and catholic; 3° ecclesiastical; 4° human.

1° *Divine faith* or *theological faith* refers to the assent which rests immediately upon divine revelation; the object of this kind of faith is revealed truths, believed on account of the truthfulness of God who reveals them.

2° Faith that is *divine and catholic*, or simply *catholic faith*, refers to revealed truths which are manifested in the doctrine of the Church; however, that revealed truths are manifested through the Church is accidental to faith, namely on our part; from which it appears that between divine faith and catholic faith there is essentially no difference.

3° *Ecclesiastical faith* rests upon the assistance of the Holy Spirit, by which the Church of Christ is preserved immune from any error in guarding the deposit of faith; hence it cannot be doubted that it is most firm and most certain.

4° *Fides humana* hominum auctoritate innititur. — Quantum ad fidem *mediate et indirecte divinam*, qua theologi non pauci conclusiones theologicas, proprie dictas, credendas esse sentiunt, haec a fide ecclesiastica non differre videtur.

II. Veritatum diversitas. 1° Ad veritates credendas inprimis referuntur *fidei articuli*. Dicuntur autem *articuli* credibilia primaria, quae coaptationem specialem ad aliqua alia credibilia important, ita ut cetera in illis aliquo modo contineantur. Patet autem, huiusmodi credibilia non dividi ex parte objecti *quo* et rationis formalis fidei, quia haec unica est, nempe veritas divina revelans; sed ex parte objecti *quod*, id est, mysteriorum, quae creduntur. In Symbolo alii duodecim, alii quatuordecim articulos distinxerunt. Cf. S. Thom. II. II. quaest. I. art. 6. et 8.; *Comp. theol.* cap. CCXLVI.

2° *Dogmata* sunt illae veritates, quae in verbo Dei scripto vel tradito continentur, et ab ecclesia sive solemnii iudicio sive ordinario et universali magisterio tanquam divinitus revelata proponuntur. Dogmata, solemnii ecclesiae iudicio proposita, dogmata *definita*, vel etiam simpliciter fidei dogmata, dicuntur; dogmata, ordinario et universali magisterio, nulla tamen solemnii definitione, proposita, dogmata *catholica*, aut *revelata* aut veritates *ad fidem spectantes* appellantur.

3° *Conclusiones theologicae formaliter* consideratae, id est, praecise ut e praemissis deductae, fidei *divinae* obiectum dici nunquam possunt. At vero praecise ut contentae seu *materialiter*, ut ajunt, partim propositiones de fide, ut supra, partim proprium veritatum genus habentur. *Propositiones de fide* habentur conclusiones illae, sensu latiori theologicae nuncupatae, quae ratione significationis, hoc est, ut pars in toto, vel ut singulare in universali, vel ut implicitum in explicito, in praemissis continentur. Nimirum in iis concludendis syllogismo tantum *explicativo* utimur.

4° *Human faith* rests upon the authority of men. — As for faith that is *mediately and indirectly divine*, by which not a few theologians maintain that theological conclusions, properly so called, are to be believed, this does not seem to differ from ecclesiastical faith.

II. Diversity of Truths. 1° Among the truths to be believed, *articles of faith* are foremost. Those beliefs are called *articles* which are primary credible truths that import a special connection to other credible truths, such that the rest are in some way contained within them. It is evident, however, that such credible truths are not divided with respect to the object *by which* and the formal reason of faith, because this is unique, namely the divine truth revealing; but with respect to the object *which*, that is, the mysteries that are believed. In the Creed, some have distinguished twelve articles, others fourteen. Cf. St. Thomas II. II. question I. articles 6. and 8.; *Theological Compendium* chapter CCXLVI.

2° *Dogmas* are those truths which are contained in the written or transmitted word of God, and are proposed by the Church either by solemn judgment or by ordinary and universal magisterium as divinely revealed. Dogmas proposed by the solemn judgment of the Church are called *defined* dogmas, or simply dogmas of faith; dogmas proposed by the ordinary and universal magisterium, without any solemn definition, are called *catholic* dogmas, or *revealed* dogmas, or truths *pertaining to faith*.

3° *Theological conclusions formally* considered, that is, precisely as deduced from premises, can never be called the object of *divine* faith. But precisely as contained or *materially*, as they say, they are held partly as propositions of faith, as above, and partly as their own genre of truths. Those conclusions which, in a broader sense, are called theological are held as *propositions of faith* when, by reason of their signification, they are contained in the premises as a part in the whole, or as the particular in the universal, or as the implicit in the explicit. Indeed, in drawing these conclusions, we use only an *explicative* syllogism.

Conclusiones theologicae sensu strictiori intellectae habentur, quae syllogismo *deductivo* percipiuntur, et in revelatis non immediate, sed ratione connexionis naturalis, id est, vel ut proprietas in essentia, vel ut effectus in causa continentur. Cf. quaest. VIII, art. 6.

4° Veritates, quarum contradictorium ab ecclesia infra notam haereseos, v. g. ut temerarium, proscriptum est.

5° Veritates, quae communi et constanti catholicorum consensu tam certae habentur, ut opiniones adversae, non haereseos quidem, at alia tamen censura dignae habeantur.

Conclusiones theologicae, strictius dictae, et veritates, quas sub n. 4 et 5 recensuimus, etiam *veritates theologice certae* nuncupantur. — Cf. Conc. Vat. sess. III. cap. III.; Gotti, *Theol. schol.* t. I. tract. I. q. I.

III. De veritatibus, quae fide divina et catholica credi debent. Hujusmodi fide credi debent 1° fidei articuli; 2° dogmata, quae ab ecclesia sive solemnii iudicio sive ordinario et universali magisterio tanquam divinitus revelata proponuntur; 3° conclusiones theologicae, quae *sensu latiori* eo nomine appellantur. Namque omnes id genus veritates divina auctoritate *immediate* nituntur.

Quaeres I. Utrum fide divina credenda sit conclusio, quae ex maiori quidem *universali* revelata ut *particularis* deducitur, sed mediante minori non revelata, quae *non sit evidenter certa* vel *factum contingens*.

Resp. Si minor positive et *evidenter certa non sit*, conclusio de fide dici nequit. Quod ad *facta contingentia* attinet, conclusio de fide non habetur, nisi facti certitudo omne dubium prorsus excludat. Proinde haec propositio: *haec hostia adoranda est*, fide divina non creditur; quamvis enim major revelata sit: *omnis hostia rite consecrata est adoranda*, minor tamen: *haec numero hostia*

Theological conclusions understood in the stricter sense are those which are perceived through a *deductive* syllogism, and are contained in revealed truths not immediately, but by reason of natural connection, that is, either as a property in an essence, or as an effect in a cause. Cf. question VIII, article 6.

4° Truths, the contradiction of which has been proscribed by the Church under a censure less than heresy, e.g., as temerarious.

5° Truths which, by the common and constant consensus of Catholics, are held to be so certain that contrary opinions, while not deserving the censure of heresy, are nevertheless worthy of some other censure.

Theological conclusions, strictly so called, and the truths which we have enumerated under numbers 4 and 5, are also called *theologically certain truths*. — Cf. Vatican Council, session III, chapter III; Gotti, *Theologia scholastica*, tome I, treatise I, question I.

III. On truths which must be believed with divine and Catholic faith. With this kind of faith must be believed: 1° the articles of faith; 2° dogmas which are proposed by the Church, whether by solemn judgment or by ordinary and universal magisterium, as divinely revealed; 3° theological conclusions which are called by that name in a *broadier sense*. For all truths of this kind rest *immediately* on divine authority.

You may ask I. Whether a conclusion must be believed with divine faith which is deduced from a *universal* revealed major premise as a *particular* [conclusion], but by means of a minor premise that is not revealed, which is either *not evidently certain* or contains a *contingent fact*.

Response. If the minor premise is not positively and *evidently certain*, the conclusion cannot be said to be of faith. As for *contingent facts*, the conclusion is not held to be of faith unless the certainty of the fact absolutely excludes all doubt. Therefore this proposition: *this host is to be adored*, is not believed by divine faith; for although the major premise is revealed: *every properly consecrated host is to be adored*, the

rite consecrata est, moraliter tantum vera habetur.

Veruntamen factum contingens quandoque tam certum est, ut quodvis dubium evidenter excludatur. Quo in casu conclusio, ut *pars* certa majoris, esse de fide videtur. Sic illa propositio: *Leo XIII. Romanus Pontifex rite electus est*, accedente ecclesiae acceptatione, qua etiam electio illegitima rata fit, in dubium revocari non potest. Quamobrem Salmanticenses, Billuart et alii censent, esse probabilius de fide conclusionem, quae ex hujusmodi ratiocinatione sequitur: *Omnis homo rite electus in successorem Petri est Summus ecclesiae Pontifex. Atqui Leo XIII. est rite in successorem Petri electus. Ergo est Summus ecclesiae Pontifex.*

Similiter auctores, quos commemoravimus, concilii oecumenici, puta Tridentini, celebrationem legitimam manifeste certam esse docent. Nam sic ratiocinantur: *Quodlibet concilium, tanquam oecumenicum ab ecclesia acceptatum, est regula fidei. Atqui concilium Tridentinum ab ecclesia oecumenicum habetur. Ergo est regula fidei. Quam conclusionem de fide esse affirmant.* Cf. Salm. *De fide* disp. IV. dub. II. §. 1—3. Billuart, *De reg. fidei*, diss. IV. art. 9. Bannez tamen cum aliis istas conclusiones ad fidem pertinere negat; nihilominus “valde temerarium et scandalosum” esse non dubitat, “si postquam Ecclesia acceptavit aliquem ut Summum Pontificem, negaret aliquis illum esse Summum Pontificem verum.” In II. II. quaest. I. art. 10. dub. 2.

Quaeres II. Utrum facta connexa cum jure doctrinae, seu facta dogmatica, eadem ac dogmata fide credi debeant.

Resp. Facta dogmatica fide ecclesiastica credi debent; namque haec facta non immediate ob revelationem divinam credi videntur, sed ob eam infallibilitatem, quae ecclesiam in revelatis custodiendis et exponendis perpetuo comitatur.

minor premise: *this particular host is properly consecrated*, is held to be only morally certain.

Nevertheless, a contingent fact is sometimes so certain that it manifestly excludes any doubt whatsoever. In which case the conclusion, as a certain *part* of the major premise, seems to be a matter of faith. Thus that proposition: *Leo XIII was duly elected as Roman Pontiff*, with the Church's acceptance following—by which even an illegitimate election becomes valid—cannot be called into question. Therefore the Salamancan theologians, Billuart, and others consider it more probable that a conclusion is a matter of faith when it follows from reasoning of this kind: *Every man duly elected as successor of Peter is the Supreme Pontiff of the Church. But Leo XIII was duly elected as successor of Peter. Therefore he is the Supreme Pontiff of the Church.*

Similarly, the authors whom we have mentioned teach that the legitimate celebration of an ecumenical council, for instance the Council of Trent, is manifestly certain. For they reason thus: *Any council, accepted by the Church as ecumenical, is a rule of faith. But the Council of Trent is held by the Church to be ecumenical. Therefore it is a rule of faith. This conclusion, they affirm, is a matter of faith.* Cf. Salmanticenses, *De fide* disp. IV. dub. II. §. 1—3. Billuart, *De reg. fidei*, diss. IV. art. 9. Bannez, however, along with others, denies that these conclusions pertain to faith; nevertheless he does not hesitate to declare that “it would be highly rash and scandalous if, after the Church has accepted someone as Supreme Pontiff, anyone were to deny that he is the true Supreme Pontiff.” In II. II. quaest. I. art. 10. dub. 2.

Question II. Whether facts connected with doctrinal law, or dogmatic facts, ought to be believed with the same faith as dogmas.

Response: Dogmatic facts must be believed with ecclesiastical faith; for these facts do not seem to be believed immediately on account of divine revelation, but rather because of that infallibility which perpetually accompanies the Church in guarding and expounding revealed truths.

Quaeres III. Utrum revelationes privatae credendae sint fide divina.

Resp. Revelationes privadas, si evidentia adsint credibilitatis motiva, fide divina, non vero catholica credendas esse, complures auctores confirmant; alii vero negant, ut Salmanticenses, De fide diss. I. dub. IV. §. 1. 2. *Fide divina*; namque objectum fidei divinae est prima veritas revelans. At hujusmodi objectum proponitur, si Deus, peculiari influxu supplens propositionem ecclesiae suae, veritatem hominibus privatim revelat. Ergo revelationes privatae fide divina credendae sunt. — *Non fide catholica*; quia objectum fidei catholicae est veritas prima, *per doctrinam ecclesiae* manifestata. S. Thomas ait: “Singulis temporibus non defuerunt aliqui prophetiae spiritum habentes, non quidem ad *novam doctrinam fidei* depromendam, sed ad humanorum actuum directionem.” II. II. quaest. CLXXIV. art. 6. ad 3.

IV. De veritatibus, quae fide ecclesiastica credi debent. 1° Conclusiones theologicae sensu strictiori appellatae; 2° judicia ecclesiae de propositionibus, infra notam haeresos damnatis; 3° cetera, ni fallor, doctrinae capita, quae communi et constanti catholicorum consensu ut theologice certa retinentur, fide ecclesiastica credenda sunt, atque catholicos omnes eisdem ex conscientia sese subjicere opus est. Fide autem *divina* credi non putantur, quia ipsis non immediate ob revelationem divinam assentimur, sed ob assistentiam S. Spiritus, quae efficit, ut ecclesia in hoc etiam veritatum genere sit procul ab errore.

Quaeres I. Utrum haereticae dici possint illae propositiones, quae, extra materiam credendorum de fide divina, ecclesiae doctrinis refragentur.

Resp. Hoc loco tria statuamus. a) Ad fidem “aliquid pertinet dupliciter: uno modo directe et principaliter, sicut articuli fidei; alio modo indirecte et secundario, sicut ea

Question III. Whether private revelations ought to be believed with divine faith.

Response: Many authorities confirm that private revelations, if evident motives of credibility are present, ought to be believed with divine faith, though not with catholic faith, as the Salmanticenses [theologians of Salamanca] maintain in “On Faith,” dissertation I, doubt IV, §. 1. 2. *With divine faith*; because the object of divine faith is the First Truth revealing. But such an object is proposed when God, by a special influence supplying the proposition of His Church, privately reveals truth to individuals. Therefore private revelations ought to be believed with divine faith. — *Not with catholic faith*; because the object of catholic faith is the First Truth manifested *through the teaching of the Church*. St. Thomas says: “In each age, there have never been lacking some possessing the spirit of prophecy, not indeed for the purpose of *setting forth new doctrine of faith*, but for the direction of human acts.” Summa Theologica II-II, question CLXXIV, article 6, reply to objection 3.

IV. On the truths which must be believed with ecclesiastical faith. 1° Theological conclusions in the stricter sense; 2° judgments of the Church concerning propositions condemned below the note of heresy; 3° other points of doctrine which, if I am not mistaken, are held by the common and constant consensus of Catholics as theologically certain, must be believed with ecclesiastical faith, and all Catholics are bound in conscience to submit to them. They are not, however, thought to be believed with *divine* faith, because we do not assent to them immediately on account of divine revelation, but on account of the assistance of the Holy Spirit, which ensures that the Church remains far from error even in this class of truths.

Query I. Whether those propositions which, outside the matter of what must be believed with divine faith, contradict the teachings of the Church, can be called heretical.

Response. Let us establish three points here. a) Something pertains to faith “in two ways: in one way directly and principally, as the articles of

ex quibus negatis sequitur corruptio alicujus articuli; et circa utraque potest esse haeresis, eo modo quo et fides.” S. Thom. II. II. quaest. XI. art. 2. Itaque in propositionibus, de quibus dictum est, saepenumero haeresis indirecte propugnatur; directe haereticae non sunt.

b) Propositiones illae, quas constat theologicae conclusioni, strictiore sensu acceptae, repugnare, a theologis non simpliciter haeticae, sed erroneae et illative tantum haeticae habentur; atque hoc errorum genus Salmanticenses docent esse “haeresim in secundo gradu, sive mediate, et secundario; quia licet immediate solum opponatur conclusioni theologicae, mediate tamen repugnat assensui fidei.” *De fide*, disp. IX. dub. IV. §. 3. Ab illa tamen praeceptione Canus cum aliis nonnullis discedere videtur inquit: “haec (conclusio vere theologica) veritas catholica ita censebitur, ut si esset per se a Christo revelata; et illi qui adversetur, aequae erit haeticus, ac si sacris literis traditionibusve Apostolorum refragaretur.” *De locis*, lib. XII. cap. VI. praec. 7.

c) Generatim statuendum est, citra errorem negari non posse, *qualificationes* illas, quibus ecclesia propositiones damnabiles, inferiori quadam quam haeresos censura, puta *temeritatis* nota reprobatur, infallibiliter iisdem competere; ex quo plane sequitur, ut haud dubie *temeraria*, etc. haberi debeat propositio, cui ecclesia notam hujusmodi inusserit. Ceterum propositiones sic notatae per se haeticae non censentur; ex gradu tamen censurae et majori minorive connexionione doctrinae proscriptae cum fidei doctrina dignoscendum est, utrum propositio aliqua haeresin propinquius vel remotius attingat. Cf. Joan. Turrecrem. *Summa de ecclesia*, lib. IV. pars II.; Canus, *De locis*, lib. XII. cap. VII—X.; Suarez, *De fide*, disp. XIX.

faith; in another way indirectly and secondarily, such as those things from the denial of which follows the corruption of some article; and concerning both there can be heresy, in the same way as there can be faith.” St. Thomas, II-II, question 11, article 2. Thus, in the propositions of which we have spoken, heresy is often indirectly maintained; directly they are not heretical.

b) Those propositions which are known to be opposed to a theological conclusion, taken in the stricter sense, are considered by theologians not simply as heretical, but as erroneous and inferentially heretical; and the Salmanticenses teach that this type of error is “heresy in the second degree, or mediate and secondarily; because although it is immediately opposed only to a theological conclusion, it nevertheless mediate conflicts with the assent of faith.” *On Faith*, disp. IX, doubt IV, §. 3. From this teaching, however, Cano along with some others seems to depart, stating: “this truth (a truly theological conclusion) will be considered catholic in such a way as if it were revealed by Christ himself; and one who opposes it will be equally heretical as if he were contradicting the Sacred Scriptures or Apostolic traditions.” *On Theological Topics*, book XII, chap. VI, rule 7.

c) Generally, it must be established that it cannot be denied without error that those *qualifications* by which the Church condemns objectionable propositions with a censure lower than that of heresy, such as the note of *temerity*, infallibly apply to these same propositions; from which it plainly follows that a proposition to which the Church has applied such a mark must undoubtedly be considered *temerarious*, etc. However, propositions thus noted are not in themselves considered heretical; yet from the degree of censure and the greater or lesser connection of the condemned doctrine with the doctrine of faith, one must discern whether a particular proposition approaches heresy more closely or more remotely. Cf. Johannes de Turrecremata, *Summa de ecclesia*, book IV, part II; Melchior Canus, *De locis*, book XII, chapters VII-X; Francisco Suárez, *De fide*, disputation XIX.

Quaeres II. In qualem errorem incidat, qui asseruerit, ecclesiam in ferendis censuris, nota haereceos inferioribus, non esse immunem ab errore.

Resp. Inter omnes doctores catholicos convenit, ecclesiae iudicia *dogmatica* et *infallibilia* sese porrigere ad proponendas veritates, cum immediate revelatis *connexas*; necnon ad reprobandos errores, infra haeresim. Quae quidem doctorum sententia veritas est saltem *theologice certa*. Quare Bannez: „Error est — inquit — vel proximum errori, asserere, quod ecclesia in ejusmodi censuris possit errare.” In II. II. quaest. XI. art. 2. Quin imo haec assertio ab aliis haeresis appellatur.

Consequens est, ut dicta ecclesiae iudicia doctrinalia conscientias ligent et internum mentis assensum exigant. Id confirmatur ex concilio Constantiensi, nominatim ex mandato Martini V., de suspectis errorum Wicleff et Hus: „Specialiter literatus interrogetur, utrum *credat*, sententiam sacri Constantiensis concilii super 45 Joannis Wicleff, et Joannis Hus 30 articulis superius descriptis latam, fore *veram* et catholicam: scilicet quod supradicti articuli 45 Joannis Wicleff, et Joannis Hus 30, non sunt catholici, sed quidam ex eis sunt notorie haeretici, quidam *erronei*, alii *temerarii* et *seditiosi*, alii *piarum aurium offensivi*.”

Item in schemate constitutionis dogmaticae de fide catholica concilii Vaticani continebatur canon: „Si quis dixerit, licitum esse, tenere vel tradere opiniones ab ecclesia damnatas, *dummodo ne sint damnatae tamquam haeticae*, a. s.” Canon omissus est; *principium*, in canone assertum, confirmari videtur ex hac relatione ill. domini Pie, episc. Pictaviensis: „censuerunt Patres deputati satius esse, re serius perpensa, si assertio tanti momenti, *tantae necessitatis*, et *expressius et clarius* (quam in capite huic canonis respondente) exprimeretur in altera constitutione, ubi de potestate doctrinali judiciaria ecclesiae directe et ex professo ageretur.” Coll. Lac. t.

Question II. Into what error does one fall who asserts that the Church, in pronouncing censures lower than the note of heresy, is not immune from error?

Response. Among all Catholic doctors there is agreement that the Church's *dogmatic* and *infallible* judgments extend to proposing truths *connected* with immediately revealed matters; and also to condemning errors below the level of heresy. This opinion of the doctors is a truth that is at least *theologically certain*. Wherefore Bañez says: “It is an error—or nearly an error—to assert that the Church can err in such censures.” In II. II. question XI, article 2. Indeed, this assertion is called heresy by others.

It follows that the aforementioned doctrinal judgments of the Church bind consciences and require internal assent of the mind. This is confirmed by the Council of Constance, specifically by the mandate of Martin V concerning those suspected of the errors of Wycliffe and Hus: “In particular, the learned person shall be asked whether he *believes* that the judgment of the sacred Council of Constance regarding the 45 articles of John Wycliffe and the 30 articles of John Hus described above is *true* and catholic: namely, that the aforementioned 45 articles of John Wycliffe and 30 of John Hus are not catholic, but some of them are notoriously heretical, some *erroneous*, others *temerarious* and *seditious*, others *offensive to pious ears*.”

Likewise, in the draft of the dogmatic constitution on the Catholic faith of the Vatican Council, there was contained this canon: “If anyone says that it is permissible to hold or teach opinions condemned by the Church, *provided they are not condemned as heretical*, let him be anathema.” This canon was omitted; however, the *principle* asserted in the canon seems to be confirmed by this report of the illustrious Lord Pie, Bishop of Poitiers: “The delegated Fathers, having more carefully considered the matter, deemed it better that an assertion of such importance and *such necessity* should be expressed *more explicitly and clearly* (than in the chapter corresponding to this canon) in another constitution, where the judicial teaching

VII. c. 1632. et 208. Cf. Syll. prop. 22. et encycl. *Quanta cura*.

Quaeres III. Utrum fieri possit, ut falsa sit aliqua doctrina, quae ab ecclesia tanquam probabilior proponitur.

Resp. Ex eo quod propositio sit probabilior, per se non efficitur, eam esse veram. Nec tamen absurde Lugo docet, „posse pie credi, quod licet circa hoc nulla exstet divina promissio, Deus tamen non permittet ab ecclesia doctrinam aliquam ut probabiliorem proponi, quae re ipsa falsa sit, . . . quia daret occasionem magnam fidelibus adhaerendi magis et magis doctrinae falsae.” *De fide*, disp. XX. n. 129.

authority of the Church would be treated directly and thoroughly.” *Collectio Lacensis*, Vol. VII, col. 1632 and 208. Cf. *Syllabus of Errors*, proposition 22, and the encyclical *Quanta cura*.

Inquiry III. Whether it can happen that a doctrine which is proposed by the Church as more probable could be false.

Response. From the fact that a proposition is more probable, it does not in itself follow that it is true. Nevertheless, Lugo does not teach absurdly when he says, “it can be piously believed that, although there exists no divine promise concerning this, God nevertheless will not permit any doctrine to be proposed by the Church as more probable which is in reality false, . . . because it would give the faithful great occasion to adhere more and more to false doctrine.” *On Faith*, disputation XX, n. 129.