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## Quaestio XIV - De Romano Pontifice, Thesis XXIX, §3

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *Latin* |  | *English* |
| Sed quidquid demum de possibilitate vel impossibilitate praefatae hypothesis adhuc sentias, id saltem veluti penitus inconcussum et extra omnem dubitationem positum firmiter tenendum est: adhaesionem universalis Ecclesiae fore semper ex se sola infallibile signum legitimitatis personae Pontificis, adeoque et exsistentiae omnium conditionum quae ad legitimitatem ipsam sunt requisitae. Neque huius rei a longe repetenda ratio. Immediate enim sumitur ex infallibili Christi promissione atque providentia: *Portae inferi non praevalebunt adversus eam*, et iterum: *Ecce ego vobiscum sum omnibus diebus*. Idem namque foret, Ecclesiam adhaerere pontifici falso, ac si adhaereret falsae fidei regulae, cum Papa sit regula vivens quam Ecclesia in credendo sequi debet et semper de facto sequitur, uti ex dicendis in posterum luculentius adhuc apparebit. Equidem permittere potest Deus ut aliquando vacatio sedis diutius protrahatur. Permittere quoque potest ut de legitimitate unius vel alterius electi exoriatur dubium. Permittere autem non potest ut Ecclesia tota eum admittat pontificem qui verus et legitimus non sit. Ex quo igitur receptus est, et Ecclesiae coniunctus ut corpori caput, non est amplius movenda quaestio de possibili vitio electionis vel defectu cuiuscumque conditionis ad legitimitatem necessariae, quia praedicta Ecclesiae adhaesio omne vitium electionis radicitus sanat, et exsistentiam omnium requisitarum conditionum infallibiliter ostendit. Et hoc sit obiter dictum contra eos qui certa tentamina schismatica tempore Alexandri VI facta hoc nomine cohonestare volunt, quod ab eo fiebant qui de haereticitate Alexandri certissimas probationes in Concilio generali revelandas habere se dictitabat. At vero, ut aliae nunc rationes omittantur quibus opinio ista facile posset confutari, haec una sufficit: Constat nempe quod tempore quo Savonarola suas ad principes litteras scribebat, tota christianitas Alexandro adhaerebat et obediebat tanquam vero pontifici. Ergo eo ipso, Alexander non erat pontifex falsus, sed legitimus. Ergo non erat haereticus, ea saltem haereticitate quae tollendo rationem membri Ecclesiae, pontificia potestate vel qualibet alia ordinaria iurisdictione ex natura rei consequenter privat. |  | But whatever you may still think about the possibility or impossibility of the aforementioned hypothesis, this at least must be firmly held as entirely unshaken and placed beyond all doubt: that the adherence of the universal Church will always be, by itself alone, an infallible sign of the legitimacy of the person of the Pontiff, and consequently of the existence of all conditions that are requisite for legitimacy itself. Nor must the reason for this be sought from afar. For it is derived immediately from Christ’s infallible promise and providence: *The gates of hell shall not prevail against it*, and again: *Behold, I am with you all days*. Indeed, it would be the same for the Church to adhere to a false pontiff as if she adhered to a false rule of faith, since the Pope is the living rule whom the Church must follow in believing and always in fact does follow, as will appear even more clearly from what will be said in the future. Certainly, God can permit that sometimes the vacancy of the See be protracted for a longer time. He can also permit that doubt may arise concerning the legitimacy of one or another elect. But He cannot permit the whole Church to recognize as pontiff one who is not truly and legitimately such. Therefore, once he has been accepted and joined to the Church as the head to the body, the question of a possible defect in the election or the absence of any condition necessary for legitimacy should no longer be raised, because the aforementioned adherence of the Church radically heals every defect of the election, and infallibly demonstrates the existence of all required conditions. And let this be said in passing against those who wish to justify certain schismatic attempts made during the time of Alexander VI on the grounds that they were made by one who claimed to possess most certain proofs of Alexander’s heresy, which were to be revealed in a general Council. But indeed, to omit now other reasons by which that opinion could easily be refuted, this one suffices: It is evident that at the time when Savonarola was writing his letters to princes, the whole of Christendom was adhering to and obeying Alexander as the true pontiff. Therefore, by that very fact, Alexander was not a false pontiff, but legitimate. Therefore he was not a heretic, at least not with that heresy which, by removing the status of being a member of the Church, consequently deprives one of pontifical power or any other ordinary jurisdiction by the very nature of things. |
| Hactenus de iis quae spectant perpetuitatem primatus Petri in Romanis Pontificibus. Nunc *de vi et ratione primatus* agendum est. |  | Thus far concerning those matters which pertain to the perpetuity of Peter’s primacy in the Roman Pontiffs. Now we must treat *of the power and nature of the primacy*. |