

# Manuale Theologiae Dogmaticae (*Manual of Dogmatic Theology*)

by J. M. Hervé (J. M. Herve), 1950

[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 7, 2025.
- Version: 1.0
- Selection pages: 501–503

## Pars II, Caput III, Articulus III, 3° De factis dogmaticis

### Latin

**514. Notio facti dogmatici.** — Factum *dogmaticum* in genere est quodlibet *factum* in se non revelatum, sed *cum dogmate* ita *connexum*, ut necessarium sit ad dogma agnoscendum, custodiendum, explicandum aut rite proponendum. *Triplex* distingui potest: 1. principaliter *historicum*, quo agnoscitur regula fidei, v. g. legitimitas concilii alicujus œcumenici aut Pontificis; 2. *doctrinale*, ut iudicium de sensu alicujus libri in ordine ad fidem; 3. *hagiographicum*, ut canonizatio sanctorum.

De duobus ultimis tantum loquimur in præsentī, cum infallibilitas Ecclesiæ circa primum sponte defluat ex supradictis de concilio, de Pontifice et de ipsa Ecclesiæ indefectibilitate. « Quid prodesset enim in abstracto profiteri infallibilem conciliorum œcumenicorum (aut Pontificum R.) auctoritatem, si licitum esset dubitare de *legitimitate* cujuslibet concilii » aut Pontificis? »<sup>[1]</sup>.

**515.** Ecclesia infallibilis est in iudicando de sensu alicujus libri in ordine ad fidem [*Theol. certum*]. — Ecclesia iudicat non de sensu auctoris *pure subjectivo*, qui scilicet forte latebat in mente auctoris, sed de sensu *objectivo* et obvio, quem verba præ se ferunt, et quem auctor intendere debuit, si, verborum

### English

**514. The Notion of a Dogmatic Fact.** — A *dogmatic* fact in general is any *fact* which is not revealed *in itself*, but is so *connected with dogma* that it is necessary for recognizing, preserving, explaining, or properly presenting dogma. *Three* types can be distinguished: 1. primarily *historical*, by which the rule of faith is recognized, e.g., the legitimacy of some ecumenical council or of a Pope; 2. *doctrinal*, such as a judgment concerning the meaning of some book in relation to faith; 3. *hagiographical*, such as the canonization of saints.

We speak only of the last two in the present discussion, since the infallibility of the Church regarding the first naturally flows from what has been said above concerning councils, the Pope, and the indefectibility of the Church itself. “For what would it profit to profess in the abstract the infallible authority of ecumenical councils (or of Roman Pontiffs), if it were permitted to doubt the *legitimacy* of any council” or Pope?<sup>[1]</sup>.

**515.** The Church is infallible in judging the meaning of a book as it relates to faith [*Theologically certain*]. — The Church judges not the *purely subjective* meaning of the author, which perhaps remained hidden in the author’s mind, but rather the objective and apparent

significationem cognoscens, *sincere* locutus fuerit. Hoc iudicium igitur circa *hæc duo* versatur : 1. utrum talis doctrina rectæ fidei *sit conformis* necne (quæstio juris); 2. utrum hæc doctrina in tali libro *contineatur* (quæstio facti).

Ecclesiam infallibilem esse in his duobus dijudicandis, *probat*ur:

**a) Ex ipsa infallibilitatis natura :** Ecclesia enim infallibilis est in quæstione *juris*, ut omnes concedunt ; sed, nisi infallibilis sit etiam in quæstione *facti*, depositum fidei integrum servare et fideles efficaciter ab erroribus præcavere nequiret et prorsus vana esset et illusoria ejus infallibilitas, cum quilibet falsas doctrinas impune spargere posset et condemnationem effugere, dicendo Ecclesiam non recte intellexisse sensum ejus libri. Ergo.

**b) Ex praxi Ecclesiæ :** Ecclesia non errat in determinando infallibilitatis suæ objecto. Atqui, jam ab antiquis temporibus, de doctrina orthodoxa vel heterodoxa multorum scriptorum, infallibile iudicium protulit Ecclesia, illud ut *definitivum et absolutum* omnibus imponendo fidelibus ; v. g. concilium *Nicaenum* damnavit *Arii librum*, qui « *Thalia* » inscriptus erat ; Conc. *Ephesinum* *Nestorii scripta* rejecit et *Cyrelli opera* approbavit ; Conc. *Constantinopolitanum II tria capitula* proscripsit ; conc. *Constantiense* quemlibet suspectum errorum *Wiclef, Hieronymi de Praga et Huss* interrogari jussit : « utrum credat, quod condemnationes... factæ de personis eorum, libris et documentis fuerint rite et juste factæ. et a *quolibet catholico* pro talibus *tenendæ et firmiter asserendæ* »<sup>[2]</sup>.

Pius IX alienam a Doctrina Ecclesiæ, reprobandam et damnandam declaravit doctrinam a *Frohschammer* assertam, item Leo XIII confirmavit decretum *S. Officii*, quo prop. A. *Rosmini* « in proprio auctoris sensu reprobandas ac proscribendas esse judicavit

meaning which the words themselves convey, and which the author must have intended if, knowing the significance of the words, he spoke *sincerely*. This judgment therefore concerns *these two aspects*: 1. whether such doctrine *is conformable* to right faith or not (question of law); 2. whether this doctrine *is contained* in such a book (question of fact).

That the Church is infallible in judging both of these matters is *proven*:

**a) From the very nature of infallibility:** For the Church is infallible in questions of *law*, as all concede; but unless it were also infallible in questions of *fact*, it could neither preserve the deposit of faith intact nor effectively safeguard the faithful from errors, and its infallibility would be entirely vain and illusory, since anyone could spread false doctrines with impunity and escape condemnation by saying that the Church had not correctly understood the meaning of his book. Therefore.

**b) From the practice of the Church:** The Church does not err in determining the object of its infallibility. And indeed, from ancient times, the Church has pronounced infallible judgment concerning the orthodox or heterodox doctrine of many writers, imposing it upon all the faithful as *definitive and absolute*; for example, the *Nicene Council* condemned *Arius's book*, which was entitled "Thalia"; the *Ephesian Council* rejected *Nestorius's writings* and approved Cyril's works; the Second Council of *Constantinople* proscribed the *three chapters*; the Council of *Constance* ordered that anyone suspected of the errors of *Wycliffe, Jerome of Prague, and Huss* be questioned: "whether he believes that the condemnations... made of their persons, books, and documents were properly and justly made, and should be *held and firmly asserted as such by every Catholic*"<sup>[2]</sup>.

Pius IX declared the doctrine asserted by *Frohschammer* to be alien to the Doctrine of the Church, deserving of reproof and condemnation. Likewise, Leo XIII confirmed the decree of the *Holy Office*, by which it "judged that the

»[<sup>3</sup>].

**c) Præsertim ex casu Jansenii :** 1. Jansenius, in libro « Augustinus », exponit et defendit diversos errores, tanquam doctrinam S. Augustini. Innocentius X, 1652, quinque propositiones ex libro excerptas damnat ut hæreticas[<sup>4</sup>]. 2. Jansenistæ, ut effugerent damnationem, distinguunt inter quæstionem *juris* et *facti*, et contendunt has propositiones, *secundum se* sumptas, *jure* esse proscriptas, sed *de facto*, doctrinam damnatam non contineri in libro « Augustinus ». 3. At Alexander VII definit, 1656, has propositiones fuisse damnatas « in sensu ab eodem Jansenio intento » et imponit, 1665, formulam qua idem exprimitur ; Jansenistas nondum acquiescentibus Innocentius XII, [1694 et 1696] denuo declarat prop. Jansenii sensu *obvio* esse Damnatas[<sup>5</sup>].

**4.** Jansenistis autem putantibus *non* requiri assensum internum huic definitioni sed satis esse “*silentium religiosum*”, Clemens XI, 1705, decernit “damnatum in quinque propositionibus Jansenii libri *sensum* quem illarum verba præ se ferunt, ut præfertur, ab omnibus Christi fidelibus *ut hæreticum*, non *ore* solum, sed *et corde* rejici ac damnari debere” [6].

[<sup>1</sup>]: {org. 1} Van Noort, n. 89 ; cf. D. 212, 657, 658, 674, etc.

[<sup>2</sup>]: {org. 1} D. 214-247, 225, 387, 659 sq.

[<sup>3</sup>]: {org. 2} D. 1667, 1669, 1673, 1675 ; D. 1930 a.

[<sup>4</sup>]: {org. 3} D. 1092 sq.

[<sup>5</sup>]: {org. 4} D. 1098, 1099 et n. 3.

[<sup>6</sup>]: {org. 1} D. 1350. De his, cf. *Dict. théol.*, art. Jansénisme, col. 500-522; art. Quesnel, col. 1467 sq., 1500 sq.; Zapelena, t. 2, p. 238 sq.

propositions of A. Rosmini were to be reproved and proscribed in the proper sense of the author”[<sup>3</sup>].

**c) Especially from the case of Jansenius:** 1. Jansenius, in his book “Augustinus,” expounds and defends various errors as though they were the doctrine of St. Augustine. Innocent X, in 1652, condemned five propositions extracted from the book as heretical[<sup>4</sup>]. 2. The Jansenists, to evade condemnation, distinguished between questions of *law* and *fact*, and contended that these propositions, taken *in themselves*, were *rightly* proscribed, but that *in fact*, the condemned doctrine was not contained in the book “Augustinus.” 3. But Alexander VII defined, in 1656, that these propositions had been condemned “in the sense intended by Jansenius himself” and imposed, in 1665, a formula by which the same was expressed; when the Jansenists still did not acquiesce, Innocent XII, [1694 and 1696] again declared that the propositions of Jansenius were condemned in their *obvious* sense[<sup>5</sup>].

**4.** When the Jansenists maintained that internal assent to this definition was *not* required but that “*religious silence*” was sufficient, Clement XI, in 1705, decreed that “the *sense* of Jansenius’ book condemned in the five propositions, which their words manifest, as stated, must be rejected and condemned by all the faithful of Christ as *heretical*, not only with the *mouth*, but also with the *heart*”[<sup>6</sup>].

[<sup>1</sup>]: {org. 1} Van Noort, n. 89; cf. D. 212, 657, 658, 674, etc.

[<sup>2</sup>]: {org. 1} D. 214-247, 225, 387, 659 sq.

[<sup>3</sup>]: {org. 2} D. 1667, 1669, 1673, 1675; D. 1930 a.

[<sup>4</sup>]: {org. 3} D. 1092 sq.

[<sup>5</sup>]: {org. 4} D. 1098, 1099 and n. 3.

[<sup>6</sup>]: {org. 1} D. 1350. Concerning these matters, cf. *Dict. théol.* [Dictionary of Theology], art. Jansenism, col. 500-522; art. Quesnel, col. 1467 sq., 1500 sq.; Zapelena, vol. 2, p. 238 sq.