

Heresies in Catholic History

A Documentary History of Propositions and Responses

Condemned propositions, ecclesial responses,
historical aftermaths, and an audited chronology

Contents

1	Apostolic Boundaries before Named Systems	1
2	Second and Third Centuries: Rule of Faith against Rival Gospels	2
3	Fourth to Sixth Centuries: Trinity, Incarnation, Grace, and Church	9
4	Seventh to Tenth Centuries: Christ's Will, Images, and Carolingian Controversies	16
5	Eleventh to Thirteenth Centuries: Sacrament, Dualism, Poverty, and Schools	19
6	Fourteenth Century through Lateran V: Poverty, Authority, and Reform	26
7	Sixteenth-Century Reformations: Propositions and Confessional Divisions	31
8	Post-Reformation Controversies: Grace, Rigorism, and Interior Religion	36
9	Modern and Contemporary Censures: Reason, Revelation, and Doctrinal Method	41
10	What the Long History Clarifies	51
A	Historical Timeline of Heresies and Responses	53
B	Census, Aliases, Contexts, and Exclusions	63
C	Scope, Terms, and Qualifications	74
D	References	76

1 Apostolic Boundaries before Named Systems

The New Testament establishes the doctrinal realities against which later systems were judged. Acts 15 and Galatians reject the claim that Gentile converts must receive circumcision and the Mosaic law as a condition of belonging to Christ. First Corinthians 15 answers denial of the resurrection of the dead. Colossians insists upon the cosmic primacy and bodily reconciling work of Christ. The Johannine letters make confession that Jesus Christ has come in the flesh a test of teaching and communion. The Pastoral Epistles oppose speculative genealogies and the claim that the resurrection has already occurred. These inspired apostolic judgments concern the propositions and teachers identified in the texts; the later names “Ebionite,” “Docetic,” and “Gnostic” belong to later dossiers.

1.1 The Judaizing necessity claim

Object and setting: The controversy recorded in Acts 15 and Galatians concerned baptized Jewish believers who maintained that Gentile converts must be circumcised and keep the Mosaic law. The doctrinal object is this apostolic-era salvation claim among baptized believers. Evidence grade A for the scriptural texts.

Propositions at issue: Gentile believers could not be saved or admitted as full members of God’s people without circumcision and observance of the Mosaic law. Paul further opposed treating works of the law as the ground of justification and table separation as required by the gospel (Gal 2–5).

Ecclesial response: The apostles and elders at Jerusalem judged that Gentile converts were not to bear the yoke of circumcision and the whole Mosaic law, while prescribing limited requirements for communion (Acts 15:1–29). Paul’s letters locate justification and covenant membership in Christ received by faith, whose living form works through love (Gal 2:15–5:6; Rom 3–4).

Aftermath and qualification: Jewish-Christian communities remained diverse. Later heresiologists used names such as Ebionites, Nazarenes, and Elchasaites for groups whose Christology and observance differed; those later dossiers depend on patristic evidence. The apostolic judgment concerns the specific claim that Gentile salvation and full covenant membership require circumcision and observance of the Mosaic law.

1.2 Denial or evacuation of the resurrection

Object and setting: Paul names some Corinthian Christians who said there is no resurrection of the dead, while 2 Timothy 2:17–18 names Hymenaeus and Philetus as saying that the resurrection had already happened. The texts give propositions, not enough data to reconstruct one enduring sect. Evidence grade A for the scriptural witness.

Propositions at issue: Either the dead do not rise, or the promised resurrection is exhausted in an event already past. Paul shows the consequence: if there is no resurrection, Christ has not been raised, apostolic preaching and faith are empty, and the dead in Christ have perished (1 Cor 15:12–19).

Ecclesial response: First Corinthians 15 transmits the received proclamation of Christ’s death, burial, appearances, and resurrection, and teaches the future bodily transformation of those who belong to him. Second Timothy treats realized-resurrection teaching as destructive of faith. Later creeds confess the resurrection of the body and the life of the world to come.

Aftermath and qualification: Spiritualizing or denying bodily resurrection recurs in several later systems, especially some Gnostic trajectories, but recurrence does not prove direct descent from the unnamed Corinthians. The apostolic response became a stable article of the baptismal creeds and a touchstone for Christian anthropology and eschatology.

1.3 Denial that Jesus Christ came in the flesh

Object and setting: First and Second John address teachers who would not confess Jesus Christ as having come in the flesh. The immediate opponents cannot be identified securely with a later named school; the texts nonetheless establish an apostolic Christological boundary. Evidence grade A.

Propositions at issue: The rejected confession separates the saving Christ from real embodied human existence. First John also binds denial of the Son to denial of the Father and insists upon the tangible, historically manifested Word of life (1 Jn 1:1–3; 2:22–23; 4:1–3; 2 Jn 7).

Ecclesial response: The Johannine witness confesses one Jesus Christ truly come in the flesh, whose real blood cleanses from sin and whose death and risen life ground communion. Later anti-Docetic and anti-Gnostic teaching does not add a disposable material shell to the gospel; it safeguards the identity of the incarnate, crucified, and risen Lord.

Aftermath and qualification: Ignatius of Antioch soon confronts more explicit claims that Christ only seemed to suffer. The later category *Docetism* is useful for that family of propositions, but it is not treated as the proper name of every opponent envisioned by the Johannine letters.

2 Second and Third Centuries: Rule of Faith against Rival Gospels

The earliest post-apostolic evidence is uneven. Some teachers left books; others are known almost entirely through refutations written a generation or more later. A bishop's refusal of communion is sometimes reported, but no decree survives. These dossiers therefore identify the rule of faith clarified by the controversy without pretending that every later catalogue preserves a verbatim confession or a juridical sentence.

2.1 Simon and the later Simonian construction

Object and setting: Acts 8:9–24 narrates an encounter with a Samaritan magician named Simon. Justin and Irenaeus, writing in the second century, describe a developed Simonian mythology, but its historical identity with the individual in Acts and the stages of its growth cannot be demonstrated from surviving target texts. Evidence grade C for the contemporary opponent reports about a Simonian school and D for the asserted genealogy, statue identification, and later death legends.

Propositions at issue: Acts attributes to Simon an attempt to purchase apostolic power, not the later system. Justin, *First Apology* 26 and 56, and Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* 1.23.1–4, attribute to Simonians Simon's self-presentation as supreme divine power, Helena as his first Thought, world-making angels, and salvation through recognition of Simon. Irenaeus also reports magic and moral indifference; those allegations remain an interested opponent's account. The *Great Declaration* excerpted in the *Refutation of All Heresies* cannot be assigned to the Simon of Acts without a separate attribution argument.

Ecclesial response: Peter's rebuke in Acts 8:18–24 rejects treating the gift of God as a purchasable power and summons Simon to repentance; it is not a proposition list against the later school. Justin publicly repudiates Simonian claims, while Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* 2.31.1–2 and 2.32.3–5, contrasts magic and self-deification with one Creator and the saving work of the crucified and risen Christ. No extant second-century synodal or Roman sentence against a Simonian body survives.

Aftermath and qualification: Later heresiologies made Simon the genealogical source of nearly every subsequent error, a literary scheme rather than documented institutional descent. The term *simony* derives from the attempted purchase in Acts, not from proof that later ecclesiastical corruption continued a Simonian church. Justin's statue report and later stories of Simon's contest with Peter cannot bear the weight of a formal aftermath.

2.2 Cerinthus: a divided Christ in conflicting reports

Object and setting: Cerinthus is placed by Irenaeus and later Eusebius near the apostolic generation in Asia Minor, but no writing of his and no ecclesiastical sentence against him survives. Irenaeus supplies the earliest detailed doctrinal account; later stories and catalogue additions cannot automatically be joined to it. Evidence grade C for the system attributed by Irenaeus, falling to D for the bathhouse anecdote, the sensual-millennium report, and later aggregations.

Propositions at issue: Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* 1.26.1, attributes the world's formation to a power ignorant of the supreme God and distinguishes Jesus, ordinarily born of Joseph and Mary, from a heavenly Christ who descended at baptism and departed before the Passion; Jesus therefore suffered and rose while the spiritual Christ remained impassible. Caius and Dionysius, preserved in Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* 3.28.1–6, instead associate Cerinthus with an earthly millennium and disputed claims about Revelation. That separate hostile tradition is not evidence for one composite Cerinthian creed.

Ecclesial response: Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* 3.11.1, interprets John's Gospel as an answer to Cerinthus, and 3.16.1–9 argues that the one Jesus Christ is the divine Son truly born, suffering, and risen. This is a patristic theological response, not a surviving Johannine trial record. No extant episcopal, Roman, or synodal act names Cerinthus.

Aftermath and qualification: No securely traceable Cerinthian organization survives in the record. Irenaeus's story that John fled a bathhouse containing Cerinthus (*Against Heresies* 3.3.4) records remembered hostility, not a juridical condemnation. Later use of his name as a source of Christological or millenarian error neither proves institutional descent nor makes every ancient millennial expectation Cerinthian.

2.3 Docetism: a suffering only in appearance

Object and setting: *Docetism* is a modern umbrella for claims that Christ's flesh, birth, or suffering was apparent rather than fully real. Ignatius of Antioch supplies the clearest early episcopal witness, but he does not give his opponents a stable sect name. Evidence grade B for the proposition preserved by a direct refuter, not for a lost judicial act.

Propositions at issue: Ignatius reports teachers who denied that Jesus truly took flesh, suffered, and rose, with some consequently abstaining from the Eucharist because they did not confess it as the flesh of the Savior. Not every Gnostic or Marcionite Christology was docetic in the same way.

Ecclesial response: *Smyrnaeans* 1–7 and *Trallians* 9–10 bind the one Jesus Christ's genuine Davidic birth, bodily suffering under Pontius Pilate, and bodily resurrection to Christian salvation and Eucharistic communion. Serapion of Antioch later rejected the *Gospel of Peter* after finding teaching he identified as docetic (Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* 6.12). These are episcopal and patristic responses, not an extant ecumenical decree.

Aftermath and qualification: The anti-Docetic confession became integral to creeds and to later conciliar Christology. "Docetic" remains a description of a proposition, not proof that every text using symbolic language belonged to one secret school.

2.4 Ebionite and Elchasaite currents

Object and setting: Irenaeus, Hippolytus, Origen, and Epiphanius use *Ebionite* for differing Jewish-Christian groups; Hippolytus and Eusebius also describe followers of a revelatory book associated with Elchasai. No self-authenticating membership list or formal sentence survives, and the catalogues do not describe one uniform organization. Evidence grade C, falling to D where only late catalogues attest a feature.

Propositions at issue: The witnesses variously attribute adoptionist accounts of Jesus' birth, continued observance of circumcision and the Mosaic law as necessary, rejection of Paul, a restricted Gospel, repeated ritual washings, and astrological teaching. These traits must be assigned to the particular witness; they cannot all be made the creed of every Jewish Christian.

Ecclesial response: Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* 1.26.2 and 3.21.1, answers the Ebionite Christology from the apostolic rule of one divine Son truly born of Mary. Hippolytus, *Refutation* 9.13–17, and Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical*

History 6.38, oppose the Elchasaite revelation and its repeated purifications. No extant universal conciliar act names either complex in this period.

Aftermath and qualification: The communities disappear from securely traceable evidence, while their names became flexible labels in later heresiology. They are not identical with the necessity claim answered in Acts 15, still less with Judaism; later resemblance does not establish institutional descent.

2.5 Menander: baptism and promised present immortality

Object and setting: Justin, writing about the middle of the second century, identifies Menander as a Samaritan from Cappadocia active at Antioch and says adherents still professed his teaching. Irenaeus presents him as Simon's successor; Eusebius's later account is expressly dependent on Justin and Irenaeus. No Menandrian writing or judicial act survives. Evidence grade C for the near-contemporary reports and D where later catalogues elaborate their succession scheme.

Propositions at issue: Justin, *First Apology* 26, reports Menander's promise that adherents would not die. Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* 1.23.5, more fully attributes an unknown supreme Power, world-making angels, Menander's claim to be a saving emissary, magical knowledge by which the angels could be overcome, and a baptism received from Menander that conferred resurrection and immortal youth. These are opponent summaries, not quotations from a Menandrian confession.

Ecclesial response: Justin, *First Apology* 26 and 56, rejects the claims in a public Christian apology; Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* 2.31.1 and 2.32.5, answers Menander together with Simon by confessing one Creator and locating resurrection and saving power in Jesus Christ rather than in magic or a teacher's private baptism. Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* 3.26.1–4, repeats that response but supplies no independent sentence.

Aftermath and qualification: Justin's notice establishes that the immortality claim circulated in his own period, not that a durable Menandrian institution can be followed thereafter. The name persists chiefly in dependent catalogues. Similar language about baptism, resurrection, or immortality in another community does not establish Menandrian descent.

2.6 Saturnilus or Satornilus: angelic creation and severe dualism

Object and setting: Saturnilus, also transmitted as Satornilus or Saturninus, is placed at Antioch in Syria in the earlier second century. His teaching is known principally from Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* 1.24.1–2; the parallel in *Refutation of All Heresies* 7.28 largely preserves the same report, while later catalogues add little independent evidence. Evidence grade C, falling to D for features attested only by late or dependent witnesses.

Propositions at issue: Irenaeus attributes an unknown Father, seven subordinate angels who made the world and an initially powerless human creature, and a life-giving spark sent from above. The Savior was said to appear without true birth or body; the God of Israel was reduced to one angel; some persons possessed the saving spark; marriage and generation were assigned to Satan; and adherents reportedly rejected animal food. These particulars are the refuter's formulation and should not be transferred indiscriminately to every ascetical group.

Ecclesial response: Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* 2.31.1, expressly applies his defense of the one Creator against Saturnilus; the public rule stated at 1.10.1–3 confesses the goodness and unity of creation, the Son's real Incarnation and Passion, bodily resurrection, and moral judgment. No extant Antiochene, Roman, or universal act against Saturnilus survives.

Aftermath and qualification: No target-side document or secure institutional succession permits a detailed history after the second century. The name remained in the catalogues, while anti-Docetic and pro-creation doctrine entered the wider Catholic rule of faith. Severe abstinence, dualist vocabulary, or rejection of marriage in a later movement does not by itself prove Saturnilian transmission.

2.7 Basilides and divergent Basilidean trajectories

Object and setting: Basilides taught at Alexandria in the second century and was followed by his son Isidore and later interpreters. Fragments attributed to Basilides survive through Clement, but Irenaeus and the *Refutation of All Heresies* describe markedly different systems. No formal sentence survives. Evidence grade C for claims kept with their particular witness; a harmonized single system, late biographical details, and uncorroborated moral allegations fall to grade D.

Propositions at issue: Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* 1.24.3–7, attributes successive divine powers, 365 heavens, an inferior angelic creator, salvation through secret knowledge, bodily corruption rather than bodily salvation, and a Passion in which Simon of Cyrene was substituted while Christ escaped. *Refutation of All Heresies* 7.20.1–27.13 gives a substantially different account beginning from a transcendent non-existent God and a cosmic seed. Basilides's *Exegetica*, quoted at Clement, *Stromata* 4.12.81.1–83.1, addresses providence and suffering but does not independently establish Irenaeus's substitution account. The dossiers must not merge these witnesses silently.

Ecclesial response: Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* 4.7.6–8, reports and briefly summarizes Agrippa Castor's written refutation of Basilides; the work no longer survives independently and was not a conciliar act. Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* 2.31.1, applies his defense of the one Creator to Basilides, while 3.16 and 5.1–14 defend the one incarnate Son's genuine suffering and the salvation and resurrection of the body.

Aftermath and qualification: Clement's engagement with Basilides, Isidore, and their followers shows continued Basilidean interpretation around the end of the second century, but the duration and organization of the school cannot be reconstructed securely. The surviving fragments correct any account that simply repeats Irenaeus as Basilides's own words. Later dualisms are not Basilidean by genealogy merely because they resemble one reported feature.

2.8 Carpocrates: angelic makers, privileged souls, and moral allegations

Object and setting: Carpocrates and associated teachers are known chiefly from Irenaeus; an Alexandrian setting and material concerning Epiphane come through Clement. No writing securely attributable to Carpocrates survives. Clement preserves part of an *On Righteousness* attributed to Epiphane, but its relation to every Carpocratian is disputed. Evidence grade C for the witness-specific doctrinal outline and D for sensational practices or biographies lacking independent control.

Propositions at issue: Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* 1.25.1–2, attributes creation to angels inferior to the unbegotten Father and presents Jesus as an ordinarily born man whose unusually pure soul received power from above, so that other souls might equal or surpass him. Sections 1.25.4–5 connect liberation with transmigration and experience of every kind of action. Clement, *Stromata* 3.2.5–11, quotes Epiphane on equality and common possession, then attributes sexual communalism to followers. The quotation, Clement's inference, and Irenaeus's allegations must remain distinct; none proves that every named adherent practiced every reported act.

Ecclesial response: Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* 2.31.1–2 and 2.32.1–5, rejects inferior creators, magic, transmigration, and the claim that moral acts are indifferent, defending one Creator, real judgment, and the unique saving work of Jesus Christ. Clement, *Stromata* 3.2–4, rejects the sexual and antinomian conclusions while defending creation and Christian marriage. Neither text preserves a Roman or Alexandrian judicial sentence.

Aftermath and qualification: Irenaeus 1.25.6 reports that Marcellina brought related teaching to Rome under Anicetus; the notice shows alleged diffusion, not a surviving Roman condemnation act. The movement cannot be securely traced after the early centuries. Later catalogues often amplified its moral notoriety, so the history must not turn polemical accusations into an unqualified community ethnography.

2.9 Valentinus and the plurality of Valentinian schools

Object and setting: Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* 3.4.3, places Valentinus at Rome during the episcopates of Hyginus, Pius, and Anicetus. Ptolemy, Heracleon, Theodotus, Marcus, and other teachers developed differing Valentinian trajectories. Irenaeus is an interested near-contemporary witness, while Ptolemy's letter, Clement's excerpts, and securely classified recovered texts supply partial target-side controls. Evidence grade C overall

because no formal act survives; attempts to make every school, late biography, or unattributed Coptic work the doctrine of Valentinus fall to D.

Propositions at issue: Irenaeus 1.1–9 describes chiefly a Ptolemaean scheme of thirty aeons, Sophia’s disruption, a lower Demiurge, material, psychic, and spiritual human classes, and a complex Savior whose higher components are distinguished from the sufferer. At 1.11.1 he assigns Valentinus a related but different sequence of emanations. Ptolemy’s *Letter to Flora*, preserved in Epiphanius, *Panarion* 33.3.1–7.10, divides the Mosaic law by source and attributes its divine part to an intermediate maker rather than the perfect Father. These texts establish family resemblance and internal disagreement, not one universal Valentinian creed.

Ecclesial response: Irenaeus places the public apostolic rule against the schools at *Against Heresies* 1.10.1–3, defends the one Creator at 2.1–3, the public succession and tradition of the churches at 3.1–4, the one incarnate Jesus Christ at 3.16–22, and bodily salvation and resurrection at 5.1–14. Tertullian’s *Against the Valentinians* is a later patristic refutation. No extant Roman sentence, proposition list, or universal conciliar act against Valentinus survives from this period.

Aftermath and qualification: Valentinian teachers produced several schools and substantial exegetical literature into the third century. Target-side fragments and recovered writings have made their diversity clearer without rendering Irenaeus irrelevant or proving that every work now called Valentinian belonged to one institution. The term *Valentinian* is therefore a historically bounded family label, not a genealogy for every later theology of emanation or privileged knowledge.

2.10 Gnostic schools and the rule of faith

Object and setting: Second-century teachers now grouped as Gnostic included Valentinians, Basilideans, Sethian trajectories, and others whose myths and rites differed. Irenaeus and Hippolytus are interested opponents; Valentinian fragments and recovered Coptic writings provide partial controls. Evidence ranges from A for extant works to C for systems reconstructed only from refuters.

Propositions at issue: Recurring, not universal, patterns include a hierarchy of divine emanations, a deficient or hostile maker distinguished from the highest God, the soul’s rescue through privileged knowledge, and a devaluation of embodied creation. Their accounts of Christ range from docetic separation to elaborate unions of heavenly and earthly agents.

Ecclesial response: Irenaeus, especially *Against Heresies* 1 and 3, appeals to the public apostolic rule: one Creator, one economy of salvation, the Word’s real incarnation, and the resurrection of the flesh. Tertullian’s *Prescription against Heretics* similarly contrasts public apostolic churches and Scriptures with esoteric succession claims. No single second-century council condemned a unitary entity called “Gnosticism.”

Aftermath and qualification: The schools declined or changed, while individual texts survived in translation and manuscript caches. Modern discovery has corrected details in the heresiologists without turning every recovered work into a neutral sociological survey or proving continuity with later dualist movements.

2.11 Marcion’s two gods and restricted canon

Object and setting: Marcion taught at Rome in the middle of the second century and organized durable communities. His *Antitheses* and edited Gospel and Apostle do not survive independently; Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Epiphanius preserve and contest them. The reported Roman rupture about 144 has no surviving sentence. Evidence grade C for that act, strengthened by multiple witnesses for the principal teaching.

Propositions at issue: Marcion distinguished the just creator and lawgiver of Israel from the previously unknown good God revealed by Christ, rejected the Old Testament as Christian Scripture, and used an edited Gospel resembling Luke with ten Pauline letters. His Christology denied an ordinary human birth and compromised the full reality of the Incarnation.

Ecclesial response: Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* 1.27 and 3–5, and Tertullian, *Against Marcion*, defend the identity of the Creator and Father of Jesus Christ, the unity of the two Testaments, real incarnation, and bodily resurrection. The Roman church excluded Marcion from communion, but the exact procedure and wording cannot be recovered from an act.

Aftermath and qualification: Marcionite churches persisted for centuries in several regions. Their rival canon sharpened Christian explanation of the received Scriptures, but it is too simple to say that Marcion single-handedly caused the Catholic canon to be created.

2.12 Montanism or the New Prophecy

Object and setting: Montanus, Prisca, and Maximilla led a prophetic movement in Phrygia from the later second century. Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* 5.16–19, transmits anti-Montanist reports and says Asian synods examined and rejected it; their acts are lost. Tertullian later embraced the New Prophecy. Evidence grade C.

Propositions at issue: The dispute concerned ecstatic oracles claimed as the Paraclete's present speech, stringent fasts, restrictions upon remarriage, a heightened summons to martyrdom, and the authority of new commands. Reports of a fixed expectation that the heavenly Jerusalem would descend at Pepuza belong to the movement's contested profile. The issue was not whether the Holy Spirit can give gifts, but whether these utterances could impose a new universal discipline and demand ecclesial submission.

Ecclesial response: Bishops in Asia Minor tested the prophets, refused their claims, and broke communion; Serapion of Antioch reported the same judgment. Patristic responses appealed to apostolic faith, discernment of spirits, and the Church's authority over penitential discipline. No surviving ecumenical proposition list licenses treating every Montanist practice as a separately defined heresy.

Aftermath and qualification: Communities survived for centuries, especially in Phrygia, and later imperial laws penalized them. Tertullian's adherence does not make all his earlier Catholic writings Montanist, nor does later charismatic Christianity inherit this movement merely by affirming prophecy.

2.13 Encratism and rejection of created goods

Object and setting: *Encratite* could denote several ascetical circles rather than one church. Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* 1.28.1, and Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* 4.29, associate Tatian with rejection of marriage and certain foods; later witnesses mention Eucharistic use of water. The group's own rule is not extant. Evidence grade C.

Propositions at issue: The censured boundary is not celibacy, fasting, or abstinence freely undertaken, but treating marriage, meat, wine, or material creation as intrinsically defiling and therefore incompatible with salvation. The several practices should not be attributed wholesale to every person called Encratite.

Ecclesial response: Irenaeus answers from the goodness of creation and apostolic teaching on marriage and food. The regional Council of Gangra, about 340, later anathematized specific contempt for marriage, married clergy, ordinary Christian households, and lawful foods; those canons answer an ascetical complex but do not prove that every target was a surviving follower of Tatian.

Aftermath and qualification: Strict ascetical currents continued under changing names. Catholic monastic renunciation remained voluntary and sacramental, not a declaration that marriage or created food is evil.

2.14 Dynamic monarchianism and Paul of Samosata

Object and setting: Theodotus of Byzantium was reportedly excluded from communion by Pope Victor; the anonymous *Little Labyrinth*, excerpted in Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* 5.28, describes his learned Roman successors. Paul of Samosata, bishop of Antioch, was examined by several eastern synods and deposed in 268; the final synodal letter survives only through Eusebius 7.27–30. Evidence grade C for Theodotus and B for Paul.

Propositions at issue: These witnesses attribute an adoptionist pattern in which Jesus is a merely human subject specially empowered or indwelt by the divine Word. Paul's terminology and the synod's disputed use of *homoousios* cannot be made equivalent to later Nicene usage; the hostile summaries do not preserve a complete treatise by him.

Ecclesial response: Victor's episcopal exclusion answered Theodotus. The Antiochene synod deposed Paul and confessed the Son as existing before the ages, truly descending from heaven and becoming man. Imperial

enforcement later transferred the church building to the bishop recognized by the wider episcopate; that property order was a civil consequence, not the doctrinal definition.

Aftermath and qualification: Later writers connected Paul with Photinus and other adoptionist trajectories, but those connections require proposition-level comparison. Nicaea's confession of the eternally begotten, consubstantial Son supplied the mature dogmatic answer.

2.15 Modal monarchianism: Noetus, Praxeas, and Sabellius

Object and setting: Noetus and Sabellius are known chiefly through Hippolytus; "Praxeas" may be Tertullian's pseudonym for an opponent. Their positions are related but not demonstrably one school. Dionysius of Alexandria and Dionysius of Rome exchanged important Trinitarian clarifications about 260. Evidence grade C for the early trials and B for the transmitted doctrinal controversy.

Propositions at issue: The refuters attribute a collapse of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit into one subject appearing under successive names or modes, sometimes with the consequence that the Father himself suffered as the Son. Sabellius's precise account cannot be reconstructed safely from one formula.

Ecclesial response: Hippolytus's *Against Noetus* and Tertullian's *Against Praxeas* defend real distinction without division of the one God. Dionysius of Rome rejected both separation into three gods and denial of the Word's eternal divine generation. Constantinople I later named Sabellians among the heresies anathematized in canon 1, while the Nicene-Constantinopolitan faith confessed one divine essence and three irreducible personal relations.

Aftermath and qualification: "Sabellian" became a durable polemical label, sometimes applied too broadly. The Catholic answer is neither three gods nor one person wearing three masks.

2.16 Novatianism: rigorism joined to schism

Object and setting: After the Decian persecution, the Roman presbyter Novatian opposed Cornelius's election and received rival episcopal consecration in 251. Cornelius's letter in Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* 6.43, and Cyprian's correspondence document the rupture. Novatian's surviving Trinitarian work is substantially orthodox; the dossier is therefore mixed schism and penitential error. Evidence grade A/B.

Propositions at issue: The dispute centered on whether the Church could reconcile baptized Christians guilty of grave post-baptismal apostasy. Novatianist communities styled themselves the "Pure" and withheld ecclesial absolution and communion from the lapsed even after penance, while leaving judgment to God.

Ecclesial response: A Roman synod under Cornelius in 251 rejected the rival consecration and excluded Novatian and his supporters; African councils under Cyprian defended a disciplined path of penance and reconciliation. Nicaea I canon 8 later prescribed how returning "Cathari" could be received, recognizing a real ecclesial structure while requiring submission to Catholic communion.

Aftermath and qualification: Novatianist churches remained widespread into late antiquity. Their history cannot be reduced either to a doctrinal denial of the Trinity or to a dispute with no doctrinal content: penitential authority and schismatic hierarchy were intertwined.

2.17 Manichaeism: a rival dualist religion

Object and setting: Mani founded a missionary religion in third-century Mesopotamia using Christian, Iranian, and other materials. Coptic, Middle Persian, and other Manichaean texts preserve its own voice; Augustine later described and refuted the movement he had joined. Because Mani claimed a new universal revelation, Manichaeism is historically treated among heresies but is not simply an internal baptized Catholic school. Evidence grade A for many teachings.

Propositions at issue: Its cosmology posited opposed principles or realms of Light and Darkness, explained the material world through their conflict, located particles of light in living matter, and reinterpreted Christ and salvation within Mani's chain of revelatory messengers. The elect and hearers had different ascetical obligations.

Ecclesial response: Christian refutations—notably Augustine’s *Against the Fundamental Epistle of Mani*, *On the Nature of the Good*, and anti-Manichaean disputations—defend one good Creator, creation from nothing, evil as privation rather than a coeternal substance, and the true Incarnation. Pope Leo I opposed Manichaean teaching and practice in sermons and letters in the fifth century. No single third-century Catholic decree supplies a complete proposition list.

Aftermath and qualification: Roman, Persian, and later rulers used confiscation, exile, and death against Manichaeans; those are civil persecutions and must not be attributed to Augustine’s doctrinal argument. Manichaean communities spread across Eurasia and survived for centuries. A later dualist movement is not thereby proven Manichaean by descent.

3 Fourth to Sixth Centuries: Trinity, Incarnation, Grace, and Church

This period supplies the survey’s first sustained conciliar record. Even here the evidence is not uniform: Nicaea and Constantinople survive principally in creeds, canons, and later reception, while Ephesus and Chalcedon preserve large, partisan documentary dossiers. Positive definitions identify the Catholic faith more securely than later slogans about what every member of a defeated party believed.

3.1 Donatism: holiness, sacraments, and a rival African communion

Object and setting: The division followed the disputed election of Caecilian of Carthage after the persecution and accusations that one of his consecrators had surrendered Scriptures. Donatist bishops formed a durable North African hierarchy; the evidence includes acts, imperial records, Optatus, Augustine, and Donatist voices preserved in controversy. Evidence grade A/B.

Propositions at issue: The conflict joined a claim that the true Church was the undefiled communion of the martyrs with the practice of rebaptizing Catholics. Its sacramental edge was whether a minister’s betrayal or separation nullified baptism and orders. Donatist positions and pastoral practice varied, and the dispute was also regional and political.

Ecclesial response: The Roman hearing of 313 and Council of Arles in 314 judged for Caecilian; Arles canon 8 required reception without rebaptism where Trinitarian baptism had been given. African Catholic councils and Augustine defended Christ as the true giver of the sacrament and the worldwide communion as the field in which saints and sinners await judgment. The imperial Conference of Carthage in 411 adjudicated the competing historical claims and ruled against the Donatist party.

Aftermath and qualification: Imperial laws suppressed Donatist worship, confiscated property, and used coercion; those civil measures are distinct from the sacramental answer and were themselves debated by Catholic writers. Donatist communities endured into the sixth century. The controversy helped clarify sacramental validity without teaching that a minister’s sin is unimportant.

3.2 Arius and the fourth-century Arian complexes

Object and setting: Arius, a presbyter of Alexandria, disputed with Bishop Alexander beginning about 318. His letters and fragments of the *Thalia* survive through opponents; the later Homoean, Homoiousian, and Anomoean coalitions cannot all be reduced to Arius’s exact teaching. Evidence grade A/B.

Propositions at issue: The Nicene anathemas identify the decisive claims: the Son came from non-being, “there was when he was not,” he existed only after being made, he was from another hypostasis or essence, and he was created or changeable. These conciliar targets are safer than treating every fourth-century use of “Arian” as one creed.

Ecclesial response: Nicaea I in 325 confessed the Son as begotten from the Father’s essence, true God from true God, begotten not made, and consubstantial with the Father, and anathematized the listed formulas. Constantinople I in 381 reaffirmed the Nicene faith and named Arians or Eudoxians in canon 1. Imperial

banishment, restoration, and seizure of churches repeatedly changed with emperors; those political acts were not additions to the creed.

Aftermath and qualification: Controversy continued for more than fifty years, and Homoean Christianity later flourished among several Germanic peoples. The Cappadocians helped stabilize the confession of one divine essence in three hypostases. “Semi-Arian” must not be used as though every Homoiousian remained outside the Nicene settlement.

3.3 Apollinarians, Marcellians, and Photinians

Object and setting: Constantinople I canon 1 names these three distinct trajectories. Apollinaris of Laodicea wrote extensively; Marcellus of Ancyra was condemned, defended, and reassessed amid shifting alliances; Photinus of Sirmium developed a more clearly adoptionist Christology. Evidence ranges from A for fragments to B/C for judicial summaries.

Propositions at issue: Apollinaris was understood to replace Christ’s rational human mind or soul with the divine Word, leaving the assumed humanity incomplete. Marcellus was accused of making the Word’s personal distinction temporary and the kingdom finite; the exact scope of his own teaching remains disputed. Photinus denied the Son’s personal pre-existence and treated Jesus as a man uniquely empowered by the divine Word.

Ecclesial response: Roman synods under Damasus in the 370s rejected Apollinarian propositions; Constantinople I anathematized all three names. Its creed confesses the eternally begotten Son, incarnate by the Holy Spirit and Mary, whose kingdom has no end. Chalcedon later made explicit that the one Son is complete in divinity and complete in humanity, with a rational soul and body.

Aftermath and qualification: Apollinarian communities persisted into the fifth century and some adherents entered later Christological disputes. Marcellus’s changing reception warns against turning a party label into a verdict on every sentence in an author’s corpus.

3.4 Eunomians or Anomoeans

Object and setting: Aetius and Eunomius represent the radical Anomoean trajectory within the fourth-century controversy. Eunomius’s *Apology* survives, as do major answers by Basil of Caesarea and Gregory of Nyssa. Evidence grade A.

Propositions at issue: Eunomius identified God’s essence with unbegottenness, claimed that this essence could be comprehended, and concluded that the begotten Son is unlike the unbegotten Father in essence. His theory linked names, knowledge of essence, and a hierarchy between Father, Son, and Spirit.

Ecclesial response: Basil’s *Against Eunomius* and Gregory of Nyssa’s works of the same controversy answer that no human definition comprehends the divine essence and that the Son’s generation does not make him a creature. Constantinople I canon 1 expressly anathematized Eunomians or Anomoeans while its creed confessed worship and glory of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

Aftermath and qualification: Eunomian communities retained a distinct initiation and hierarchy for a time; later reception rules treated their baptism differently from Trinitarian baptism. The controversy sharpened Christian language about divine names and incomprehensibility, but those theological developments are not reducible to a philosophical ban on speaking truly of God.

3.5 Pneumatomachi or Macedonians

Object and setting: “Pneumatomachi” names opponents of the Holy Spirit’s full divinity; “Macedonians” associates some with Macedonius of Constantinople, though his precise role is uncertain. Athanasius’s *Letters to Serapion* and Basil’s *On the Holy Spirit* answer the controversy. Evidence grade B/C for the movement’s own formulations.

Propositions at issue: The opponents are reported to have treated the Holy Spirit as a creature or ministering power subordinate to Father and Son rather than as sharing the one divine glory and action. Different groups that accepted a high Christology did not necessarily use the same account of the Spirit.

Ecclesial response: Constantinople I in 381 named the Pneumatomachi in canon 1 and confessed the Holy Spirit as Lord and life-giver, proceeding from the Father and worshiped and glorified together with Father and Son. The council's positive confession, read with the Nicene faith it reaffirmed, supplies the controlling answer rather than a speculative reconstruction of lost speeches.

Aftermath and qualification: The Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed became the Church's enduring baptismal and liturgical confession. Later East-West controversy about the *filioque* concerns the expression of procession and authority to alter the creed; it is not a survival of Macedonian denial of the Spirit's divinity.

3.6 Priscillianism and a capital civil sentence

Object and setting: Priscillian, an ascetic Iberian bishop, was opposed at Zaragoza in 380, condemned at Bordeaux in 384, and executed with companions at Trier about 385 after a secular prosecution. His surviving tractates do not corroborate every later charge. Evidence grade A for his texts and the execution, C/D for portions of the doctrinal portrait.

Propositions at issue: Later catalogues attribute dualist cosmology, astrological determinism, denial of orthodox Trinity and Incarnation, and deceptive ascetic practice. The tractates profess a Trinitarian and scriptural faith, although their language and use of apocrypha raised questions. Each alleged proposition therefore requires its own witness.

Ecclesial response: Zaragoza's canons regulated suspicious ascetical practices without naming Priscillian. Bordeaux deposed him; later councils, especially Toledo I in 400 and Braga I in 561, supplied creeds and anathemas against propositions received as Priscillianist. Those later lists are evidence of the tradition being opposed, not transcripts of Priscillian's lost trial defense.

Aftermath and qualification: The emperor Magnus Maximus's court executed the accused on charges that included magic. Martin of Tours and other bishops opposed the capital process; the death sentence was civil, not a conciliar penalty. Veneration of Priscillian in parts of Iberia and recurring later condemnations show that neither his following nor the controversy ended at Trier.

3.7 Jovinian's ascetical propositions

Object and setting: Jovinian taught at Rome near the end of the fourth century. His books are lost; the notification of Pope Siricius, the Milanese reply preserved as Ambrose's Letter 42, and Jerome's highly polemical *Against Jovinian* are the main witnesses. The Roman and Milanese proceedings are securely attested, but their date is variously placed about 390–393. Evidence grade B/C.

Propositions at issue: The witnesses attribute parity of merit between marriage, widowhood, and virginity when other works are equal; denial that fasting is spiritually preferable to eating with thanksgiving; one heavenly reward for all who preserve baptism; and such security for the fully faithful baptized that the devil cannot overthrow them. The Milanese letter also attributes denial that Mary remained a virgin in giving birth. The sources do not justify every moral allegation in Jerome's invective.

Ecclesial response: A Roman presbyteral council under Siricius excluded Jovinian and named associates from communion and notified Milan. Ambrose and the bishops assembled at Milan adopted the same judgment in Letter 42, defending the goodness of marriage together with the distinctive evangelical excellence of consecrated virginity, fasting, perseverance, differing rewards, and Mary's virginal childbirth. Jerome's treatise is a theological response, not the sentence itself.

Aftermath and qualification: No durable Jovinian church can be traced, and later imperial restrictions must be distinguished from the episcopal censures. The controversy does not authorize contempt for marriage; the Catholic response explicitly called marriage good while refusing to make every Christian state or ascetical work spiritually interchangeable.

3.8 Messalians or Euchites

Object and setting: Messalians or Euchites were ascetical groups reported in Syria and Asia Minor. Their own normative writings are difficult to identify; Epiphanius, Theodoret, monastic authors, and synodal dossiers transmit the charges. Evidence grade B/C.

Propositions at issue: Synodal summaries attribute claims that a demon inhabits each person even after baptism, that continuous prayer alone expels it, that the Holy Spirit is then sensibly perceived, and that sacraments, ecclesial work, and ordinary ascetical discipline become unnecessary. Later catalogues add claims that should not automatically be read into the earliest group.

Ecclesial response: Regional synods at Side and Constantinople rejected the movement. At Ephesus in 431, the council received a synodical dossier brought by the bishops of Pamphylia and decreed deposition or anathema for clergy or monks who accepted the condemned Messalian teaching. The positive answer joins persevering prayer to baptismal grace, sacramental communion, work, and accountable ecclesial life.

Aftermath and qualification: “Messalian” became a recurrent accusation against unconventional mystics, so later uses require fresh evidence. Similar emphasis on interior prayer does not establish adherence to the propositions in the Ephesine dossier.

3.9 Origenist controversies and disputed anathema collections

Object and setting: Origen died in the third century, but disputes over readings of his works and later monastic Origenism erupted around 400 and again under Justinian. Origen’s texts, Theophilus’s and Jerome’s polemics, Justinian’s edict, and conciliar materials survive with major attribution problems. Evidence grade B, with D for claims that collapse all later propositions into Origen’s own teaching.

Propositions at issue: Later anti-Origenist lists target pre-existent rational minds, embodiment as punishment, cycles of worlds, Christological schemes associated with later Origenists, and a final restoration construed to erase enduring distinctions and punishment. The several lists are not identical, and not every proposition is demonstrably Origen’s.

Ecclesial response: A Constantinopolitan synod about 543 received Justinian’s anti-Origenist propositions. Constantinople II in 553 names Origen among earlier heretics in anathema 11, but its extant formal sessions concern the Three Chapters. The famous fifteen anathemas associated with 553 do not belong uncontroversially to that session sequence and must be cited under their own textual provenance rather than silently as ecumenical canons.

Aftermath and qualification: Origen’s speculative errors were rejected while much of his biblical and spiritual legacy continued to be read critically. The dossier does not support the shortcut that every version of hope for universal salvation, or every sentence in Origen, received one undifferentiated conciliar censure.

3.10 Pelagius, Caelestius, and the necessity of grace

Object and setting: Pelagius, Caelestius, and Julian of Eclanum were distinct participants in a controversy over sin, freedom, baptism, and grace. Their works, Augustine’s answers, African synodal acts, and papal letters survive unevenly. Evidence grade A/B.

Propositions at issue: The African canons target denial that Adam’s sin brought death and a transmitted condition needing redemption; the claim that infants are baptized without receiving remission of original sin; and accounts of grace that reduce it to nature, law, teaching, or pardon rather than God’s interior help for every saving act. Not every later proposition originated with Pelagius personally.

Ecclesial response: Councils at Carthage and Milevis in 416 appealed to Innocent I, who confirmed their doctrinal concern in 417. After further inquiry, Pope Zosimus’s *Tractoria* and the Council of Carthage in 418 rejected the specified propositions and confessed prevenient, healing grace and infant baptism for remission of sins. Ephesus in 431 deposed or excluded clergy adhering to Caelestius and confirmed the prior judgment in its canons.

Aftermath and qualification: Imperial banishment followed the ecclesial decisions and must be distinguished from them. Augustine's theology became decisive in the West, but disputes about his strongest formulations continued. Catholic teaching preserves both the priority of grace and the real, graced cooperation of freedom.

3.11 The Gallic grace controversy and Orange II

Object and setting: "Semi-Pelagianism" is a later label for several fifth- and sixth-century positions associated with southern Gaul; the Council of Orange II in 529 did not condemn a body bearing that name. John Cassian, Faustus of Riez, and later monks cannot be assigned one creed without qualification. Evidence grade A for the conciliar propositions, B/C for their attribution.

Propositions at issue: Orange rejected the claim that the beginning of faith, desire for baptism, assent to preaching, or saving invocation can arise from unaided nature before the illumination and inspiration of the Holy Spirit. It also rejected the idea that grace is given merely because human petition or merit came first.

Ecclesial response: Orange II, canons 1–25 and its concluding statement, taught that sin wounded human nature and that every movement toward faith and salvation is preceded and enabled by grace. At the same time it rejected predestination to evil and affirmed that the baptized, assisted by Christ, can perform what belongs to salvation. Pope Boniface II confirmed the council in 531.

Aftermath and qualification: Orange was a regional council with papal confirmation, not an ecumenical session, and its reception developed over time. It supplies a precise Catholic boundary: neither self-starting salvation nor a divine predestination of anyone to evil.

3.12 Nestorius, Ephesus, and the one incarnate Son

Object and setting: Nestorius, bishop of Constantinople, objected to disputed uses of *Theotokos*; Cyril of Alexandria and Pope Celestine I judged that his formulas divided the one Christ. Nestorius's letters, Cyril's letters, extensive Ephesine acts, and Nestorius's later *Bazaar of Heracleides* survive. Evidence grade A/B.

Propositions at issue: The council rejected language that made the Word and the man born of Mary two personal subjects joined by honor or association, so that divine and human predicates belonged to two sons. *Theotokos* safeguards that the one born of Mary according to the flesh is the eternal Word, not that the divine nature originated from her.

Ecclesial response: A Roman synod under Celestine in 430 required recantation. At Ephesus in 431, session I compared Nestorius's second letter and Cyril's second letter with Nicaea, condemned and deposed Nestorius, and affirmed Cyril's letter. Cyril's Twelve Anathemas belong to the conciliar dossier but their precise reception must not be simplified into twelve separately promulgated universal definitions. The Formula of Reunion in 433 confessed one Christ while acknowledging the distinction of divinity and humanity.

Aftermath and qualification: The controversy contributed to lasting separation and to missions of the Church of the East, but "Nestorian Church" is not an adequate present name. The 1994 Common Christological Declaration between the Catholic Church and the Assyrian Church of the East professes one person, true God and true man, and recognizes that past anathemas often involved persons, formulas, and misunderstandings.

3.13 Eutyches and the definition of Chalcedon

Object and setting: Eutyches, an archimandrite at Constantinople, was condemned by Flavian's home synod in 448, restored at the contested council of Ephesus in 449, and rejected at Chalcedon in 451. The acts preserve his examination, but parties disputed terminology and procedure. Evidence grade A/B.

Propositions at issue: Eutyches would not confess Christ as consubstantial with humanity in the required sense and spoke of two natures before the union but one afterward. Chalcedon rejected both confusion or change of the humanity and division of Christ into two personal subjects.

Ecclesial response: Chalcedon's Definition, read with Nicaea, Cyril's letters, and Leo's *Tome*, confessed one and the same Son complete in divinity and humanity, consubstantial with the Father according to divinity and

with us according to humanity, acknowledged in two natures without confusion, change, division, or separation. The council deposed Eutyches; Dioscorus of Alexandria was deposed through a sentence whose procedural and disciplinary grounds must not be reduced to simple identity with Eutyches.

Aftermath and qualification: Imperial enforcement and resistance produced depositions, violence, rival hierarchies, the Henotikon, and the Acacian schism. The Oriental Orthodox churches describe their Christology as miaphysite, not Eutychian. Catholic–Coptic and Catholic–Syriac common declarations now confess together the full divinity and humanity united without confusion or separation.

3.14 Strict one-nature formulas after Chalcedon

Object and setting: After 451, several anti-Chalcedonian parties used one-nature language with different meanings. Cyril of Alexandria's formula of one incarnate nature of the Word could express the unity of the person without denying intact divinity and humanity; strict formulas that absorbed, confused, or diminished the humanity form the object here. Evidence grade A for the conciliar boundary, B/C for assigning a particular party's sense.

Propositions at issue: The rejected sense makes the humanity cease to remain complete and consubstantial with us after the union, converts it into divinity, or forms from divinity and humanity a mixed third nature. The mere words *one nature*, *miaphysite*, or *Cyrrillian* do not establish that sense.

Ecclesial response: Chalcedon's Definition in 451 confessed one and the same Son acknowledged in two natures without confusion or change and without division or separation. Constantinople II in 553, especially anathemas 7 and 8, explained that two-nature and one-incarnate-nature expressions are orthodox when used to preserve both the distinction of natures and the hypostatic union, and condemned their use to introduce either division or confusion.

Aftermath and qualification: Imperial enforcement, rival councils, and competing hierarchies prolonged separation. Modern Catholic agreements with Coptic, Syriac, Armenian, and other Oriental Orthodox authorities recognize a shared confession of Christ's full divinity and humanity; those churches must not be called strict Monophysites or Eutychians merely because they reject Chalcedon's preferred formula.

3.15 Lucidus and predestination to evil

Object and setting: Lucidus, a priest in southern Gaul, was required to answer accusations about grace and predestination before bishops associated with Arles about 473. The principal direct record is his signed *Libellus of submission*; because a retraction can summarize an accuser's construction as well as the author's earlier words, the prior teaching cannot be recovered verbatim from it. Evidence grade B/C.

Propositions at issue: The libellus repudiates claims that human obedience need not be joined to divine grace, that free will was wholly extinguished after the fall, that Christ did not die for all, that divine foreknowledge compels a person toward death, and that some are divinely predestined to evil or made unable to be saved. Its list is the object of the proceeding, not proof that Lucidus had taught every item in precisely that form.

Ecclesial response: Lucidus subscribed the profession and condemned the listed propositions before the regional bishops. He confessed grace as the beginning and continuing aid of good action, a will liberated and assisted by Christ, Christ's saving coming even for those who perish against his will, and no divine predestination to sin. No ecumenical council or identified papal confirmation made the Arles dossier a universal syllabus.

Aftermath and qualification: Lucidus disappears from reliable evidence after his submission. Later controversies involving Gottschalk or Reformation-era predestination arose from different texts and acts; the recurring label *Predestinarian* does not prove an institutional succession.

3.16 Aphthartodocetism or Julianist incorruptibility teaching

Object and setting: Julian of Halicarnassus and Severus of Antioch divided in the sixth century over the condition of Christ's body from the Incarnation. Julian's works survive mostly in fragments transmitted by opponents; Evagrius, John of Ephesus, and later catalogues narrate the dispute. Evidence grade B/C.

Propositions at issue: Julianists held that Christ's body was incorruptible from its union with the Word and underwent hunger, pain, and death voluntarily rather than from the ordinary necessity of a corruptible condition. Opponents charged that this compromised consubstantiality with us and made the Passion apparent; surviving fragments require caution before assigning that full docetic consequence to Julian.

Ecclesial response: Severus and his followers rejected and refuted the formula within the non-Chalcedonian communion. Justinian's reported edict of 564 attempted to impose an incorruptibility thesis and his officials deposed Patriarch Eutychius for resistance; that lost imperial measure was not a Catholic condemnation. John Damascene later catalogued the Julianists in *On Heresies* 84. No extant ecumenical or papal act supplies a universal proposition list under this name.

Aftermath and qualification: Julianist or Gaianite communities survived especially in Egypt and divided further. The durable conciliar boundary remains Christ's complete, truly passible humanity and real voluntary Passion; later debates about the glorified body or Christ's freedom do not by resemblance alone reproduce Julian's position.

3.17 The Three Chapters and Constantinople II

Object and setting: The "Three Chapters" were Theodore of Mopsuestia and his writings, specified anti-Cyrrillian writings of Theodoret of Cyrrhus, and the letter attributed to Ibas of Edessa to Mari. Justinian sought their condemnation to show that Chalcedon did not protect Nestorian teaching. Evidence grade A/B.

Propositions at issue: Constantinople II's fourteen anathemas reject division into two personal subjects, merely moral or honorific union, misuse of "in two natures" to separate two Christs, and the specified writings or defenses of Theodore, Theodoret, and the letter to Mari. The object was delimited; it was not a condemnation of every work by Theodoret or Ibas.

Ecclesial response: Justinian issued an edict against the Chapters in the 540s. Constantinople II in 553 examined the texts and condemned them while repeatedly affirming Chalcedon. Pope Vigilius first resisted a posthumous condemnation and issued a *Constitutum*; he then accepted the council and confirmed its doctrinal judgment, explaining his change in a second settlement.

Aftermath and qualification: Reception caused a prolonged schism in parts of northern Italy and resistance in Africa. The episode illustrates that an ecumenical council may condemn persons and specified writings to interpret an earlier council; it did not promulgate a new movement called the Three Chapters heresy.

3.18 Sixth-century Tritheist formulations

Object and setting: John Philoponus and bishops including Conon and Eugenius became associated with a sixth-century Tritheist party. Fragments of Philoponus's *Arbiter*, Syriac controversy records, and John Damascene's later excerpt permit partial reconstruction. The party's internal phases and terminology remain contested. Evidence grade B/C.

Propositions at issue: Philoponus applied the category of individual nature or substance to each divine hypostasis so strongly that the common divine nature risked becoming only an abstraction shared by three particular natures, substances, or deities. This is not the ordinary confession of three hypostases, which retains one numerically undivided divine essence.

Ecclesial response: Chalcedonian and non-Chalcedonian bishops both rejected the three-nature conclusion; Alexandrian censures and the Constantinopolitan negotiations of 567 document the immediate response. John Damascene preserved and refuted a Philoponan extract with *On Heresies* 83. No extant Catholic ecumenical decree supplies a separate list against Philoponus, so the controlling positive norm is the received Nicene-Constantinopolitan confession of one essence in three persons.

Aftermath and qualification: The ecclesial party fragmented, while Philoponus's philosophical and scientific works circulated independently of the censure. Later use of *tritheism* is often polemical; speaking of three persons, centers of relation, or personal acts does not establish belief in three gods.

3.19 Agnoetes and Christ's human knowledge

Object and setting: Themistius, a sixth-century Alexandrian deacon, gave his name to Agnoete teaching within an anti-Chalcedonian setting. His relevant work and Eulogius of Alexandria's answer are lost; later extracts and Gregory the Great's correspondence preserve the issue. Evidence grade B/C.

Propositions at issue: The attributed proposition says that Christ, according to his humanity, was actually ignorant of the day and hour of judgment and of facts such as Lazarus's burial place. The question is not whether Christ possessed a genuinely human mode of knowing or could refrain from revealing knowledge, but whether personal ignorance could be predicated of the incarnate Wisdom in the asserted sense.

Ecclesial response: Patriarch Eulogius wrote against the Agnoetes. Gregory the Great endorsed that response in his *Register*, book 10, letter 39 in the older English numbering, arguing that the incarnate Son knew the day and hour in his humanity through the divine person, though not from the human nature as its source. This was a papal theological judgment in correspondence, not an ecumenical canon.

Aftermath and qualification: The named party soon disappears from clear evidence, while the exegesis of Mark 13:32 continued. Later Catholic theology developed more exact accounts of Christ's human knowledge; those debates should not be collapsed into Themistianism without the specific denial censured here.

4 Seventh to Tenth Centuries: Christ's Will, Images, and Carolingian Controversies

The principal universal definitions of these centuries concern Christ's human willing and the legitimacy of sacred images. Other disputes were local, imperial, or entangled with jurisdiction. The section therefore includes source-limited eastern movements and two major controversies that should not be mislabeled as simple universal heresies.

4.1 Monoenergism, Monothelitism, and Christ's human will

Object and setting: Seventh-century efforts to reconcile Chalcedonians and non-Chalcedonians proposed one operation and later one will in Christ. Sergius of Constantinople, Cyrus of Alexandria, emperors Heraclius and Constans II, Maximus the Confessor, Pope Martin I, and Pope Honorius I entered successive phases. Letters, imperial edicts, and conciliar acts survive. Evidence grade A/B.

Propositions at issue: The rejected formulas made the one personal agent in Christ operate or will through only one divine-human energy or will, thereby failing to preserve the complete natural activity and free human obedience of the assumed humanity. Catholic dyothelitism does not posit two persons or two competing centers of moral rebellion.

Ecclesial response: The Lateran Synod of 649 under Martin I condemned the imperial *Ekthesis* and *Typos*, one operation, and one will. Constantinople III in 680–681 defined two natural wills and two natural operations in the one Christ, the human will freely following and never opposing the divine, and anathematized named promoters including Sergius, Cyrus, Pyrrhus, and Honorius. Pope Leo II confirmed the council in 682 and faulted Honorius for failing to preserve and defend the apostolic tradition; the exact Latin and Greek confirmation texts govern any account of his censure.

Aftermath and qualification: Imperial officials arrested Martin and Maximus, exiled them, and subjected Maximus to mutilation; those were civil punishments for resisting imperial policy, not conciliar penalties. The definition completed Chalcedon's protection of Christ's full humanity and made his human obedience central to the doctrine of salvation.

4.2 Paulicians: a Byzantine and Armenian source problem

Object and setting: Paulician communities appear in seventh- to ninth-century Armenian and Byzantine settings. Peter of Sicily, Photius, and other hostile Greek sources provide the principal systematic descriptions; securely attributable Paulician writings are scarce. The movement also became a military and political power on the imperial frontier. Evidence grade C/D.

Propositions at issue: Opponents attribute rejection of the Old Testament and ecclesial sacraments, a dualist contrast between the creator of this world and the heavenly God, docetic Christology, and rejection of the cross and images. Scholars dispute how much of that profile describes early Paulicians rather than later groups or heresiological templates.

Ecclesial response: Armenian and Byzantine ecclesiastical authorities refuted and anathematized Paulician teaching, while emperors alternated forced transfer, persecution, negotiation, and military action. No identified Roman papal or Catholic ecumenical act supplies a universal Paulician proposition list; the jurisdiction and source of every judgment must therefore remain explicit.

Aftermath and qualification: Imperial campaigns destroyed the Paulician state in the ninth century, but populations were resettled in Thrace and traditions continued under changing conditions. Similarities with Bogomils or western Cathars are historical leads, not proof of an unbroken institutional genealogy.

4.3 Iconoclasm and Nicaea II

Object and setting: Byzantine emperors supported removal or destruction of sacred images in two principal periods, while the council of Hieria in 754 gave the first period a conciliar rationale. Evidence for Leo III's earliest measures is later and contested; the acts and definition of Nicaea II in 787 are extensive. Evidence grade A/B.

Propositions at issue: Iconoclast theology argued that a material image of Christ either divided or confused his natures, that images lacked apostolic warrant, and that their veneration was idolatry. Defenders answered that the depictability of Christ follows from the Word's real Incarnation and that honor offered to an image is relative to its prototype.

Ecclesial response: Nicaea II annulled Hieria and ordered that images of Christ, Mary, angels, and saints be displayed and receive honorable reverence, lights, and incense, while reserving the true worship of adoration to the divine nature. It distinguished the image from the prototype and grounded depiction in the Incarnation. Pope Hadrian I received the council; defective translation and differing political settings complicated its Frankish reception.

Aftermath and qualification: Emperors renewed iconoclasm in 815; eastern veneration was finally restored in 843. Imperial confiscation, exile, corporal punishment, and destruction of art remain distinct from the doctrinal argument. Frankfurt in 794 rejected what its participants understood as a demand to adore images; it should not be described without qualification as a Frankish rejection of all sacred art or as a second ecumenical iconoclast council.

4.4 Spanish Adoptionism

Object and setting: Elipandus of Toledo and Felix of Urgell taught in the late eighth century that Christ could be called God's adopted son according to his humanity. The dispute crossed Muslim-ruled Iberia and the Carolingian realm; letters, professions, and Alcuin's refutations survive. Evidence grade A/B.

Propositions at issue: The contested formula distinguished Christ as natural Son in divinity and adopted son in humanity. Its opponents judged that, despite an intended defense of two natures, it divided the one Son into natural and adoptive subjects and made his human sonship analogous to the grace of ordinary Christians.

Ecclesial response: The synod of Regensburg in 792 rejected Felix's teaching and received a recantation. The Council of Frankfurt in 794 condemned the adoptionist formula; Pope Hadrian I and Roman teaching supported the judgment. After renewed controversy, Felix made a further profession before the Council of Aachen in 799. The positive answer was that the humanity belongs personally to the eternal natural Son: Christ is not first another human son subsequently adopted.

Aftermath and qualification: Elipandus did not submit, while the organized controversy waned after Felix's confinement and death. "Adoptionism" also names much earlier and later theories; shared vocabulary alone does not prove a continuous school from Theodotus or Paul of Samosata.

4.5 Gottschalk and the Carolingian predestination dispute

Object and setting: Gottschalk of Orbais, a monk and priest, defended a twofold predestination during the ninth century. His confessions survive alongside works by Rabanus Maurus, Hincmar of Reims, John Scottus Eriugena, Ratramnus, and others. Several regional councils disagreed about the sound Augustinian formula. Evidence grade A.

Propositions at issue: Gottschalk taught divine predestination of the elect to salvation and of the reprobate to just punishment. His opponents feared that his language made God predestine sin or denied a genuine saving will; Gottschalk denied that God causes evil. Judicial summaries and his own confessions therefore must be compared rather than conflated.

Ecclesial response: Mainz in 848 condemned his teaching and handed him to Hincmar; Quierzy in 849 deposed, flogged, and confined him. Hincmar's Quierzy capitula of 853 proposed one predestination to life, while Valence in 855 rejected parts of that formulation and defended a double destination carefully separated from divine causation of sin. No ecumenical council or final papal definition converted one local formula into a universal list of heresies.

Aftermath and qualification: Gottschalk remained confined until his death and apparently refused the demanded profession. The corporal punishment was imposed through Carolingian ecclesiastical power and monastic custody and should not be confused with a dogmatic definition. The durable Catholic boundary is God's gracious initiative and just judgment without predestination of anyone to commit evil.

4.6 The Photian rupture: schism and contested jurisdiction

Object and setting: The deposition of Ignatius and elevation of Photius to Constantinople, rival Roman and Constantinopolitan synods, mission in Bulgaria, papal jurisdiction, and the western creed addition converged in the ninth-century rupture. Extensive acts and letters survive, but later East and West received the councils of 869–870 and 879–880 differently. Evidence grade A/B.

Propositions at issue: There was no single proposition constituting "the Photian heresy." Disputes concerned the legality of episcopal deposition and restoration, the extent of Roman appellate and jurisdictional claims, Latin missionary practice, and whether the *filioque* was theologically sound and could be inserted into the creed unilaterally.

Ecclesial response: Roman councils under Nicholas I condemned Photius; a Constantinopolitan council in 867 condemned Nicholas. Constantinople IV in 869–870, received by the Catholic Church as ecumenical, deposed Photius and legislated against irregular intrusion into sees. The council of 879–880 restored Photius and communion with Rome under John VIII, though the authority and later interpretation of its acts remain disputed.

Aftermath and qualification: Communion was restored, so 867 was not an uninterrupted beginning of the 1054 separation. Catholics confess the Spirit's procession from Father and Son while recognizing the legitimate Greek formula through the Son; the jurisdictional and creedal questions require their own history, not a flat label applied to all Byzantine Christians.

4.7 Bogomils: tenth-century Balkan dualism

Object and setting: Bogomil preaching arose in tenth-century Bulgaria and later spread through Byzantine and Balkan lands. The priest Cosmas's *Sermon against the Heretics* is an early hostile witness; fuller descriptions by Euthymius Zigabenus and others are later. Evidence grade C, with direct ritual or apocryphal texts requiring separate attribution.

Propositions at issue: The sources attribute a dualist creation myth, rejection or spiritualization of baptism and Eucharist, repudiation of the cross, images, church buildings, and hierarchy, and a rigorous ascetical division

between perfected adherents and ordinary hearers. Regional and chronological differences make a single Bogomil creed unsafe.

Ecclesial response: Bulgarian and Byzantine clergy answered from one good Creator, the true Incarnation, sacramental regeneration, and the visible Church. Byzantine synods and emperors condemned leaders; the later trial and execution of Basil under Alexios I belongs to the early twelfth-century aftermath and was an imperial capital act, not a tenth-century Roman decree.

Aftermath and qualification: Bogomil communities or accusations appear for centuries in Balkan sources. Contacts with western dualists are plausible in some settings, but lexical resemblance and migration do not establish that every Cathar group was simply transplanted Bogomilism.

5 Eleventh to Thirteenth Centuries: Sacrament, Dualism, Poverty, and Schools

The word *heresy* now operated within a denser system of canon law, papal government, universities, and secular enforcement. Some groups left their own books; others survive only as names in legislation or portraits by missionaries and inquisitors. The repeated medieval machinery of suppression does not itself prove that every named group held one theology.

5.1 Berengar of Tours and Eucharistic conversion

Object and setting: Berengar of Tours questioned accounts of Eucharistic conversion in the mid-eleventh century. His surviving works, opponents such as Lanfranc, and several professions document a controversy whose vocabulary changed across repeated proceedings. Evidence grade A/B.

Propositions at issue: Berengar resisted a substantial conversion that leaves only the appearances of bread and wine and emphasized sacramental signification. Opponents charged him with leaving ordinary bread and wine after consecration. His precise position developed, so one recantation formula cannot simply be treated as his lifelong creed.

Ecclesial response: Roman and regional councils from 1050 onward condemned his teaching. The Roman profession of 1059 used strongly physical language; under Gregory VII, the Roman council of 1079 required a more carefully framed profession that bread and wine are substantially converted into Christ's true body and blood. Lateran IV constitution 1 in 1215 supplied the durable conciliar term: bread and wine are transubstantiated by divine power.

Aftermath and qualification: Berengar submitted, again disputed interpretation, and finally reconciled. The supersession of the 1059 formula by the 1079 settlement cautions against presenting every demanded profession as an equally exact timeless definition. The controversy helped refine sacramental realism while preserving sacramental mode from crude cannibalistic interpretation.

5.2 The rupture of 1054 and the limits of a heresy label

Object and setting: Centuries of linguistic, political, liturgical, and jurisdictional estrangement formed the background to the exchange of censures between Cardinal Humbert's legation and Patriarch Michael Cerularius in 1054. The texts survive, but the papal authority of the legates after Leo IX's death and the scope of both sentences require qualification. Evidence grade A/B.

Propositions at issue: The controversy included Roman primacy, the western addition of the *filioque*, use of leavened or unleavened Eucharistic bread, clerical discipline, and mutual accusations assembled from old heresiological labels. No one proposition or date created a homogeneous "Orthodox heresy," and the legatine bull did not excommunicate every eastern Christian.

Ecclesial response: Humbert placed a bull against Cerularius and specified associates on the altar of Hagia Sophia; a Constantinopolitan synod anathematized the legates. Later reunion councils at Lyons II in 1274 and Florence in 1439 confessed papal primacy and the procession of the Holy Spirit while respecting legitimate eastern

rites. The 1054 acts were mutual disciplinary censures within a broader doctrinal and ecclesiological dispute, not an ecumenical dogmatic definition.

Aftermath and qualification: Communion continued locally after 1054 but separation hardened through later events, especially the Latin sack of Constantinople in 1204. Paul VI and Athenagoras removed the 1054 sentences from living ecclesial memory in 1965; they did not declare remaining disagreements solved or erase the history that produced them.

5.3 Tanchelm: a dossier preserved by accusers

Object and setting: Tanchelm preached in the Low Countries early in the twelfth century and was entangled in a political dispute over the church of Utrecht. A letter of the Utrecht canons to Archbishop Frederick of Cologne, written about 1112–1114, and a later life of Norbert of Xanten are the principal witnesses; no writing by Tanchelm survives. Evidence grade C/D.

Propositions at issue: The Utrecht letter attributes a Donatist-like dependence of sacramental efficacy upon a minister's holiness, rejection of clerical authority and tithes, extraordinary claims for Tanchelm's own reception of the Holy Spirit, and a personal cult. Its sexual and ceremonial allegations use conventional heresiological motifs and cannot be treated as independently verified propositions.

Ecclesial response: The canons asked Frederick to detain and judge Tanchelm and associates; the surviving letter is an accusation, not a preserved synodal sentence. Norbert later preached at Antwerp in defense of Catholic ministry and Eucharistic communion. No extant papal or ecumenical act names Tanchelm, and reports of a Cologne proceeding do not preserve an authoritative proposition list.

Aftermath and qualification: Tanchelm was killed by an individual cleric or attendant, not executed under an extant conciliar sentence. His following soon disappears from identifiable evidence. Later references to Tanchelmites repeat the same accusatory dossier; the surviving evidence identifies neither an organized church nor a genetic link to other medieval dissenters.

5.4 Petrobrusians and Henricians

Object and setting: Peter of Bruys preached in southern France in the early twelfth century; Henry of Lausanne led a related but not identical reform movement. Neither left an extant doctrinal book. Peter the Venerable's *Against the Petrobrusians*, Bernard of Clairvaux, and ecclesiastical reports are principal witnesses. Evidence grade C.

Propositions at issue: Peter the Venerable attributes rejection of infant baptism, church buildings and altars, veneration of the cross, the Eucharistic sacrifice and real presence, and prayers or offerings for the dead. Henry's preaching stressed clerical corruption and unauthorized ministry; the degree to which he shared Peter's fivefold program remains uncertain.

Ecclesial response: Local bishops and preachers opposed both movements. Lateran II canon 23 in 1139 anathematized those who condemned the Eucharist, infant baptism, priesthood and sacred orders, or lawful marriage; it provides an authoritative doctrinal boundary but does not name Peter or Henry or prove that each follower held every item. Bernard's mission answered Henry pastorally and sacramentally.

Aftermath and qualification: Peter was killed by a crowd, not executed by a council; Henry was arrested and disappears from secure evidence. Later medieval polemic sometimes made them ancestors of unrelated dissent. With no movement archive, direct descent into Waldensian or Cathar communities cannot be presumed.

5.5 Peter Abelard's censured propositions

Object and setting: Peter Abelard's theological and ethical works were examined at Soissons in 1121 and again at Sens, whose disputed date is conventionally given as 1140 or 1141. Abelard's writings survive, but the capitula prepared by opponents excerpt and combine them. Evidence grade A/B for the texts and B for the exact judicial construction.

Propositions at issue: The Sens dossier raised claims about the divine persons and attributes, an identification of the Holy Spirit with the world-soul, limits upon what God can do, inherited guilt, the purpose of the Incarnation, and whether culpability lies solely in conscious contempt. The list must be checked against Abelard's context; it was not a confession of a school, and the later papal act did not assign a separate theological grade to each item.

Ecclesial response: Soissons required Abelard to burn his first Trinitarian book and imposed monastic custody. At Sens he appealed before the full hearing concluded. Two papal letters followed in July 1141: Innocent II's *Testante apostolo* confirmed condemnation of the transmitted propositions and writings in the aggregate and imposed silence upon Abelard, while a separate mandate ordered Abelard and Arnold of Brescia confined and their erroneous books destroyed. The censure is *in globo*, not a warrant to call every extracted sentence formally heretical.

Aftermath and qualification: Peter the Venerable received Abelard at Cluny and mediated a reconciliation with Bernard of Clairvaux; Abelard died as a monk in 1142. His logical and theological work remained influential. No Abelardian sect survived, and his submission belongs to the record as essentially as the censure.

5.6 Arnold of Brescia and the Arnoldists

Object and setting: Arnold of Brescia combined a reforming attack on clerical wealth with political action in the Roman commune. His own writings are lost; Bernard of Clairvaux, John of Salisbury, Otto of Freising, and papal records are interested witnesses. "Arnoldists" later appears as a group name in *Ad abolendam*. Evidence grade C.

Propositions at issue: Opponents attribute the claim that clergy owning property, bishops exercising temporal lordship, and perhaps monks possessing goods could not validly or worthily exercise sacred ministry. The precise step from a moral demand for apostolic poverty to denial of sacramental authority is difficult to recover from the surviving polemic.

Ecclesial response: Arnold was condemned in connection with Lateran II in 1139 and later excommunicated; Eugenius III and Adrian IV opposed his Roman program. *Ad abolendam* in 1184 named Arnoldists among groups subject to anathema. Catholic reform distinguished the need to correct clerical avarice from a theory that temporal possession by itself extinguishes orders or sacramental power.

Aftermath and qualification: Frederick Barbarossa's officials captured Arnold, and Roman civil authority executed and burned him in 1155; the death was not a conciliar sentence. Later use of his name for anti-clerical groups does not establish a continuous organized Arnoldist church.

5.7 Gilbert of Poitiers at Reims

Object and setting: Gilbert, bishop of Poitiers and commentator on Boethius, answered doctrinal accusations before Eugene III at Paris in 1147 and Reims in 1148. Gilbert's commentaries survive, but the proceeding is reconstructed from Otto of Freising, John of Salisbury, Geoffrey of Auxerre, and other reports that differ about wording and outcome. Evidence grade B/C.

Propositions at issue: The reported issues concern whether a real distinction between God and divinity makes the divine essence something other than God; how the one essence is predicated of the three persons; whether divine attributes are identical with God; and in what sense the divine nature was incarnate. These technical questions cannot be reduced safely to the slogan that Gilbert taught four gods.

Ecclesial response: Eugene III and the cardinals required formulations preserving the identity of God and the one simple divine essence, the unity of the three persons in that essence, and the true Incarnation of the Son. No signed conciliar canons or papal bull of condemnation survives. Gilbert accepted the required corrections, amended disputed language, and retained his see; reports do not support a final personal verdict of obstinate heresy.

Aftermath and qualification: Gilbert's school continued to shape scholastic semantics and Trinitarian analysis within Catholic theology. The Reims settlement illustrates correction without creation of a lasting named heresy: later technical distinctions must be assessed on their own meaning, not called Gilbertine by association.

5.8 Cathars or Albigensians: diverse western dualisms

Object and setting: From the mid-twelfth century, western sources describe dualist teachers and ritual communities under names including Cathars, Albigensians, Patarenes, and “good Christians.” The *Book of the Two Principles* and ritual texts preserve some insiders’ voices, while sermons, polemics, and inquisitorial depositions dominate other regions. Evidence ranges from A to C; modern scholars dispute the cohesion of a trans-European Cathar church.

Propositions at issue: Documented groups distinguished the good spiritual God from the maker or ruler of the visible world, rejected Catholic baptism and Eucharist, and treated the *consolamentum* as the decisive rite. Some taught two eternal principles; others made the evil principle derivative. Ascetical rejection of marriage and animal food belonged especially to the perfected, not necessarily every hearer.

Ecclesial response: Lateran III canon 27 in 1179 and Lucius III’s *Ad abolendam* in 1184 condemned named dualist groups and their protectors. Lateran IV constitution 1 in 1215 answered with one Creator of visible and invisible things, the goodness of created nature, one incarnate Christ, and sacramental baptism and Eucharist; constitution 3 established procedures and penalties against heretics. Dominican and other preaching missions supplied a pastoral and theological response.

Aftermath and qualification: The Albigensian Crusade from 1209, confiscations, inquisitorial imprisonment, and executions were military, civil, and penal responses distinct from the creed. Organized dualist communities declined by the fourteenth century. Neither the evidence nor genetic metaphor justifies identifying modern dissenters as a surviving Cathar church.

5.9 Waldensians or the Poor of Lyons

Object and setting: Valdes of Lyons embraced apostolic poverty and vernacular preaching in the 1170s. His followers first sought ecclesiastical recognition; reports of Lateran III, *Ad abolendam*, professions, and later Waldensian texts show development rather than one founding doctrinal manifesto. Evidence grade A/B.

Propositions at issue: The original conflict concerned lay preaching without episcopal authorization. Later branches rejected oaths, capital punishment, purgatory, indulgences, and aspects of sacramental and hierarchical authority, but those later positions cannot all be attributed to Valdes at the beginning.

Ecclesial response: Alexander III reportedly praised the poverty ideal while withholding authorization to preach without local approval. *Ad abolendam* in 1184 excommunicated the Poor of Lyons for unauthorized preaching among other named groups. Innocent III received Durand of Huesca and others through a detailed profession of faith in 1208 and approved Catholic Poor communities, showing that reconciliation and ordered preaching were real alternatives to suppression.

Aftermath and qualification: Some communities reconciled; others developed separate ministries and survived persecution into the Reformation, when they entered Reformed Protestant alliances. Civil banishment and executions varied by territory. Present Waldensian churches should be described through their current confession, not solely by a twelfth-century disciplinary sentence.

5.10 The Humiliati: condemnation followed by reconciliation

Object and setting: The Humiliati began as lay penitential and working communities in northern Italy. Their organization contained different clerical, communal, and household forms; “Humiliati” in a prohibition does not denote an unchanging doctrinal sect. Papal letters and approved rules permit unusually clear institutional comparison. Evidence grade A/B.

Propositions at issue: The initial dispute concerned unauthorized assemblies and preaching rather than a surviving anti-sacramental creed. Some members continued to preach after prohibition; others sought a lawful form of common life and retained Catholic faith and sacraments.

Ecclesial response: *Ad abolendam* in 1184 censured those Humiliati or Poor of Lyons who presumed to preach without authorization. Under Innocent III, reconciled Humiliati received approved forms of life in 1201, with

preaching and common discipline regulated under ecclesial authority. The two acts target different institutional states and cannot honestly be summarized as “the Church declared the Humiliati heretical forever.”

Aftermath and qualification: The approved order became an important Catholic religious and economic institution before its suppression for disciplinary collapse in 1571. This history demonstrates why a survey must track submission, reform, and juridical identity rather than inherit a static catalogue label.

5.11 Passagians or Passagines

Object and setting: Passagians are named in late-twelfth-century legislation and described by the anti-heretical *Manifestatio* associated with Bonacursus and a *Summa against Heretics* once attributed to Praepositinus. No target-side text, leader, or institutional record survives. Evidence grade C/D.

Propositions at issue: The polemical witnesses attribute obligatory observance of Mosaic ceremonial law by Christians, including circumcision, Sabbath, and food rules, together with a subordinationist account of Christ and denial of the received Trinitarian confession. The several items may describe one group, several groups, or a literary construct; *Ad abolendam* itself states none of them.

Ecclesial response: Lucius III's decretal *Ad abolendam*, issued with the Verona assembly in 1184, placed the Passagians by name under anathema with other groups and established procedures against heresy. Later papal mandates repeated the canonical name. Those acts establish the classification and jurisdictional response, while the proposition content remains dependent upon the separate polemical tracts.

Aftermath and qualification: No secure Passagian history can be followed beyond scattered legal repetition. Their attributed Mosaic observance must not be projected onto Jews, Jewish converts, or later Christian Sabbath observance, and repetition of a form letter is not evidence that a stable sect persisted in every named territory.

5.12 Josephines: a name without recoverable propositions

Object and setting: The Josephines or Josepini are securely known only because *Ad abolendam* lists them between Passagians and Arnoldists. Later attempts to identify them with a Paulician leader named Joseph, a Cathar subgroup, or another medieval movement are conjectural. Evidence grade D.

Propositions at issue: No securely attributable Josephine proposition, book, leader, rite, or locality survives. The name therefore cannot support claims about dualism, Christology, sacraments, morals, or relation to Judaism. This dossier records the evidentiary absence rather than filling it from neighboring names in the decree.

Ecclesial response: *Ad abolendam* in 1184 subjected the named Josephines to anathema and the decree's procedural consequences. The act is an authoritative censure of a named object but contains no doctrinal specification by which a modern historian could identify an individual adherent.

Aftermath and qualification: Canonical and heresiological lists sometimes repeated the name, but no independent aftermath is recoverable. Josephines remain in the census so that the legislative occurrence is not silently omitted; they cannot responsibly be narrated as a known heretical church.

5.13 Amalricians and propositions known through a prosecution

Object and setting: Followers associated with the Paris master Amalric of Bène were investigated at Paris in 1210 after Amalric's death. Reports by Caesarius of Heisterbach, William the Breton, university and conciliar material preserve the case; no full Amalrician doctrinal book survives. Evidence grade B/C.

Propositions at issue: Sources attribute an undifferentiated presence of God in all things, an eschatological age of the Spirit in which ordinary sacraments and moral distinctions cease, and denial of bodily resurrection or final punishment. Which propositions belonged to Amalric, which to particular disciples, and which were judicial synthesis remains disputed.

Ecclesial response: A provincial process at Paris condemned the accused; some recanted and received imprisonment, while unrepentant clerics were degraded and handed to secular power. Lateran IV constitution 2 in 1215

reprobated Amalric's teaching and described it as "not so much heretical as insane," a deliberately distinctive censure rather than an exact proposition list.

Aftermath and qualification: Secular authorities burned several convicted followers and exhumed Amalric's body; those acts were civil aftermath. "Amaurian" later became a loose label for pantheist or antinomian claims, so apparent recurrence requires new evidence.

5.14 David of Dinant and the *Quaternuli*

Object and setting: David of Dinant wrote philosophical notebooks known as the *Quaternuli*. The work is mostly lost, though fragments and summaries in Albert the Great, Thomas Aquinas, university records, and other scholastic witnesses permit a limited reconstruction. His relation to the Amalricians is unproved. Evidence grade B/C.

Propositions at issue: Opponents attribute an identity of God, prime matter, and intellect, so that all reality reduces to one underlying substance. Because much of the formulation comes from refuters applying their own metaphysical vocabulary, it is safer to identify the alleged identity proposition than to call David's whole philosophy a demonstrated pantheist system.

Ecclesial response: A provincial synod at Paris in 1210 ordered David's *Quaternuli* burned and prohibited their use. Robert of Courçon's university statutes of 1215 renewed the reading prohibition while also regulating Aristotle's natural works. Lateran IV condemned Amalric's specified teaching but did not name David; the local academic acts must not be converted into an ecumenical sentence.

Aftermath and qualification: David's personal fate is uncertain and no organized Davidian community is documented. The prohibitions stimulated refutation by later scholastics, but the eventual Catholic reception of Aristotle shows that a temporary university ban on books was not a condemnation of philosophy or natural inquiry as such.

5.15 Joachim of Fiore's Trinitarian proposition

Object and setting: Joachim of Fiore was an abbot and scriptural theologian who died in 1202 after submitting his works to Roman judgment. Lateran IV considered his lost treatise against Peter Lombard; later "Joachite" apocalyptic movements drew selectively on a wider corpus. Evidence grade B for the condemned text, A for the conciliar response.

Propositions at issue: Joachim accused Lombard of positing a fourth reality in God and described the unity of Father, Son, and Spirit through a collective analogy that the council judged insufficient to confess one simple divine essence. This specific Trinitarian error must be distinguished from Joachim's periodization of history and from later claims about an imminent spiritual age.

Ecclesial response: Lateran IV constitution 2 defended Lombard's confession: each divine person is the one undivided divine reality, and no similarity between Creator and creature is so great that an even greater dissimilarity is absent. It condemned anyone defending the specified error but expressly declined to disparage the Florentine monastery, because Joachim had submitted his writings to the Apostolic See.

Aftermath and qualification: Joachim was not personally sentenced as an obstinate heretic by the council. Later Spiritual Franciscans and apocalyptic writers adapted his schemes in ways requiring separate judgment; the condemnation of one Trinitarian argument is not a censure of every work or every use of a threefold historical pattern.

5.16 The Eternal Gospel and radical Joachimite reception

Object and setting: Gerard of Borgo San Donnino's lost *Introductorius in Evangelium aeternum*, circulated at Paris in 1254 with works of Joachim of Fiore, transformed Joachim's historical exegesis into a more radical program. Its content survives principally in extracts assembled by opponents and the Anagni commission. Evidence grade B/C.

Propositions at issue: The extracted claims identify Joachim's books with an eternal gospel that would supersede the New Testament, place the decisive transition to the age of the Spirit about 1260, and imply that the existing Church's sacraments, hierarchy, or scriptural economy belonged to a passing age. These are Gerard's attributed conclusions and later Joachimite developments, not propositions condemned as Joachim's own in Lateran IV.

Ecclesial response: A cardinal commission at Anagni examined and censured the *Introductorius* in 1255 under Alexander IV, and its circulation was suppressed. The surviving protocol, rather than a universal papal constitution with a numbered censure, controls the account. Franciscan superiors removed Gerard from ministry and confined him; that internal penalty was distinct from the proposition-level examination.

Aftermath and qualification: Apocalyptic expectations continued among some Spiritual Franciscans and through pseudonymous Joachimite works, while other readers used Joachim without the supersession claim. Gerard died in religious confinement. Neither Franciscan poverty nor a theology of historical development is by itself radical Joachimism.

5.17 Paris 1270 and 1277: local censures of propositions

Object and setting: Bishop Stephen Tempier of Paris censured thirteen propositions in 1270 and 219 propositions on 7 March 1277 amid disputes over Aristotelian philosophy, Latin Averroism, and the limits of theology. The list and preamble survive; attribution to Siger of Brabant, Boethius of Dacia, Thomas Aquinas, or an organized "Averroist party" varies by proposition. Evidence grade A/B.

Propositions at issue: The lists address one intellect for all humans, denial of personal immortality, cosmic necessity, eternity of the world, constraints upon divine omnipotence, and claims that philosophical demonstration can establish conclusions contrary to faith. They also contain technical theses with no proven defender and propositions whose meaning depends on scholastic context.

Ecclesial response: Tempier prohibited teaching the listed propositions in his diocese and attached excommunication, acting as local bishop rather than an ecumenical council. Archbishop Robert Kilwardby issued a separate Oxford condemnation in 1277. The positive boundary protected creation, providence, divine freedom and omnipotence, personal intellect and responsibility, and the unity of truth.

Aftermath and qualification: The censures redirected university debate but did not make all 219 articles dogmatic definitions or every Aristotelian a heretic. A Parisian act in 1325 revoked the condemnation insofar as it touched Thomas Aquinas. Historians continue to dispute the list's influence upon later science; simple causal triumphalism is unwarranted.

5.18 Apostolic Brethren and Dolcinians

Object and setting: Gerard Segarelli founded the Apostolic Brethren near Parma about 1260 in imitation of apostolic poverty. After his execution in 1300, Fra Dolcino led a more militant apocalyptic remnant until 1307. Papal prohibitions, chronicles, and inquisitorial descriptions dominate; Dolcino's reported letters survive indirectly. Evidence grade B/C.

Propositions at issue: Early conflict concerned an unauthorized religious order and preaching after suppression. Later Dolcinian teaching joined radical poverty to an apocalyptic succession of church ages, denunciation of a corrupt hierarchy, and the claim that the remnant represented the true apostolic church. Judicial sources may systematize beliefs that changed under persecution.

Ecclesial response: Lyons II constitution 23, *Religionum diversitatem nimiam*, prohibited new religious orders without naming Segarelli's group. Honorius IV's *Olim felicitis recordationis* of 1286 applied that rule and ordered the Apostolics to disband; Nicholas IV renewed the command in 1290. Continued defiance brought inquisitorial prosecution and classification as heresy.

Aftermath and qualification: Segarelli and later Dolcino and Margaret were executed by secular authorities after ecclesiastical proceedings; military forces also destroyed the Dolcinian refuge. Their deaths were not penalties written into Lyons II's religious-order canon. The later militant phase should not be projected wholesale onto every early penitent attracted to Segarelli.

6 Fourteenth Century through Lateran V: Poverty, Authority, and Reform

The late medieval record is unusually rich in decretals, conciliar acts, university determinations, inquisitorial files, and civil statutes. That abundance does not make its labels simple. Mystical propositions were sometimes attributed to a supposed sect on the basis of hostile reports; evangelical-poverty disputes moved between discipline and doctrine; reform movements divided internally; and ecclesiastical judgments often preceded distinct civil punishments.

6.1 The Templars: allegations, suppression, and the absence of a definitive heresy judgment

Object and setting: Philip IV of France arrested the Knights Templar in 1307 and promoted accusations that admission rites required denial of Christ, spitting on the cross, illicit kisses, permission of sodomy, worship of a head or idol, and unauthorized absolution. Records contain admissions, denials, retractions, and regional acquittals; torture and coercive custody materially compromise many confessions. Evidence grade A for the proceedings, C for a uniform secret creed.

Propositions at issue: The alleged acts, if freely performed and believed, could involve apostasy, sacrilege, sexual wrongdoing, superstition, or usurpation of sacramental power. The evidence does not establish that the international order corporately professed one coherent heresy, and the charges should not be converted into propositions the Templars are known to have taught.

Ecclesial response: Clement V ordered a church-wide inquiry after the French arrests. At Vienne, the bull *Vox in excelso* of 22 March 1312 suppressed the order by apostolic provision because scandal and suspicion made its continuation impracticable; it expressly did not proceed by a definitive judicial sentence establishing the order's guilt. *Ad providam* transferred most property to the Hospitallers, while individual cases were reserved or returned to competent tribunals.

Aftermath and qualification: Philip's officers had initiated imprisonment and torture, and French secular authority burned fifty-four Templars in 1310 and the relapsed leaders Jacques de Molay and Geoffroi de Charney in 1314. Those executions were not a conciliar definition. The case belongs in the census because it became a paradigmatic heresy prosecution, but its historically specific conclusion is suppression amid unproved corporate allegations, not a Templar heresy with settled articles.

6.2 Vienne on the rational soul as form of the body

Object and setting: Medieval theologians disputed how the intellectual soul, bodily life, and subordinate vital powers constitute one human being. The Council of Vienne's decree is anonymous; although its history is often connected with propositions attributed to Peter John Olivi, the act names no author or organized sect. Evidence grade A for the definition, B/C for its intended personal target.

Propositions at issue: The delimited error asserts or doubts that the substance of the rational or intellectual soul is of itself and essentially the form of the human body. The definition protects the substantial unity of a true human body and rational soul; it does not by itself decide every scholastic question about subordinate forms, faculties, individuation, or embryology.

Ecclesial response: Vienne's first doctrinal decree, approved in 1312 and later promulgated in the *Clementines*, rejected the contrary proposition as erroneous and opposed to Catholic truth. It defined that anyone who thereafter stubbornly asserts, defends, or holds it is to be considered a heretic. The personal classification therefore includes the act's express condition of future obstinate adherence.

Aftermath and qualification: The definition became a controlling premise of Catholic anthropology and was later recalled by Lateran V. No historical evidence warrants inventing a Vienne soul-form sect or declaring every theologian whose technical account differs from Thomism a condemned heretic.

6.3 Beguards, Beguines, and propositions attributed to the Free Spirit

Object and setting: Beguines and Beguards formed diverse, usually local communities of lay religious life without one rule or central government. Alongside orthodox houses, inquisitors and theologians reported antinomian or quietist teachings under the label *Free Spirit*. Marguerite Porete's *Mirror of Simple Souls*, condemned at Paris before her execution in 1310, is an identifiable text; it is not a creed for every Beguine. Evidence grade A for the conciliar text, B/C for the extent and membership of a sect.

Propositions at issue: The eight errors recited in the Council of Vienne decree *Ad nostrum* include claims that a person can reach such perfection as to become impeccable; that the perfected need neither fast nor pray nor obey ordinary moral commands; that sensual acts cannot be sinful when nature seeks them; that the perfected soul need not reverence the Eucharist; and that beatific vision is naturally attainable in this life. These are condemned propositions recorded by the council, not demonstrated beliefs of all people called Beguines or Beguards.

Ecclesial response: Vienne in 1311–1312 condemned the eight propositions and those who knowingly and obstinately maintained them; John XXII promulgated the decree in the *Clementines* in 1317. The companion decree *Cum de quibusdam mulieribus* restricted an unapproved Beguine status while expressly leaving room for faithful women who lived honorably in penance. Local investigations still had to establish what a particular person had actually held.

Aftermath and qualification: Some communities were suppressed, some were examined and allowed to continue, and others were regularized or affiliated with approved orders. *Free Spirit* remained a mobile polemical and judicial category. Neither the execution of Porete by secular authority nor Vienne's censure licenses a collective judgment on medieval laywomen's spirituality.

6.4 Spiritual Franciscans and the Fraticelli

Object and setting: Disputes within the Franciscan family concerned observance of poverty, papal regulation of the rule, and apocalyptic claims about the order and Church. The terms *Spirituals*, *fraticelli*, and the many groups called *bizochi* were overlapping but not interchangeable. Papal constitutions document the acts well; much evidence about dissident networks comes from prosecutors. Evidence grade A/B.

Propositions at issue: The first conflict often concerned refusal of commands about habit, storehouses, or community life, which was disciplinary. Some separatists then claimed that the carnal Roman Church had forfeited authority and that their community alone was the true spiritual Church. A later, precisely framed dispute concerned the assertion that Christ and the apostles possessed nothing, either individually or in common, and that this total absence of ownership was a doctrine of Scripture.

Ecclesial response: John XXII's *Quorumdam exigit* in 1317 commanded obedience on disputed observances; *Sancta Romana* later that year suppressed unauthorized communities; and *Gloriosam Ecclesiam* in 1318 condemned errors attributed to an obstinate Sicilian group. In *Cum inter nonnullos* in 1323, John declared the categorical no-ownership assertion erroneous and heretical. The acts therefore range from governance of an order to censure of specified ecclesiological and poverty propositions.

Aftermath and qualification: Four Spiritual Franciscans were burned by civil authority at Marseille in 1318 after refusing submission, and later Fraticelli communities faced inquisitorial and secular suppression. Other strict Franciscans remained or were reconciled within the Church, eventually contributing to observant reform. Zeal for poverty as such was not condemned; the decisive issues were the proposition asserted and, in some cases, contumacious separation.

6.5 Marsilius of Padua, John of Jandun, and ecclesial coercive power

Object and setting: Marsilius's *Defensor pacis*, written in 1324 with assistance or association traditionally assigned to John of Jandun, joined a theory of political sovereignty to claims about the Church. Both men entered the protection of Louis of Bavaria during his conflict with John XXII. The book and papal act survive. Evidence grade A.

Propositions at issue: The papal summary selected five conclusions: Christ's payment of tribute was treated as compelled subjection to temporal power; Peter was denied any headship over the other apostles and Christ any appointment of a vicar; the emperor was said to possess authority to appoint, punish, or depose a pope; all priests were made equal in jurisdiction by divine institution; and coercive punishment of religious error was reserved to the civil legislator. The larger work also located supreme legislative authority in the body of citizens and treated ecclesiastical law as lacking coercive force without civil enactment.

Ecclesial response: John XXII's constitution *Licet iuxta doctrinam*, 23 October 1327, extracted and condemned the five propositions as contrary to Scripture and Catholic faith, with differentiated theological reasoning. The censure arose within a papal-imperial struggle, but it addressed identifiable claims about apostolic primacy, orders, jurisdiction, and the Church's authority rather than merely Marsilius's political allegiance.

Aftermath and qualification: Marsilius was never brought to a completed personal trial at Avignon and died under imperial protection. His political ecclesiology influenced later conciliar and state-sovereignty arguments, but that intellectual reception does not make every advocate of representative government a Marsilian. Imperial campaigns and penalties for treason or rebellion belong to the political history, not to the content of the doctrinal censure.

6.6 Meister Eckhart's twenty-eight propositions

Object and setting: Dominican theologian Meister Eckhart faced an inquisitorial inquiry at Cologne and appealed to Avignon. His Latin and German works, defense records, the Avignon report, and John XXII's bull preserve an unusually rich but textually difficult dossier. Extraction from sermons can remove paradox, qualification, or rhetorical setting. Evidence grade A/B.

Propositions at issue: The twenty-eight articles concern the relation of creation to God's eternity, claims that even evil acts manifest divine glory, detachment from created goods and reward, the deified person's relation to the Son and divine action, and an uncreated or uncreatable element in the soul. The bull itself acknowledges that eleven articles could bear a Catholic sense with explanations; no single pantheist slogan accurately represents all twenty-eight.

Ecclesial response: John XXII's *In agro dominico*, 27 March 1329, condemned the first fifteen and last two articles as heretical and the intervening eleven as evil-sounding, rash, and suspect of heresy. It directed proceedings against defenders according to those distinct grades rather than distributing one censure across all. The bull also recorded Eckhart's prior Catholic profession and revocation of anything in his preaching or writings capable of an heretical or erroneous sense.

Aftermath and qualification: Eckhart died before the bull and was not personally declared an obstinate heretic by it. His writings influenced later Catholic mysticism and are studied with renewed attention to context, while the proposition-level censures remain part of the record. Later reception cannot either erase the act or extend it to every expression of mystical union and deification.

6.7 The Black Death flagellants

Object and setting: Organized flagellant companies spread through central and northern Europe during the plague of 1348–1350. Public bodily penance had earlier orthodox precedents, but some companies followed unauthorized rituals, circulated a purported heavenly letter, claimed powers normally connected with sacramental ministry, and acted independently of bishops. Chronicles and the papal prohibition are principal witnesses. Evidence grade A/B, with considerable local variation.

Propositions at issue: Reports attribute salvific necessity or quasi-sacramental efficacy to a fixed course of scourging, lay absolution, contempt for clergy and sacraments, and the claim that the movement's letter conveyed a new divine mandate. No evidence warrants attributing every claim to every penitent. Voluntary self-discipline or public prayer, considered by itself, was not the condemned object.

Ecclesial response: Clement VI's *Inter sollicitudines*, 20 October 1349, ordered the unauthorized associations dissolved and directed bishops and secular rulers to restrain them, while permitting properly governed penitential practice. The response defended episcopal oversight, sacramental confession, and the sufficiency of public revelation against a self-authorizing movement.

Aftermath and qualification: Suppression varied by territory and included civil arrest and execution. Flagellant crowds were also entangled in anti-Jewish violence during the plague, but responsibility must be assigned to documented actors rather than to every procession. Later Catholic confraternities of discipline operated under ecclesiastical rule and are not continuations of the censured claims.

6.8 John Wyclif

Object and setting: The Oxford theologian John Wyclif developed positions on dominion, Eucharist, predestination, Scripture, and ecclesiastical office during the papal schism and English crown-clergy conflict. His own Latin and English works survive alongside proposition lists whose wording sometimes compresses or alters their context. Evidence grade A/B.

Propositions at issue: Censured propositions include the persistence of bread and wine after consecration and rejection of transubstantiation; an account of the Church primarily as the congregation of the predestined; claims that mortal sin or lack of grace defeats a prelate's true dominion; denial or radical restriction of papal jurisdiction; and assertions permitting temporal lords to remove church goods. Not every list gave each item the same grade, and Wyclif's appeals to Scripture cannot be reduced to a simple denial of all tradition.

Ecclesial response: Gregory XI's five letters of 22 May 1377 transmitted nineteen propositions for examination. The Blackfriars council at London in 1382 judged ten conclusions heretical and fourteen erroneous. The Council of Constance, session 8 on 4 May 1415, condemned forty-five articles and Wyclif's books, while distinguishing articles already condemned as heretical from others censured as erroneous, scandalous, or seditious; Martin V's *Inter cunctas* in 1418 supplied interrogatories for adherents. These are several acts with mixed censures, not one undifferentiated anathema.

Aftermath and qualification: Wyclif died in communion neither tried nor executed as a living convicted heretic. Constance ordered posthumous removal of his remains, carried out in 1428. His works influenced English Lollards and Bohemian reformers, but both receptions selected and altered his positions. English political restrictions and later civil penalties require separate attribution.

6.9 Lollardy as a diverse English reception

Object and setting: The label *Lollard* named networks of clerics, gentry, artisans, and readers influenced to different degrees by Wyclif from the 1380s onward. Trial records, manuscript books, episcopal registers, and the anonymous *Twelve Conclusions* presented to Parliament in 1395 show overlap without a single membership roll or confession. Evidence grade A/B.

Propositions at issue: Recurrent positions questioned transubstantiation, clerical celibacy, confession to priests, images and pilgrimage, prayers for the dead, papal authority, and the legitimacy of war or capital punishment. The *Twelve Conclusions* joined several of these to a program of church disendowment, but it cannot be assigned to every accused Lollard. Vernacular Scripture itself was not a heresy; unauthorized translation, teaching, and the doctrinal use made of texts were separately contested.

Ecclesial response: English bishops and the universities examined particular suspects and propositions under existing canon law. Archbishop Thomas Arundel's provincial constitutions, issued in 1409 after the Oxford deliberations, regulated vernacular biblical translation, preaching, schools, and theological teaching. They were a local disciplinary and preventive regime, not an ecumenical list of Lollard dogmas.

Aftermath and qualification: Parliament and the crown added the statute *De heretico comburendo* in 1401, authorizing secular burning after ecclesiastical conviction; later confiscations and executions were therefore mixed church-state proceedings. Recantation, penance, underground survival, and renewed activity during the Reformation all occurred. Accusation records must not be read as proof that a lay reader held Wyclif's complete theology.

6.10 Jan Hus and the Council of Constance

Object and setting: Jan Hus, a priest and preacher at Prague, combined Czech reform concerns with selective reception of Wyclif. His sermons, treatise *On the Church*, letters, trial record, and Constance's thirty articles permit comparison between his words and the council's judicial extracts. He denied having taught some formulations and disputed the condemned meaning of others. Evidence grade A/B.

Propositions at issue: The articles concerned the Church as the body of the predestined; whether a sinful or reprobate pope remains a true member and worthy minister of the Church; the conditions of ecclesiastical obedience and excommunication; the authority of morally corrupt prelates; and Hus's defense of censured Wycliffite propositions. Some statements could bear an orthodox qualified sense, while others were judged to undermine visible office and jurisdiction; attribution and sense were part of the trial dispute.

Ecclesial response: Constance's session 15 on 6 July 1415 condemned thirty articles, censured Hus's appeal and persistence, and declared him obstinate after he refused the demanded abjuration. Hus maintained that he could not recant errors he had never held and would retract anything shown false from Scripture; the tribunal did not accept that limitation. The council degraded him from clerical status and relinquished him to secular authority.

Aftermath and qualification: Secular officials of King Sigismund burned Hus the same day; the council did not itself carry out the execution. His death intensified a Bohemian religious and national crisis and made him a martyr to Hussite traditions. A historical account can state both the council's judgment and Hus's defense without retroactively declaring every Czech reform demand heretical.

6.11 Hussite and Utraquist currents

Object and setting: After Hus's death, Bohemian reform coalesced around the Four Articles of Prague: freer preaching, communion from the chalice for the laity, correction of public mortal sin, and limitation of clerical temporal power. Utraquists, Taborites, Orphans, and later Unitas Fratrum communities differed sharply in sacramental theology, ministry, and politics. Evidence grade A/B.

Propositions at issue: The central Utraquist claim made reception under both kinds a divine command or necessary practice for the laity. Radical Taborite teachers variously denied transubstantiation or the real presence, rejected sacramental forms and purgatory, and announced apocalyptic transformation; moderates did not share all such propositions. The chalice itself was not intrinsically heretical, since Christ is whole under either species and the Church has at times permitted both.

Ecclesial response: Constance session 13, 15 June 1415, taught the sufficiency of communion under either species and condemned as erroneous the unauthorized claim and practice that the chalice was necessary for the laity. Papal and imperial crusades against Bohemia were military measures distinct from that doctrinal decree. Negotiations with the Council of Basel produced the Compactata of 1436, permitting the chalice under specified Catholic teaching and discipline; Pius II later declared the settlement no longer binding in 1462.

Aftermath and qualification: The Bohemian wars ended neither by simple extermination nor wholesale Roman acceptance: Utraquist worship received a limited legal settlement, radical armies were defeated at Lipany in 1434, and communities developed along several confessional lines. Later permissions for communion under both kinds confirm that mode of reception and the doctrine attached to it must be distinguished.

6.12 Conciliarism and appeals from pope to council

Object and setting: The Great Western Schism made a general council the practical means of restoring one recognized pope and generated competing theories of ecclesial representation. Conciliarism in the strict sense held that a general council possesses authority over a pope, at least in matters of faith, schism, and reform; advocates differed over whether that superiority was exceptional or permanent. Evidence grade A, with disputed juridical reception of individual acts.

Propositions at issue: The contested propositions were not the legitimacy of councils, episcopal collegiality, or reform through synodal deliberation. They concerned whether a council derives jurisdiction immediately from

Christ in such a way that every Christian including a reigning pope is juridically bound to obey it, and whether an individual may evade a papal judgment by appealing to a future general council.

Ecclesial response: Constance session 5 issued *Haec sancta* in 1415 during the schism, and session 39 issued *Frequens* in 1417 to require regular councils. The authority, scope, and papal confirmation of *Haec sancta* remain disputed in Catholic interpretation. During the later Basel conflict, Eugene IV rejected the assembly's claim to judge and depose him. Pius II's *Execrabilis* in 1460 definitively prohibited appeals from a pope to a future council as an abuse contrary to ordered jurisdiction.

Aftermath and qualification: Constance successfully ended the schism, and councils remain institutions of the Church; the censure concerns a supremacy claim, not conciliar deliberation itself. Basel's rump elected antipope Felix V, who later resigned, while reunion work continued at Ferrara–Florence under papal presidency. Lateran V's *Pastor aeternus* in 1516 supplied a later authoritative rejection of conciliar superiority, but it belongs chronologically to the next century's reception.

6.13 Lateran V on the individual soul's immortality

Object and setting: Late-medieval and Renaissance Aristotelian debates asked whether philosophy could establish personal immortality and whether one separate intellect served all human beings. Lateran V addressed propositions, not a named Averroist church, and its decree predates Pietro Pomponazzi's best-known intervention. Evidence grade A.

Propositions at issue: The targeted alternatives say that the rational soul is mortal by nature or that one and the same soul or intellect animates all human bodies. The council also rejected a two-truth defense in which a proposition could be true in philosophy while contradicting revealed truth; it did not condemn philosophical inquiry or every dispute about the demonstrability of immortality.

Ecclesial response: Leo X promulgated *Apostolici regiminis* with the approval of Lateran V in session 8, 19 December 1513. Recalling Vienne, it taught that the rational soul is genuinely, of itself, and essentially the body's form, immortal, and multiplied according to the multitude of bodies, and condemned contrary assertions as false and heretical. It also required philosophy teachers to answer such arguments and clergy studying philosophy to complete theological formation.

Aftermath and qualification: Debate continued over what natural reason could prove, especially after Pomponazzi's 1516 treatise, even among thinkers who professed the doctrine by faith. The decree settled the Catholic propositions of personal immortality and individual souls; it did not name every Aristotelian interpreter a formal heretic.

7 Sixteenth-Century Reformations: Propositions and Confessional Divisions

The plural *Reformations* is deliberate. Luther's developing positions, the Lutheran confessions, Zwingli's sacramental program, Reformed theology, Anabaptist communities, the English settlement, spiritualist reformers, and anti-Trinitarian bodies did not teach one interchangeable system. Catholic acts likewise answered propositions, books, public adherence, and ruptures of communion through different instruments. The dossiers therefore identify each axis from its own texts and use Trent's exact session and canon loci rather than assigning every sixteenth-century disagreement to one papal list.

7.1 Luther's propositions and *Exsurge Domine*

Object and setting: Martin Luther's controversy moved from the 1517 indulgence debate to disputes over penance, sacramental efficacy, authority, grace, freedom, and the Church. Leo X's bull *Exsurge Domine*, dated 15 June 1520, extracted forty-one propositions from Luther's works and required their retraction. The bull and the relevant target writings survive, although an extracted sentence does not always reproduce the full argument from which it came. Evidence grade A.

Propositions at issue: The list rejects or attacks sacramental efficacy where no obstacle is placed (article 1); the received account of contrition, confession, and satisfaction (5–14); the ecclesial treasury and efficacy of indulgences (17–22); the spiritual effect of excommunication (23–24); papal and conciliar authority to judge faith and morals (25–30); the sinfulness of every work of the justified and the effective freedom of the fallen will (31–32, 35–36); and teachings concerning purgatory (37–40). Article 33 opposes burning heretics; its presence in the list must not be used to turn civil execution into Catholic doctrine.

Ecclesial response: *Exsurge Domine* condemned the forty-one articles collectively as, *respectively*, heretical, scandalous, false, offensive to pious ears, seductive of simple minds, or contrary to Catholic truth (DH 1451–1492). The formula does not assign one recoverable grade to each article. After Luther burned the bull and refused retraction, Leo X’s *Decet Romanum Pontificem* of 3 January 1521 declared the ecclesiastical penalty of excommunication. Charles V’s Edict of Worms was a separate imperial act.

Aftermath and qualification: Luther continued to revise and defend his theology; princely protection and territorial reform made the dispute an enduring separation rather than a closed proposition trial. Neither the papal censure nor the imperial outlawry proves that every later Lutheran confession simply repeats every extracted article, and the doctrinal judgment is distinct from personal culpability among later adherents.

7.2 The Lutheran confessional axis

Object and setting: The Augsburg Confession of 1530, its Apology, Luther’s catechisms, and the later Book of Concord give the Lutheran trajectory a public confessional form beyond Luther’s censured sentences. These texts affirm the Trinity and Incarnation, infant baptism, the true body and blood of Christ in the Supper, and the value of absolution; they must not be represented by a generic formula such as “no sacraments” or “only a symbol.” Evidence grade A.

Propositions at issue: The decisive differences concern justification by faith without works as its ground, the relation of imputed righteousness to interior renewal, the bondage of the fallen will, the rule of Scripture and authority of traditions, the number and defining character of the sacraments, rejection of transubstantiation as the account of Eucharistic conversion, denial of the Mass as a propitiatory sacrifice offered by a sacrificing priesthood, and rejection of papal jurisdiction by divine institution. Lutheran texts and schools do not formulate every point identically.

Ecclesial response: Trent Session VI taught prevenient grace, a real graced human response, and justification as forgiveness together with interior sanctification; canons 4–5, 9, 11–14, 18, and 30 identify the principal rejected opposites. Session VII, canon 1 on the sacraments in general; Session XIII, canons 1–4 on presence and conversion; Session XXII, canons 1–3 on the sacrifice of the Mass; and Session XXIII on Orders supply the corresponding Catholic definitions. Each Tridentine *anathema sit* attaches to the stated proposition; it is not a modern penal finding about every Lutheran Christian.

Aftermath and qualification: Lutheran territorial churches and confessional bodies endured after the Peace of Augsburg and later settlements. Twentieth-century dialogue substantially narrowed disputes about justification without dissolving differences concerning Church, ministry, sacraments, and authority. The final dossier in this section states the present qualification.

7.3 Zwingli and the memorial-supper trajectory

Object and setting: Huldrych Zwingli’s Zürich reform developed independently of Luther at important points. His writings and the 1529 Marburg Colloquy show a real dispute within the reforming camp over the Lord’s Supper. Later “Zwinglian” became a broad polemical label, so the dossier is restricted to the documented sacramental axis. Evidence grade A.

Propositions at issue: Zwingli read the eucharistic words principally as instituting a commemorative sign and communal profession, denied a bodily presence of Christ under the species, and rejected the Catholic sacrifice of the Mass. His program also removed images and the invocation of saints and reorganized worship under civic authority. This position differs both from Lutheran sacramental union and from Calvin’s account of true spiritual participation by the Holy Spirit.

Ecclesial response: Trent Session XIII, chapter 1 and canon 1 defined Christ as truly, really, and substantially present rather than present merely as in a sign; chapter 4 and canon 2 taught the conversion fittingly called transubstantiation; canon 6 defended eucharistic adoration. Session XXII, chapters 1–2 and canons 1–3 confessed the Mass as a true, visible, propitiatory sacrifice making present the one sacrifice of the Cross. The council did not condemn a person named “Zwinglianism” in each canon; it condemned the stated contradictory propositions. **Aftermath and qualification:** Zwingli died in the Kappel conflict in 1531, and Swiss Reformed settlements absorbed and modified his sacramental inheritance. Later Reformed confessions cannot be described accurately as uniformly memorialist, and civic warfare is not part of Trent’s dogmatic answer.

7.4 The Reformed and Calvinist axis

Object and setting: John Calvin’s *Institutes*, commentaries, liturgical work, and Genevan ordinances, read beside Reformed confessions, disclose a distinct family of teaching on grace, covenant, worship, Eucharist, and Church order. “Calvinist” embraces later schools that disagreed over predestination, covenant, and sacramental language. Evidence grade A.

Propositions at issue: Reformed teaching characteristically asserted the radical inability of the fallen will, unconditional divine election, justification through an alien righteousness received by faith, Scripture as the only infallible rule, and rejection of the sacrificial Mass and transubstantiation. Calvin nevertheless taught a real participation in Christ by the Spirit in the Supper, not a bare psychological recollection. Later double-predestination formulations and claims about the extent of Christ’s saving intention must be attributed to the confession or author that actually states them.

Ecclesial response: Trent Session VI, chapters 5–11 and canons 4–5, 9, 11–12, 15, 17–18, and 30 defended prevenient grace, graced cooperation, interior renewal, hope without private certainty of election, the real possibility of keeping God’s commandments in grace, and purification from temporal punishment. Sessions XIII and XXII answered denials of substantial Eucharistic presence, conversion, and sacrifice. Trent’s canons define Catholic doctrine and its contradictory; they do not prove that every Reformed text teaches the strongest condemned formulation.

Aftermath and qualification: Reformed churches developed through Swiss, French, Dutch, Scottish, Hungarian, and other confessions. Their separation included political establishment and coercion as well as theology. Present Reformed communities and members require the same *Unitatis redintegratio* 3 qualification as other descendants of sixteenth-century separation.

7.5 Anabaptist movements and believers’ baptism

Object and setting: “Anabaptist” was imposed on diverse sixteenth-century communities that rejected the baptism received in infancy and baptized confessing adults. Swiss Brethren, South German and Austrian networks, Hutterites, Mennonite trajectories, apocalyptic groups, and isolated teachers differed sharply. Confessions, correspondence, civic records, and trial testimony survive, but judicial sources require procedural caution. Evidence grade A/B.

Propositions at issue: The shared doctrinal center was that baptism requires a personal confession unavailable to infants and that an infant baptism therefore does not preclude later baptism. Many groups also taught a gathered church separated from coercive civic religion, refusal of oaths, and nonviolence; some held distinctive accounts of Christ’s humanity. The violent apocalyptic regime at Münster in 1534–1535 cannot be made the creed of pacifist Anabaptists.

Ecclesial response: Trent Session VII, canons 5 and 13–14 on Baptism taught its necessity, counted baptized infants among the faithful despite their lack of personal acts of faith, rejected their rebaptism, and denied that baptism should be treated as a merely revocable childhood commitment. Local Catholic and Protestant authorities also prohibited Anabaptist assemblies and sometimes imposed exile or death. Those civil and territorial penalties are not the doctrinal content of Trent.

Aftermath and qualification: Severe persecution helped scatter the movements; Mennonite, Hutterite, and related peace-church traditions survived. Their later members cannot be charged collectively with Münster, every proposition in a hostile interrogation, or the culpability of an original rupture.

7.6 The English Reformation and Anglican formularies

Object and setting: Henry VIII's break with Roman jurisdiction began as a dynastic and jurisdictional rupture while much inherited doctrine remained legally enforced. Under Edward VI and Elizabeth I, the prayer books, Ordinal, and Thirty-Nine Articles supplied a more distinctly Reformed doctrinal settlement; recusant, conformist, Puritan, and later Anglican trajectories remained diverse. Evidence grade A.

Propositions at issue: The mature Articles make Scripture sufficient for salvation, teach justification by faith, recognize Baptism and the Lord's Supper as the two sacraments ordained by Christ in the Gospel, reject transubstantiation, deny the Mass as a propitiatory offering for living and dead in the Catholic sense, and reject purgatory and invocation practices. Royal supremacy and rejection of universal papal jurisdiction concern ecclesial authority as well as dogma. None of this makes every stage of Henry's policy or every later Anglican school doctrinally identical.

Ecclesial response: Papal judgments concerning Henry VIII and Elizabeth I addressed communion, jurisdiction, and penalties; they must not be rewritten as proposition lists. Trent Sessions IV, VI, VII, XIII–XIV, XXII–XXV provide the Catholic doctrinal response. Leo XIII's *Apostolicae curae* of 13 September 1896 later judged Anglican ordinations invalid because of defect of form and intention in the historical rite and settlement; that is an orders judgment, not a declaration that Anglican persons are heretics.

Aftermath and qualification: A durable communion with internal evangelical, catholic, and liberal traditions emerged. Modern Anglican–Roman Catholic dialogue has recorded substantial agreement and continuing disagreement. The inherited word “Anglican” therefore identifies a communion and history, not a complete present doctrinal verdict on every member.

7.7 Spiritualists and other radical reform trajectories

Object and setting: The “Radical Reformation” is a modern umbrella, not the name of one church. This dossier uses it narrowly for spiritualist trajectories represented in different ways by Caspar Schwenckfeld, Sebastian Franck, and related circles, while treating Anabaptists and anti-Trinitarians separately. Their own writings survive unevenly beside hostile civic and confessional records. Evidence grade A/B.

Propositions at issue: Recurrent claims privileged an immediate interior word over the external ministry and fixed confession, spiritualized sacramental efficacy, described the visible churches as fallen or merely outward, or expected a purified spiritual fellowship beyond existing institutions. Schwenckfeld's account of Christ's glorified humanity and Eucharistic participation was not identical with Franck's invisible-church spiritualism; neither may be treated as the creed of all radicals.

Ecclesial response: No single universal Catholic constitution created one “Radical Reformation heresy.” Trent Session IV joined written Scripture to received apostolic traditions; Session VII defended Christ's institution and objective efficacy of the sacraments; Sessions XIII and XXIII defended Eucharist and ordained ministry; and Session XXV defended the visible Church's inherited worship. These acts answer specified propositions without establishing a common genealogy among all spiritualists.

Aftermath and qualification: Small communities survived or influenced later separatist and spiritualist currents, while other circles disappeared. Similar modern appeals to inward religion do not prove direct descent, and the Catholic response does not deny the Holy Spirit's interior action; it denies that private inspiration renders the apostolic word, sacraments, and ecclesial discernment superfluous.

7.8 Servetus, Socinianism, and anti-Trinitarian reform

Object and setting: Michael Servetus, Laelius and Faustus Socinus, the Polish Brethren, and the Racovian Catechism belong to related but nonidentical anti-Trinitarian histories. Servetus's works precede mature Socinian organization; the Socinian target texts survive and permit proposition-level description. Evidence grade A.

Propositions at issue: The mature Socinian complex denied one divine essence in three coequal eternal persons, denied the Son's eternal personal pre-existence and consubstantial deity, treated the Holy Spirit as divine power rather than a coequal person, rejected satisfaction understood as Christ bearing the punishment of sin, and denied

inherited original guilt and infant baptism. Authors differed concerning Christ's supernatural conception, worship, exaltation, and the soul's destiny.

Ecclesial response: These propositions directly contradict Nicaea I and Constantinople I on the Trinity, Ephesus and Chalcedon on the identity of the incarnate Son, and Trent Session V on original sin and Session VII on infant baptism. No new ecumenical council was required to make those contradictions visible. Geneva's civic court executed Servetus in 1553 after a Reformed prosecution; that was not a Catholic judgment and is reported as coercive confessional aftermath, not as an ecclesial definition.

Aftermath and qualification: The Polish Brethren were expelled from the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in 1658, and Socinian texts influenced later Unitarian developments. Historical influence does not make every modern Unitarian a baptized Catholic heretic or every anti-Trinitarian current a direct institutional descendant.

7.9 The Council of Trent as Catholic doctrinal response

Object and setting: The Council of Trent met in three principal periods between 1545 and 1563 under Paul III, Julius III, and Pius IV. It answered disputed propositions while also reforming episcopal residence, clerical formation, benefices, preaching, marriage procedure, and other discipline. Its decrees and canons survive as the controlling act. Evidence grade A.

Propositions at issue: The doctrinal agenda comprised Scripture and apostolic tradition; original sin; justification; the seven sacraments and their efficacy; Baptism and Confirmation; Christ's real substantial Eucharistic presence and transubstantiation; Communion; Penance and Anointing; the Mass as sacrifice; Orders; Matrimony; purgatory; saints, relics, and images; and indulgences. A canon's antecedent specifies the proposition rejected; confessional nicknames do not replace it.

Ecclesial response: Sessions IV–V treated revelation and original sin; Sessions VI–VII justification and the sacraments; Sessions XIII–XIV Eucharist, Penance, and Anointing; and Sessions XXI–XXV Communion, Mass, Orders, Matrimony, and the remaining disputed practices. The canons' *anathema sit* formulas state objective doctrinal boundaries in their sixteenth-century conciliar genre. They are neither a distribution of *Exsurge Domine*'s mixed grades nor present penal sentences against unnamed descendants.

Aftermath and qualification: Trent became the normative Catholic confessional and reform settlement, received through papal confirmation, professions, catechesis, seminaries, liturgical books, and local implementation. Its doctrinal force and its historically conditioned disciplinary decrees must remain distinct. Later agreement can clarify whether a partner still holds a condemned proposition; it does not erase the definition or pretend that every remaining difference has vanished.

7.10 Separated descendants and ecumenical qualification

Object and setting: This is a reception boundary, not a new heresy dossier. Sixteenth-century acts judged propositions, public adherence, and ruptures in their own setting. Present Lutheran, Reformed, Anglican, Anabaptist, and other Christians ordinarily receive their communities rather than personally originating the separation. Evidence grade A for the conciliar and agreed texts.

Propositions at issue: Two opposite shortcuts are excluded: inherited condemnations may not be treated as meaningless, and present partners may not be assigned a condemned proposition they no longer teach. Remaining disagreements also may not be concealed by translating substantially different doctrines into identical words.

Ecclesial response: Vatican II, *Unitatis redintegratio* 3, teaches that those now born into separated communities cannot be accused of the sin of the original separation and recognizes ecclesial endowments outside the Catholic Church's visible boundaries. Paragraph 4 requires truth and fairness in representing separated Christians and provides for dialogue; paragraph 11 rejects false irenicism, safeguards the integrity and certain meaning of Catholic doctrine, and recalls the hierarchy of truths. The 1999 Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification and its Official Common Statement identify consensus on basic truths and state that Trent's condemnations do not apply to the Lutheran teaching presented there, while the Lutheran confessional condemnations do not apply to the Catholic teaching there presented.

Aftermath and qualification: The Joint Declaration expressly preserves the continuing importance of the historic condemnations and acknowledges remaining differences. Its conclusion concerns the doctrine of justification

as jointly presented, not every Reformation controversy or every church body. Historical accuracy therefore requires both the original loci and the present agreed qualification.

8 Post-Reformation Controversies: Grace, Rigorism, and Interior Religion

The early-modern period did not produce a simple succession of new sects. Ecclesiastical acts often extracted propositions from a Catholic author's book, assigned several censures to a list collectively, or restrained rival schools without deciding between them. Grace, freedom, moral rigor, contemplative prayer, and papal authority consequently require especially exact distinctions between a proposition, the sense attributed to its author, a later party, and a permitted theological school.

8.1 The Toledo propositions attributed to Alumbrados

Object and setting: An edict of faith issued in the name of Spanish inquisitor general Alonso Manrique on 23 September 1525 gathered forty-eight propositions from proceedings concerning people whom the record called *alumbrados*, *dexados*, and *perfectos* in the kingdom of Toledo. The surviving edict is an inquisitorial construction from denunciations and examinations, not a confession adopted by one organized movement; later groups given the same label were not necessarily its descendants. Evidence grade B because the judicial text survives through a modern transcription, while the underlying testimony is mediated and uneven.

Propositions at issue: The attributed complex says that abandonment to the love of God makes deliberate human effort unnecessary or sin impossible; identifies God's love in a person too simply with God; devalues vocal prayer, petition, confession, indulgences, images, saints, and other exterior practices; treats temptations or evil thoughts as things not to be resisted; and includes startling claims about marital or sexual acts as occasions of superior union with God. Individual articles differ, and the edict itself sometimes related an allegation to Lutheran teaching without thereby proving a common source or system.

Ecclesial response: The Toledo edict states and answers the forty-eight allegations one by one under differing qualifications; it is not an *in globo* papal definition that supplies one grade for every item. Its authority was that of the Spanish Inquisition within its jurisdiction, and its form was an edict of faith soliciting denunciation, not the final sentence in every accused person's case. The exact article and attached qualification therefore control; neither the word *Alumbrado* nor later similarity is a sufficient censure.

Aftermath and qualification: Pedro Ruiz de Alcaraz and Isabel de la Cruz received separate sentences in 1529 after prolonged proceedings, including public penance and imprisonment; those judicial penalties are distinct from the edict's doctrinal classification. The Llerena edict of 1574 and Seville edict of 1623 enlarged or reused the category for different regional phenomena. Historians consequently dispute the unity and continuity implied by the inquisitorial label, and orthodox interior prayer must not be condemned merely by association.

8.2 Baius and the naturalization of original justice

Object and setting: Michael Baius, a theologian at Louvain, sought to recover Augustine's teaching on nature, grace, sin, and merit but formulated theses that Roman examiners judged to collapse the gratuity of the original and redeemed states. Pius V's constitution *Ex omnibus afflictionibus*, 1 October 1567, transmitted the list commonly numbered as seventy-nine propositions; Gregory XIII's *Provisionis nostrae*, 29 January 1579, reaffirmed the judgment. Evidence grade A/B because the act and list survive while extraction and numbering complicate their relation to Baius's full works.

Propositions at issue: The characteristic complex treated original justice, integrity, and immortality as requirements or conditions of created human nature rather than gratuitous gifts; described concupiscence and involuntary movements as sin in an overextended sense; made all acts of unbelievers and all acts lacking charity sinful; and narrowed the freedom and merit possible under grace. Individual propositions differ, and the list should not be converted into one sentence about "Baianism."

Ecclesial response: *Ex omnibus afflictionibus* rejected the propositions under several notes applied collectively, including heretical, erroneous, suspect, rash, scandalous, and offensive to pious ears (DH 1901–1980). Its disputed closing qualification and the list’s history do not permit an editor to distribute a particular note to every item. The positive Catholic boundary preserves both the gratuity of Adam’s gifts and the reality of nature and graced freedom after the Fall.

Aftermath and qualification: Baius submitted, although controversy over interpretation continued. His categories supplied part of the background to Jansenism, but influence is not identity: Jansenius and Quesnel were judged through later, separate acts, and Catholic Augustinian theology as such was never prohibited.

8.3 The *de auxiliis* non-condemnation

Object and setting: The publication of Luis de Molina’s *Concordia* led Dominican and Jesuit theologians to dispute how efficacious grace, divine foreknowledge, predestination, and created freedom cohere. Congregations met under Clement VIII and Paul V from 1598 to 1607; Thomist or Bañezian and Molinist accounts remained distinct Catholic schools. Evidence grade A/B for the extensive records and the papal termination formula.

Propositions at issue: The controversy concerned physical premotion and intrinsically efficacious grace on one side, and divine middle knowledge and grace whose efficacy includes foreknown free consent on the other. Polemical accusations of Calvinism or Pelagianism did not themselves establish that either school taught a condemned proposition.

Ecclesial response: Paul V’s formula of 5 September 1607 dismissed the disputants while reserving any future declaration and strictly forbade either party to mark the opposing opinion with a theological censure (DH 1997). A Holy Office decree of 23 April 1654 further denied authority to alleged private acts claiming that Paul V had condemned Molina. No later universal definition converted either permitted school into heresy.

Aftermath and qualification: Dominican, Jesuit, and other Catholic accounts continued to debate the question within common dogmatic limits: grace is prevenient and necessary, God is sovereign, and the graced human act is truly voluntary. This non-condemnation is a controlling exclusion from the census and a warning against treating unresolved scholastic disagreement as formal heresy.

8.4 Richerism and ecclesial jurisdiction

Object and setting: Edmond Richer, syndic of the Paris Faculty of Theology, published *De ecclesiastica et politica potestate* in 1611 as a concise account of ecclesial and civil power. Its brevity, its claim to represent the School of Paris, and the jurisdictional conflict surrounding its examination all matter. The target book and the Sens censure survive; evidence grade B pending full collation of the papal briefs and Index register described below.

Propositions at issue: Richer located the power of the keys primarily and immediately in the whole Church, described pope, bishops, and priests as ministerial organs that execute ecclesial jurisdiction, subordinated the pope to the Church represented in general council, and denied papal coercive power over temporal rulers. His mixed “monarchical” and “aristocratic” model cannot be reduced to a claim that the Church has no visible head, but it materially restricted the pope’s proper jurisdiction and legislative authority.

Ecclesial response: On 13 March 1612 the provincial synod of Sens censured the book for containing several false, erroneous, and scandalous propositions which, *ut sonant*—as they sound—were schismatic and heretical; it prohibited reading, possession, publication, and sale while reserving asserted Gallican liberties. A provincial council at Aix condemned the doctrine on 24 May. Paul V’s briefs of 6 May and 27 September confirmed the French episcopal condemnation, and an Index decree specially approved by him listed the book in May 1613. These are not a numbered papal list assigning “heresy” to every sentence; the Sens qualifier and each act’s jurisdiction remain controlling.

Aftermath and qualification: Richer was removed as syndic in September 1612 but continued to defend a conciliarist ecclesiology. He signed a declaration concerning the book on 7 December 1629 under intense political and ecclesiastical pressure; its meaning and sincerity were contested both before and after his death. Richerist influence persisted in later Gallican debates, but the Four Articles of 1682 and Vatican I require their own acts and may not be projected backward as Richer’s personal sentence.

8.5 Jansenius and the five condemned propositions

Object and setting: Cornelius Jansenius's posthumous *Augustinus* appeared in 1640 and became the center of a Catholic dispute over Augustine, grace, freedom, and Christ's saving will. Urban VIII's *In eminenti* of 1642 prohibited the book; Innocent X then judged five extracted propositions in *Cum occasione*, 31 May 1653. Evidence grade A for the book and acts, with an attribution controversy over sense.

Propositions at issue: The five propositions say: some divine precepts are impossible even to just persons who will and strive because the enabling grace is absent; fallen persons never resist interior grace; merit and demerit require freedom from external compulsion but not from necessity; it is Semi-Pelagian to affirm that prevenient grace can be resisted; and it is Semi-Pelagian to say that Christ died or shed his blood for all without exception.

Ecclesial response: *Cum occasione* called proposition 1 rash, impious, blasphemous, anathematized, and heretical; propositions 2 and 3 heretical; proposition 4 false and heretical; and proposition 5 false, rash, and scandalous, and—when understood as restricting Christ's saving death to the predestined—impious, blasphemous, insulting to divine goodness, and heretical (DH 2001–2005). Alexander VII's *Ad sanctam beati Petri sedem*, 16 October 1656, declared that the five were in *Augustinus* and condemned in Jansenius's intended sense; *Regiminis apostolici* supplied a formulary in 1665.

Aftermath and qualification: Resistance distinguished the doctrinal “right” from the factual attribution to Jansenius and sometimes proposed respectful silence. Port-Royal, French episcopal politics, and sacramental rigor broadened the controversy beyond the five sentences. The acts do not justify calling every advocate of frequent moral rigor or every Augustinian theologian a Jansenist.

8.6 The condemned laxist moral propositions

Object and setting: Two Holy Office decrees under Alexander VII, 24 September 1665 and 18 March 1666, condemned forty-five propositions of laxer moral doctrine; a Holy Office decree under Innocent XI, 2 March 1679, condemned sixty-five more. The lists collect claims from different casuists and controversies rather than defining one church, founder, or uniform “Laxist heresy.” Evidence grade A for the Roman acts and B for complete author-by-author attribution.

Propositions at issue: Representative claims made acts of faith, hope, charity, or confession almost never obligatory; allowed dueling or lethal defense of honor, property, or office; treated deliberately invalid confession or sacrilegious Communion as satisfying ecclesial precepts; excused mental reservation, simulated sacraments, abortion before supposed animation, usurious or simoniacal transactions, and direct exposure to occasions of sin; or made the bare existence of a thinly probable opinion sufficient for action despite a safer judgment. Each proposition must be read as the act states it, not as a caricature of casuistry.

Ecclesial response: Alexander VII condemned and prohibited each of the forty-five propositions *at least as scandalous* (DH 2021–2065). Innocent XI condemned and prohibited the sixty-five *as they stand, at least as scandalous and pernicious in practice* (DH 2101–2166). These minimum collective notes do not make every article formally heretical. Innocent's decree also ordered theologians not to censure still-disputed Catholic propositions before a judgment of the Holy See.

Aftermath and qualification: Debate over probabilism, probabiliorism, and the direction of penitents continued; legitimate probabilistic reasoning was not abolished, and no religious order may be identified wholesale with the condemned extracts. Later Catholic moral theology sought a middle path between laxity and rigorism. The paired Roman lists show why a practical prohibition or the note “scandalous” must not be promoted to “heresy.”

8.7 Quesnel and *Unigenitus*

Object and setting: Pasquier Quesnel's *Réflexions morales* joined scriptural meditation to a developed Jansenist account of grace, Church, penance, and authority. Clement XI's dogmatic constitution *Unigenitus Dei Filius*, 8 September 1713, extracted and condemned 101 propositions. Target work and act survive. Evidence grade A.

Propositions at issue: Propositions 9–25 describe grace as an omnipotent operation that is never resisted; 26–32 restrict grace and Christ's saving effect in ways tied to faith and the elect; 34–40 make Adam's original

grace due and the unaided will capable only of evil; 44–65 treat every act outside charity or supernatural faith as sinful; 72–78 risk identifying the Church simply with the elect and just; and 87–94 concern delayed reconciliation, excommunication, and pastoral authority. Propositions 79–86 on Scripture cannot be detached from the censured system and represented as a simple Roman rejection of lay Bible reading.

Ecclesial response: *Unigenitus* applied a long series of notes to the list *respectively*: false, captious, ill-sounding, offensive, scandalous, pernicious, rash, injurious, seditious, impious, blasphemous, suspect of or savoring of heresy, favorable to heresy or schism, erroneous, proximate to heresy, previously condemned, and heretical, especially as renewing the condemned Jansenist propositions (DH 2401–2501). It does not disclose one individual grade for each of the 101 articles.

Aftermath and qualification: Appeals from the constitution, Gallican resistance, and disputes over reception divided France and the Low Countries. Quesnel died outside submission to the act. Later historical use must distinguish the bull’s doctrinal object from political opposition to papal reception and from Catholic encouragement of scriptural reading under ecclesial interpretation.

8.8 Molinos and Quietist passivity

Object and setting: Miguel de Molinos taught spiritual direction in Rome and published the *Spiritual Guide*. After investigation, Innocent XI’s constitution *Caelestis Pastor*, 20 November 1687, condemned sixty-eight propositions associated with his teaching. The propositions survive principally as extracts in the act, while the book and trial materials provide context. Evidence grade A/B.

Propositions at issue: The list promotes annihilation or total passivity of the faculties; suppresses deliberate acts and desires, even concerning salvation; treats reflective prayer and distinct virtues as impediments in an advanced state; reduces resistance to temptation to a merely negative non-consent; devalues meditation on Christ’s humanity and devotion to Mary and the saints; weakens confession, obedience, and ecclesial direction; and includes propositions purporting to excuse grave sexual acts as violence suffered from the devil.

Ecclesial response: The constitution condemns the articles *respectively* as heretical, suspect, erroneous, scandalous, blasphemous, offensive to pious ears, rash, relaxing Christian discipline, subversive, or seditious (DH 2201–2268). No responsible summary may call all sixty-eight individually heretical. The Catholic answer preserves contemplative receptivity while insisting that grace does not extinguish charity’s acts, moral responsibility, sacramental life, or ecclesial discernment.

Aftermath and qualification: Molinos abjured and remained imprisoned until his death. Suspicion spread more broadly than his exact propositions, but authentic mystical theology and passive contemplation were not condemned. Later use of “Quietism” requires the proposition, author, and act to be named rather than inferred from silent prayer alone.

8.9 The Gallican Four Articles

Object and setting: The French clergy’s assembly of 1682 issued four articles on temporal power, councils, national customs, and papal judgments. They arose within a conflict over regalia and royal power and therefore combine political, canonical, and doctrinal claims. Evidence grade A.

Propositions at issue: The articles deny papal authority to depose temporal sovereigns or release subjects from allegiance; treat the conciliarist decrees associated with Constance as permanently limiting papal authority; subject exercise of apostolic power to canons and Gallican customs; and say that papal judgments in faith are not irreformable without the Church’s consent. These four claims do not exhaust every practice historically called a Gallican liberty.

Ecclesial response: Alexander VIII’s *Inter multiplices*, 4 August 1690, declared the assembly’s proceedings and declaration null and void (DH 2281–2285); it did not attach a separate theological note to each article. Vatican I’s *Pastor aeternus*, chapters 3–4, later defined the pope’s universal and immediate jurisdiction and the irreformability *ex sese, non autem ex consensu Ecclesiae* of ex cathedra definitions under the stated conditions.

Aftermath and qualification: The bishops associated with the declaration withdrew or qualified adherence during the 1693 settlement, although Gallican ecclesiology and national policy persisted. After 1870, denial of

the defined primacy or infallibility contradicts dogma; the broader earlier political phenomenon must still not be flattened into one personal heresy verdict.

8.10 The thirty-one rigorist propositions of 1690

Object and setting: A Holy Office decree issued under Alexander VIII on 7 December 1690 condemned thirty-one propositions commonly grouped as Jansenist or rigorist errors. The list ranges across grace, moral responsibility, contrition, sacramental discipline, Marian teaching, sacramental form and intention, and papal authority; it is not the creed of one homogeneous party. Evidence grade A for the act and proposition text, with several authorial attributions still requiring item-level collation.

Propositions at issue: The articles deny that invincible ignorance excuses formal sin; restrict Christ's offering to the faithful and deny unbelievers any influence of Christ or sufficient grace; make every act of an unbeliever sinful and sufficient grace pernicious; reject supernatural value in hope of reward, fear of hell, or attrition; call absolution before completed satisfaction an abuse; bar Communion until penance or pure love is complete; and deny papal superiority or infallibility, privilege an alleged Augustinian doctrine over a papal bull, or call *In eminenti* false. Other articles concern Mary, images, and sacramental validity and must not be silently folded into this summary.

Ecclesial response: The decree condemned and prohibited the thirty-one propositions *respectively* as rash, scandalous, ill-sounding, injurious, proximate to heresy, savoring of heresy, erroneous, schismatic, or heretical (DH 2301–2331). Because the closing clause is mixed and collective, the act does not authorize assigning any one of those grades to an individual article unless a separate competent source does so. The Catholic boundary preserves real grace beyond the visibly faithful, morally good acts under grace, salutary fear and attrition, sacramental discipline, and papal authority without canonizing every less rigorous practice.

Aftermath and qualification: The list fed the continuing Jansenist controversy and later disputes addressed by *Unigenitus* and *Auctorem fidei*. Moral seriousness, demanding penance, or reverent preparation for Communion is not thereby “rigorist heresy.” Just as probabilism is not laxism, opposition to a lax proposition does not make its maximal opposite Catholic doctrine.

8.11 Fénelon and the propositions on pure love

Object and setting: Archbishop François de Salignac de La Mothe-Fénelon's *Maxims of the Saints* attempted to distinguish orthodox disinterested love from Molinos's Quietism amid controversy with Jacques-Bénigne Bossuet. Innocent XII's brief *Cum alias*, 12 March 1699, extracted twenty-three propositions. Evidence grade A.

Propositions at issue: The extracts describe an habitual state in which fear of punishment and desire of reward no longer motivate; “holy indifference” toward personal perfection and happiness; extreme trials in which concern for one's own salvation or hope appears surrendered; and a passive state in which distinct virtues and reflective acts are no longer perceived or desired as such. The stated sense, not every affirmation that God should be loved for himself, is the object.

Ecclesial response: *Cum alias* rejected the propositions, in their obvious or extended sense, as *respectively* rash, scandalous, ill-sounding, offensive to pious ears, pernicious, and erroneous in practice (DH 2351–2373). The brief does not style them heretical. It safeguards theological hope, deliberate virtue, and the believer's commanded desire for salvation without reducing love of God to self-interest.

Aftermath and qualification: Fénelon accepted the judgment publicly and instructed his flock to do likewise. His submission and the act's lower censure grades are material facts: neither his whole spiritual corpus nor all teaching on disinterested charity may be labeled Quietist heresy.

8.12 Febronianism, Josephinism, and the national-church boundary

Object and setting: Johann Nikolaus von Hontheim, writing as “Justinus Febronius,” published *De statu Ecclesiae* in 1763; Josephinism names the state-directed ecclesiastical program associated especially with Emperor Joseph II. One is a theological-canonical argument and the other a shifting complex of legislation, administration, and reform. Evidence grade B pending complete collation of the 1764 Roman instruments against their register text.

Propositions at issue: Febronian claims located the keys and governing power primarily in the whole Church, reduced the pope to a coordinating center with limited reserve powers, enlarged episcopal and national autonomy, and proposed recovery of allegedly usurped papal prerogatives. Josephinist policies placed seminaries, religious houses, worship, communications with Rome, and ecclesiastical property under extensive state control. Not every administrative reform entails Febronian doctrine.

Ecclesial response: The Index decree of 27 February 1764 prohibited Hontheim’s book, and Clement XIII’s brief to German bishops of 21 May 1764 ordered its suppression. These were book-level and disciplinary responses, not a promulgated proposition-by-proposition list. Later papal teaching and Vatican I supplied the positive primacy boundary. No single Roman act defined “Josephinism” as one heresy.

Aftermath and qualification: Hontheim submitted a retraction in 1778 and later published a qualified commentary; territorial church policies outlived him. The dossier belongs as an ecclesiological tendency and exclusion boundary. Its primary-source caution must remain visible until the Index decree, Clement XIII brief, and retraction are collated in full.

8.13 The Synod of Pistoia and *Auctorem fidei*

Object and setting: Bishop Scipione de’ Ricci’s diocesan Synod of Pistoia met in 1786 and combined Jansenist, Gallican, sacramental, liturgical, and disciplinary reforms. Pius VI’s constitution *Auctorem fidei*, 28 August 1794, extracted eighty-five propositions and, unlike many collective lists, attached a particular censure or qualification to each. Both synodal acts and papal act survive. Evidence grade A.

Propositions at issue: Proposition 1 alleged a general obscuring of the most important religious truths in recent centuries; 2 derived ministerial and governing power from the community of the faithful; 3 made the pope a merely ministerial head receiving power from the Church; 16 treated original justice as due to created nature; 28 insinuated a defect in a Mass where no one besides the priest participates sacramentally or spiritually; 29 omitted *transubstantiation* as though it were a dispensable scholastic question; and 40–42 reduced indulgences to canonical penance and attacked the treasury and suffrage for the dead.

Ecclesial response: *Auctorem fidei* calls propositions 1–3 heretical in their specified senses; proposition 16 false, already condemned in Baius and Quesnel, erroneous, and favorable to Pelagian heresy; proposition 28 false, erroneous, suspect of and savoring of heresy; proposition 29 pernicious, derogatory to the exposition of Catholic truth about transubstantiation, and favorable to heretics. Propositions 40–42 receive differing notes including false, rash, injurious, offensive, and inductive of previously censured error. The act’s own wording, not a blanket summary, controls every other article.

Aftermath and qualification: The Tuscan reform project failed, and Ricci submitted to the constitution in 1805. The act became an important Roman reference on grace, Church, sacraments, liturgy, and the interpretation of ambiguous propositions. It is not evidence that every proposal for vernacular worship, frequent Scripture reading, episcopal responsibility, or disciplinary reform is Pistoian heresy.

9 Modern and Contemporary Censures: Reason, Revelation, and Doctrinal Method

Modern acts make the survey’s category discipline especially important. A council can define a dogma; a pope can condemn a specified proposition; the Holy Office can prohibit a book or say that a thesis cannot safely be taught; a doctrinal congregation can notify an author of error or ambiguity; and a canonical act can concern disobedience or schism. These are not interchangeable. Freemasonry, Nazism, political parties, ordinary dissent, and canonical

irregularity are therefore not inserted as Christian heresies merely because Catholic authority opposed them. A contextual dossier appears only where the doctrinal object and exact response materially illuminate the boundary.

9.1 Indifferentism, naturalism, and the religious-liberty distinction

Object and setting: Nineteenth-century papal documents addressed philosophical naturalism, claims that all religions are equally salvific, state control of the Church, and revolutionary political programs in settings where “liberty of conscience” could mean immunity from truth or law as well as civil non-coercion. Gregory XVI’s *Mirari vos* of 15 August 1832 and Pius IX’s *Quanta cura* with the *Syllabus* of 8 December 1864 are controlling acts. Evidence grade A.

Propositions at issue: The central religious error is that a person can attain eternal salvation equally well through any profession of religion so long as conduct is morally upright, with conscience treated as autonomous from objective religious and moral truth. Related naturalist propositions make civil society’s good independent of religion, subordinate ecclesial authority absolutely to the state, or deny any public duty toward true religion. Those claims must not be conflated with a civil right not to be coerced into religious acts.

Ecclesial response: *Mirari vos* rejects religious indifferentism and an unbounded liberty of conscience; *Quanta cura* condemns specified naturalist and state-absolutist propositions. The attached eighty-item *Syllabus* is an index to earlier acts, organized under headings; each source instrument and context controls its force rather than one invented censure for all eighty. Vatican II, *Dignitatis humanae* 1–2, later teaches civil immunity from coercion in religious matters while expressly retaining the moral duty of persons and societies toward truth.

Aftermath and qualification: Catholic doctrine rejects both coercion into faith and relativism about truth. Consequently, the nineteenth-century acts may not be quoted as though they condemned every modern constitutional liberty, while *Dignitatis humanae* may not be read as teaching that all religions are equally true or salvific.

9.2 Hermesianism and methodical doubt

Object and setting: Georg Hermes attempted a rational reconstruction of Catholic theology beginning from universal doubt. Gregory XVI’s brief *Dum acerbissimas*, 26 September 1835, confirmed prohibition of his works and warned the German hierarchy concerning their system. The works and papal act survive. Evidence grade A/B because the act characterizes a corpus rather than attaching a fixed note to numbered propositions.

Propositions at issue: The disputed method made positive doubt the beginning of theology, treated reason as the principal norm by which revelation must first be mastered, and generated errors concerning faith and its motives of credibility, God’s nature, grace, original sin, and freedom. The issue was not careful rational inquiry but a method in which autonomous demonstration governed assent to revealed mystery.

Ecclesial response: *Dum acerbissimas* confirms the Index judgment and characterizes errors with several terms, including false, rash, tending toward skepticism and indifferentism, erroneous, or savoring of heresy. It does not supply one solemn heresy censure for every Hermesian sentence. Vatican I’s *Dei Filius* later taught that faith is a supernatural obedience supported, but not produced, by rational motives of credibility.

Aftermath and qualification: A prolonged conflict over university appointments and clerical formation followed in German-speaking lands. Hermesianism declined as an organized school; Catholic theology’s rejection of its method did not abolish apologetics, historical inquiry, or philosophical demonstration.

9.3 Bautain, Bonnetty, and the fideist limit

Object and setting: Louis-Eugène Bautain and Augustin Bonnetty reacted against rationalism by assigning human reason too little capacity apart from transmitted revelation or primordial tradition. Bautain signed required propositions beginning on 8 September 1840 and renewed in 1844; Bonnetty accepted propositions imposed by an Index decree of 11 June 1855. Evidence grade A.

Propositions at issue: The corrected theses denied or endangered reason’s ability to establish God’s existence and some religious or moral truths, made external signs unable to demonstrate revelation’s credibility, or treated

tradition as the sole source of intellectual and moral knowledge. The subscriptions instead affirm that reason can know God with certainty, that miracles and prophecy are credible signs, and that reason can lead to faith while mysteries remain known through revelation.

Ecclesial response: The Bautain subscriptions are located at DH 2751–2756 and the Bonnetty propositions at DH 2811–2814. They are corrective professions required of named Catholic thinkers, not conciliar definitions that every use of “fideism” identifies a formal heretic. Vatican I’s *Dei Filius*, chapter 2 and its canons on revelation, supplied the later dogmatic boundary.

Aftermath and qualification: The episode established a two-sided Catholic answer: rationalism may not absorb faith into autonomous proof, and faith may not deny created reason’s real knowledge and the rational credibility of revelation. Appeals to tradition remain legitimate when they do not erase reason or confuse human transmission with the supernatural act of faith.

9.4 Güntherian philosophical theology

Object and setting: Anton Günther sought to reconstruct Christian mysteries through modern philosophical categories. An Index decree of 8 January 1857 prohibited his works, and Pius IX’s letter *Eximiam tuam*, 15 June 1857, explained the doctrinal concern. Evidence grade A/B because the books and prohibition survive but the act expressly did not fix individual propositions and censures.

Propositions at issue: The concerns involve rational mastery of mysteries; accounts of divine self-consciousness and the Trinity that imperil the unity of divine substance; Christological and anthropological formulations affecting the Incarnation and the soul as substantial form of the body; divine freedom in creation; and a relation of philosophy to faith in which philosophical construction becomes the judge of revelation.

Ecclesial response: *Eximiam tuam* confirms the prohibition but states that the earlier decree had not selected particular propositions or attached determinate theological notes. Its positive boundary protects mystery’s intelligibility without claiming that reason can demonstrate or reconstruct the Trinity and Incarnation from its own principles.

Aftermath and qualification: Günther and principal followers submitted to the judgment. The act therefore cannot support a personal verdict of obstinate heresy, nor may it be represented as condemning engagement with modern philosophy as such.

9.5 Ontologism and immediate knowledge of God

Object and setting: “Ontologism” names a family of claims that the human intellect knows finite realities through an immediate intuition of divine being. The Holy Office examined seven propositions and issued its decree on 18 September 1861. Evidence grade A for the formal list and response.

Propositions at issue: The propositions make habitual immediate knowledge of God essential to all intellectual knowledge; identify the being first known in things with divine being; deny a real distinction between universal being and God; make other ideas modifications of the idea of God; or describe creatures as present within God in a way that turns creation into divine self-distinction.

Ecclesial response: The Holy Office answered that the seven propositions *tuto tradi non possunt*—they cannot safely be taught (DH 2841–2847). This is a precise lower censure, not an assertion that each thesis was solemnly defined as heretical. Catholic doctrine permits genuine natural knowledge of God from creatures while denying that ordinary human cognition is the beatific or immediate intuition of the divine essence.

Aftermath and qualification: Ontologist language continued to be debated and overlapped with disputes about Rosmini. Similar vocabulary does not prove identical systems; the exact seven propositions and their “unsafe” censure control this entry.

9.6 Vatican I against pantheism, materialism, and rationalist closure

Object and setting: Vatican I's constitution *Dei Filius*, 24 April 1870, answered modern systems by defining positive Catholic doctrine concerning God, creation, revelation, faith, and reason. *Pastor aeternus*, 18 July 1870, separately defined papal primacy and infallibility. Both are dogmatic constitutions of an ecumenical council confirmed by Pius IX. Evidence grade A.

Propositions at issue: The canons reject denial of the one Creator; materialism; identification of divine and created substance; necessary emanation or divine self-development into finite things; denial of free creation from nothing; denial that God can be known naturally from created things; denial of supernatural revelation, inspiration, miracles, or faith as a supernatural virtue; reduction of assent to scientific demonstration; and a change in dogma's meaning under the name of progress.

Ecclesial response: *Dei Filius*, chapters 1–4 and the corresponding canons, anathematizes the exact contradictory propositions while teaching harmony rather than rivalry between faith and reason. *Pastor aeternus*, chapters 3–4, defines the pope's universal ordinary and immediate jurisdiction and ex cathedra infallibility under stated conditions. The conciliar anathemas are objective doctrinal canons in their historical genre, not automatic findings of present personal culpability.

Aftermath and qualification: The council was suspended during the Franco-Prussian War and never completed its intended ecclesiology. Vatican II later situated primacy within episcopal collegiality without retracting the definitions. "Rationalism" and "pantheism" remain useful only when tied to the proposition actually meant, not as labels for science, philosophical argument, or every non-Catholic system.

9.7 Old Catholic rejection after Vatican I

Object and setting: Clergy and laity who rejected the Vatican I definitions organized congresses and eventually a separate episcopal succession. Pius IX addressed the movement in *Etsi multa*, 21 November 1873, and *Graves ac diuturnae*, 23 March 1875. The object includes dogmatic denial, an alternative hierarchy, and schism; these must remain distinct. Evidence grade A.

Propositions at issue: Movement leaders denied the defined universal primacy and ex cathedra infallibility, alleged that the pope or Catholic Church had fallen into error by defining them, located decisive jurisdiction in community or state-supported structures, and elected Joseph Hubert Reinkens as bishop without papal mandate.

Ecclesial response: *Etsi multa* calls the leaders "new heretics," identifies rejection of infallibility and indefectibility, declares Reinkens's election null, and states canonical penalties. *Graves ac diuturnae* describes the sect as condemned and its adherents as separated and schismatic. The nullity and penalties are juridical acts; the contradiction of *Pastor aeternus* supplies the doctrinal object.

Aftermath and qualification: Old Catholic bodies formed the Union of Utrecht and later developed further doctrinal and liturgical differences. Present descendants are not personally charged with the founders' culpability, and current member churches must be described from their own texts rather than only Pius IX's nineteenth-century polemic.

9.8 Rosmini, *Post obitum*, and later clarification

Object and setting: After Antonio Rosmini's death, the Holy Office decree *Post obitum*, 14 December 1887, condemned and proscribed forty propositions drawn from works published posthumously. The CDF revisited their interpretation in a doctrinal note of 1 July 2001. Evidence grade A.

Propositions at issue: The extracts concern being and cognition, creation, the soul, the Trinity, Incarnation, Eucharist, original sin, justification, and the beatific state. Read in an idealist or ontologist sense, some could identify created and divine being or dissolve creation and supernatural mystery; Rosmini's broader corpus allowed other readings.

Ecclesial response: *Post obitum* judged the forty propositions not consonant with Catholic truth but did not declare Rosmini personally guilty of formal denial of faith. The 2001 CDF note states that the reasons for doctrinal concern had been superseded because the meanings condemned in 1887 do not correspond to Rosmini's authentic

position as clarified by the integral text and later doctrine. It retains the objective force of the decree against the heterodox sense.

Aftermath and qualification: The note removed the earlier obstacles to Rosmini's cause; he was beatified in 2007. This rare authoritative afterlife is a controlling example: a proposition's objectively condemned sense, its extraction from a book, and an author's demonstrable intention are three different judgments.

9.9 The tendencies called "Americanism"

Object and setting: Leo XIII's letter *Testem benevolentiae*, 22 January 1899, addressed Cardinal James Gibbons after controversy over a French presentation of Isaac Hecker. It conditionally rejected tendencies attributed to American Catholics while expressing confidence that the American bishops did not intend them. Evidence grade A.

Propositions at issue: The rejected tendencies would soften or omit doctrine to attract separated Christians; exalt private liberty over ecclesial authority; make interior inspiration render external guidance superfluous; prefer natural to supernatural virtues and "active" to supposedly passive virtues; or depreciate religious vows and institutes as unsuitable to modern life.

Ecclesial response: *Testem benevolentiae* rejects those opinions in the stated senses but does not attach a formal heresy note, establish that Hecker held them, or condemn the American constitutional order. Leo expressly distinguishes the alleged system from American character, laws, and customs that can be praised.

Aftermath and qualification: American bishops denied that the described system represented their Church and submitted to the letter. "Americanism" is therefore a cautionary label for specified tendencies and a transatlantic reception dispute, not the name of one proved American heresy.

9.10 Modernism, proposition list and constructed system

Object and setting: The Holy Office decree *Lamentabili sane exitu*, 3 July 1907 and approved by Pius X on 4 July, rejected sixty-five propositions drawn from contemporary biblical, historical, and dogmatic writing. Pius X's encyclical *Pascendi dominici gregis*, 8 September 1907, then presented the several roles and claims of a connected Modernist system. Evidence grade A for the acts and principal target writings, while attribution to individual authors remains separate.

Propositions at issue: The complex restricts reason to phenomena and makes God unknowable; derives faith from immanent religious need or sentiment; severs the Christ of faith from historical knowledge; treats revelation and dogma as expressions of changing consciousness; subordinates Scripture, sacraments, Church, and authority to communal evolution; and permits dogmatic meaning to change substantially. Individual historical-critical conclusions do not constitute that full system.

Ecclesial response: *Lamentabili* reproves and proscribes its sixty-five propositions without publishing a separate theological grade for each. *Pascendi* analyzes and rejects the system, famously calling that constructed whole a "synthesis of all heresies." *Praestantia Scripturae*, 18 November 1907, confirmed the authority and penalties; *Sacrorum antistitum*, 1 September 1910, imposed an anti-Modernist oath as a disciplinary safeguard.

Aftermath and qualification: The oath and older profession were replaced in 1967; disciplinary replacement did not reverse dogmatic teaching. Vatican II's *Dei Verbum* 11–12 requires attention to literary forms, historical setting, and authorial intention while affirming inspiration and scriptural truth. "Modernism" must therefore not become a polemical synonym for modern scholarship, doctrinal development, or any disputed contemporary theology.

9.11 Atheistic communism as a contextual exclusion

Object and setting: Marxist–Leninist movements combined a materialist worldview, revolutionary political organization, and varied state regimes. Pius XI’s *Divini Redemptoris*, 19 March 1937, and the Holy Office decree of 1 July 1949 supplied major Catholic responses. This dossier explains a doctrinally condemned ideology that is not ordinarily a Christian heresy under canon 751. Evidence grade A.

Propositions at issue: The condemned system denies God, spiritual soul, and afterlife; interprets reality through dialectical materialism and class struggle; subordinates the person to collective economic development; and treats religion, morality, family, and property through that reduction. Particular economic reforms or concern for workers do not by themselves constitute this system.

Ecclesial response: *Divini Redemptoris* judges atheistic communism intrinsically incompatible with Christianity while also requiring justice for workers. The 1949 Holy Office responsa prohibited knowing support for the Communist Party and propagation of its materialist anti-Christian doctrine and attached historical canonical consequences to Catholics who professed it. Party discipline, sacramental admission, and doctrinal apostasy are separate objects.

Aftermath and qualification: Many adherents were unbaptized or coerced citizens, so “heresy” is ordinarily the wrong canonical category; explicit repudiation of Christianity may instead be apostasy for a baptized person. The fall or transformation of particular regimes did not by itself settle every philosophical proposition, and Catholic social doctrine must not be reduced to a partisan opposite.

9.12 Mitigated millenarianism

Object and setting: A Holy Office decree considered a mitigated millenarian system in which Christ would reign visibly on earth before the final judgment, whether or not preceded by a resurrection of many just persons. The plenary session answered on 19 July 1944; Pius XII approved the response on 20 July, and the decree was issued on 21 July (AAS 36 [1944] 212; DH 3839). Evidence grade A.

Propositions at issue: The question was not every theological hope for the fulfillment of history, but a temporal visible reign of Christ before the definitive judgment proposed as an eschatological system. The decree’s broadened wording deliberately included a mitigated form.

Ecclesial response: The response says that the system *tuto doceri non posse*—it cannot safely be taught. It does not assign the note “heresy” or create a personal penal finding. The positive Catholic confession expects Christ’s glorious return, resurrection, judgment, and a kingdom whose consummation is God’s gift rather than an intrahistorical political construction.

Aftermath and qualification: The Catechism 675–677 later distinguishes Christian hope from secular or religious pseudo-messianism and cites the rejection of millenarian falsification. The lower censure must remain exact: “unsafe to teach” is not interchangeable with a solemn definition of heresy.

9.13 Feeneyism and an exclusivist salvation formula

Object and setting: A Boston controversy associated with Leonard Feeney interpreted “outside the Church no salvation” as requiring explicit visible Catholic membership in every saved person. The Holy Office letter *Suprema haec sacra*, 8 August 1949, was sent to Archbishop Richard Cushing; a separate Holy Office decree of 13 February 1953 excommunicated Feeney. Evidence grade A.

Propositions at issue: The restrictive thesis excludes salvation wherever explicit canonical incorporation is absent, thereby denying the efficacy of an implicit desire for the Church under grace and confusing the objective necessity of Church and faith with the visible status of every individual. The opposite indifferentist claim—that any religion saves as such—is equally excluded.

Ecclesial response: *Suprema haec sacra* teaches the Church’s necessity while distinguishing explicit membership, explicit desire, and implicit desire; any saving desire must be formed within supernatural faith and charity, not reduced to natural goodwill. The 1953 decree states grave disobedience as the disciplinary basis of Feeney’s excommunication; it is not a decree declaring him personally a formal heretic.

Aftermath and qualification: Feeney was reconciled before his death without being required to repudiate an invented proposition formula, while communities deriving from the controversy followed different canonical paths. “Feeneyism” should name the documented doctrinal error, not convert the disciplinary penalty or every member of a later community into a heresy judgment.

9.14 *Humani generis* and dangerous theological reductions

Object and setting: Pius XII’s encyclical *Humani generis*, 12 August 1950, addressed currents in philosophy, doctrinal development, biblical interpretation, creation, and original sin without naming one organized “new theology” or conducting trials of individual theologians. Evidence grade A.

Propositions at issue: It rejects dogmatic relativism in which opposed concepts become equivalent expressions; restriction of scriptural truth to religious or moral matters; reduction of transubstantiation to symbolism or communal effect; dilution of the Church’s identity and necessity; and philosophical systems incompatible with creation and supernatural order. It says that polygenism could not then be embraced because no reconciliation appeared with the revealed and magisterial teaching on original sin.

Ecclesial response: Paragraphs 14–17 protect enduring dogmatic meaning, 22 scriptural truth, 26 Eucharistic conversion, 27 the Church, and 35–37 human origins. Paragraph 36 permits research and discussion concerning evolution of the human body while requiring the immediate creation of spiritual souls. The encyclical grades opinions variously as false, dangerous, or irreconcilable; it does not label every question it discusses heresy.

Aftermath and qualification: The document prompted restrictions and further theological development before Vatican II. It cannot be cited as condemning evolution as such, every ressourcement theologian, or all development in theological language; neither may its doctrinal cautions be treated as silently repealed.

9.15 Situation ethics and objective moral order

Object and setting: The Holy Office instruction of 2 February 1956 addressed a “new morality” or situation ethics circulating in Catholic education and formation (AAS 48 [1956] 144–145). The object was a method, not every prudent judgment about circumstances. Evidence grade A.

Propositions at issue: The prohibited system makes the final norm of conduct an individual’s concrete, intuitive judgment or personal sincerity rather than objective moral law, so that universal norms can be displaced by the uniqueness of the situation. Circumstances and intention thereby cease merely to specify responsibility and become authority to make an intrinsically disordered choice right.

Ecclesial response: The instruction prohibited teaching or approving the system in universities, seminaries, and religious study houses, and prohibited propagating or defending it in books, lectures, conferences, or any other manner. It named no proponent and did not attach the formal note “heresy.” The positive doctrine retains conscience, prudence, circumstances, and subjective culpability within an objective natural and revealed moral order.

Aftermath and qualification: Later Catholic moral theology continued to study conscience and complex cases; *Veritatis splendor* gave a fuller account of intrinsically evil acts and fundamental moral norms. Neither pastoral discernment nor attention to diminished responsibility is identical with the 1956 system.

9.16 The postconciliar error inventory and dogmatic meaning

Object and setting: The CDF’s confidential circular letter to episcopal conferences of 24 July 1966 summarized reported errors and requested episcopal assessment; it was not an ecumenical definition or a sentence against named authors. The CDF declaration *Mysterium Ecclesiae*, dated 24 June 1973, later addressed the Church, infallibility, priesthood, and dogmatic language publicly. Evidence grade A.

Propositions at issue: The 1966 inventory names restriction of inspiration and inerrancy; dogmatic formulas whose objective meaning changes; the ordinary Magisterium reduced to opinion; relativism; Christ reduced to an ordinary man and miracles or resurrection naturalized; merely symbolic Eucharistic presence without

transubstantiation; Mass without sacrifice; penance reduced to social reconciliation; original sin obscured; situation ethics; and ecumenical indifferentism.

Ecclesial response: The circular calls these examples opinions and errors requiring pastoral investigation; its genre does not assign a formal note to each. *Mysterium Ecclesiae* 1–5 defends the Church’s concrete continuity, the infallibility of faithful and pastors under their proper conditions, and dogmatic formulas whose expression can develop while their determinate truth remains. Sections 6 and the conclusion defend the distinct ministerial priesthood and theological freedom within the word and Magisterium.

Aftermath and qualification: These acts show that Vatican II did not authorize doctrinal reversal, while also recognizing legitimate research and improved expression. “Postconciliar error” is not the name of a single sect, and disagreement over an interpretation must still be tied to a proposition, level of teaching, and competent judgment.

9.17 Hans Küng and a Catholic-teaching authorization

Object and setting: Hans Küng’s works prompted prolonged examination and exchanges concerning Church, infallibility, and ministry. The CDF declaration *Christi Ecclesia*, 15 December 1979, records the doctrinal and administrative conclusion. Evidence grade A.

Propositions at issue: The declaration identifies positions that deny or reduce the Church’s infallibility, detach authentic interpretation from the Magisterium, and fail to preserve received teaching concerning the capacity validly to consecrate the Eucharist. It judges the published formulations, not Küng’s internal forum or every subject in his corpus.

Ecclesial response: *Christi Ecclesia* states that Küng had departed from integral Catholic truth in his doctrine and could no longer be considered a Catholic theologian or teach as one. This is a doctrinal and canonical-administrative judgment concerning authorization; the document does not use the procedure or final formula of a personal heresy trial.

Aftermath and qualification: Küng remained a priest and continued academic work and dialogue outside a Catholic teaching mandate. The exact consequence—withdrawal of recognition to teach as a Catholic theologian—must not be inflated into excommunication or a judgment on every later reader.

9.18 Certain liberation theologies and Marxist reduction

Object and setting: The CDF’s *Libertatis nuntius*, 6 August 1984, examined “certain aspects” of liberation theology; *Libertatis conscientia*, 22 March 1986, supplied a positive synthesis of Christian freedom and liberation. The plural is essential because the acts do not condemn every theology arising from poverty or oppression. Evidence grade A.

Propositions at issue: The rejected reduction adopts Marxist analysis uncritically, treats class struggle as a governing hermeneutic and criterion of truth, reduces sin and salvation to political structures, makes orthopraxis displace received faith, legitimates violence, or recasts Christ, Church, Eucharist, and kingdom as instruments of revolutionary struggle.

Ecclesial response: *Libertatis nuntius* warns that accepting the analysis imports its materialist anthropology and total interpretation even where a theologian rejects atheism verbally. It expressly affirms the biblical demand for justice and concern for the poor. *Libertatis conscientia* develops integral liberation from sin together with moral, social, cultural, and political freedom under truth and charity.

Aftermath and qualification: Particular authors later received separate notifications or disciplinary judgments, which must be cited on their own terms. The Church’s preferential concern for the poor, opposition to oppression, and Catholic social action are not the censured object, while a good pastoral intention does not make incompatible premises harmless.

9.19 The Lefebvre rupture, SSPX status, and sedevacantist claims

Object and setting: Archbishop Marcel Lefebvre consecrated four bishops without pontifical mandate on 30 June 1988 for the Society of Saint Pius X. John Paul II's *Ecclesia Dei*, 2 July 1988, judged the consecrations a schismatic act. Sedevacantism is a separate family of claims that the Roman See has been vacant for an extended period because recent popes or councils defected from the faith. Evidence grade A for the public acts; no one act defines every later faction.

Propositions at issue: SSPX disputes have concerned reception of Vatican II, religious liberty, ecumenism, liturgical reform, and the authority of the postconciliar Magisterium; the 1988 act itself concerned unauthorized episcopal consecration and rupture of communion. Sedevacantist arguments add claims about loss of office, indefectibility, or universal deception that differ among groups.

Ecclesial response: *Ecclesia Dei* calls the consecrations schismatic and records the canonical consequences; it does not issue a blanket proposition-level heresy sentence against everyone attached to the older liturgy. Benedict XVI remitted the four bishops' excommunications in 2009, while *Ecclesiae unitatem*, 2 July 2009, stated that the Society lacked canonical status and that doctrinal questions remained unresolved. No universal act has condemned one standardized system called "sedevacantism."

Aftermath and qualification: Francis extended faculties for sacramental absolution in *Misericordia et misera* 12 (2016), and the 2017 marriage-faculty letter still described the "objective persistence" of the Society's canonical irregularity; those acts did not themselves supply full canonical status or a doctrinal settlement. The DDF warned on 13 May 2026 that announced episcopal ordinations without papal mandate would constitute a schismatic act, and Leo XIV asked the Society to desist on 29 June. The consecrations occurred at Écône on 1 July. The signed DDF decree of 2 July states that Alfonso de Galarreta and the four recipients incurred the *latae sententiae* excommunication reserved to the Apostolic See under canon 1387 and also applies canon 1364 §1 to de Galarreta. It separately states that Bernard Fellay incurred *latae sententiae* excommunication under canon 1364 §1 through direct participation as co-consecrator and public adherence; it does not describe Fellay's penalty as reserved. The accompanying explanatory note states that SSPX sacred ministers are in schism, are considered schismatics, and are subject to canon 1364 §1; it does not individually declare every minister excommunicated. The note further states that lay faithful are schismatic and excommunicated when their adherence is formal under the 1996 explanatory note and that the Society's sacramental ministry is illicit, with its Penance and assisted marriages invalid. These controlling status determinations do not turn the SSPX into one proposition-level named heresy or make every attendee a formal adherent. The categories remain distinct: an act may be schismatic, a thesis may contradict primacy or indefectibility, and a person's canonical status may differ from the doctrinal classification of an object.

9.20 Priestly ordination reserved to men

Object and setting: Debate over admitting women to ministerial priesthood led John Paul II to issue *Ordinatio sacerdotalis*, 22 May 1994. The CDF answered a doubt on 28 October 1995, and its 1998 commentary on the *Professio fidei* located the teaching within the levels of assent. Evidence grade A.

Propositions at issue: The contrary thesis says that the Church possesses authority to confer priestly ordination on women, or that the reservation to baptized men is merely a reversible discipline. Questions about women's dignity, gifts, offices not requiring ordination, or prudential structures are not identical with that proposition.

Ecclesial response: *Ordinatio sacerdotalis* declares that the Church has no authority to confer priestly ordination on women and that this judgment is to be held definitively by all the faithful. The 1995 responsum says it belongs to the deposit of faith and has been set forth infallibly by the ordinary and universal Magisterium. The 1998 doctrinal commentary gives it as an example of a second-paragraph truth to be held definitively, not as its example of a newly defined first-paragraph dogma.

Aftermath and qualification: Denial therefore rejects a definitive Catholic doctrine and impairs full communion, but the technical category must remain the one supplied by the 1998 commentary; it should not be called canonical heresy automatically by collapsing all definitive teaching into revealed dogma. Attempts at ordination also carry separate canonical questions and penalties.

9.21 Religious pluralism and the uniqueness of Christ

Object and setting: The CDF declaration *Dominus Iesus*, 6 August 2000, responded to relativist theories of revelation, Christ, salvation, Church, and religions. It reaffirms Catholic doctrine without declaring that every theologian of religions, adherent of another religion, or non-Catholic Christian is a formal heretic. Evidence grade A.

Propositions at issue: The rejected theses make revelation in Christ limited or incomplete; separate an eternal saving Logos from Jesus; posit a Logos economy beyond the Incarnation or a Spirit economy parallel to Christ; deny Christ's unique and universal mediation; treat religions as complementary salvific ways equal in principle; or imagine Christ's Church as nowhere concretely continuing in history.

Ecclesial response: Sections 5–8 affirm the definitive and complete revelation in Jesus Christ and reserve scriptural inspiration in the proper sense to the canonical books; 9–15 confess the one incarnate Word and unique universal mediation; 16–17 treat the Church's unicity and subsistence; and 20–22 distinguish participation in grace and elements of truth from religious relativism. The declaration describes several propositions as contrary to Catholic faith but does not assign one penal censure to every author.

Aftermath and qualification: The document acknowledges that the Spirit works and elements of truth and goodness are present among peoples and religions, all ordered to Christ's one mediation. Dialogue and respect therefore coexist with proclamation; neither indifferentism nor contempt for persons follows from the dogmatic claim.

9.22 Modern notifications: de Mello, Dupuis, and Sobrino

Object and setting: Modern CDF notifications commonly judge writings and require correction without declaring a new named heresy or deciding subjective culpability. Representative cases are the notification on Anthony de Mello of 24 June 1998, the notification on Jacques Dupuis of 24 January 2001, and the notification on Jon Sobrino dated 26 November 2006 and published in 2007. Target texts and notifications survive. Evidence grade A.

Propositions at issue: The de Mello notification identifies dissolving the personal God, Christ's unique mediation, evil, and final destiny into an undifferentiated spiritual account. The Dupuis notification addresses ambiguous or insufficient formulations concerning Christ's unique mediation, revelation, the Spirit, Church, kingdom, and religions. The Sobrino notification identifies erroneous or dangerous propositions concerning the divinity of Christ, Incarnation, relation of Jesus to the kingdom, self-consciousness, and saving value of his death.

Ecclesial response: De Mello's incompatible positions were judged capable of grave harm. Dupuis was required to assent to clarifying propositions, with the notification expressly not judging subjective intention. Sobrino's propositions were graded erroneous or dangerous, again without a judgment of subjective culpability. Those exact conclusions and document genres govern; none is a universal act creating "de-Melloism," "Dupuisism," or "Sobrinoism."

Aftermath and qualification: Notifications can restrict use of a text, require clarification, or identify a doctrinal boundary while leaving other work untouched. They exemplify why "the CDF investigated an author" and "the Church declared that person a heretic" are historically and canonically different claims.

9.23 "Neo-Gnosticism" and "neo-Pelagianism" as analogies

Object and setting: The CDF letter *Placuit Deo*, issued 22 February 2018, and Francis's exhortation *Gaudete et exsultate*, 19 March 2018, use ancient names to diagnose modern temptations in Christian life. They do not document institutional descent from ancient Gnostics or Pelagius and do not promulgate a new penal catalogue. Evidence grade A.

Propositions at issue: The "neo-Gnostic" analogy concerns a self-enclosed intellectual or subjective salvation that escapes the concrete body, creation, and relationships; the "neo-Pelagian" analogy concerns autonomous self-sufficiency, reliance on personal power or observance, and forgetfulness of grace. The analogies select recurrent structural features rather than every proposition of the ancient systems.

Ecclesial response: *Placuit Deo* 3 explicitly limits the comparison to general common features and denies exact identity with the ancient heresies; 6–15 teaches salvation as God’s gift in the incarnate Christ, received bodily and communally in the Church. *Gaudete et exsultate* 35–62 applies the terms pastorally to temptations against holiness and grace.

Aftermath and qualification: These labels are useful only with their stated analogical limit. They must not be converted into accusations that a contemporary school or person has been formally adjudged Gnostic or Pelagian, and similarity supplies no historical genealogy.

10 What the Long History Clarifies

The dossiers do not describe a smooth march from primitive confusion to effortless precision. They show a Church receiving the apostolic confession, meeting new questions in changing languages, sometimes answering only after prolonged conflict, and learning to state a boundary without exhausting the mystery inside it. The same history also records ambition, caricature, coercion, political opportunism, and failures of charity by Catholic and non-Catholic actors alike. A true definition is not made true by an emperor’s exile order or an executioner’s sword, and a wicked enforcement does not by itself make the proposition enforced false.

10.1 Seven recurring doctrinal fault lines

Fault line	Recurring reduction	Catholic center	Representative responses
Creation and redemption	Matter is evil, made by an inferior god, or disposable to an esoteric spirit.	The one good God creates; the Word truly assumes created flesh; grace heals and glorifies nature.	Anti-Gnostic rule of faith; Nicaea and Chalcedon; sacramental confession.
Trinity	Divine unity consumes real personal distinction, or the three are divided into unequal beings.	One divine essence in three really distinct, coeternal persons.	Nicaea I; Constantinople I; later Trinitarian clarifications.
Incarnate Christ	Christ’s divinity, full humanity, personal unity, two natures, two operations, or two wills is removed.	One divine person, true God and true man, acting through complete divine and human natures without confusion or division.	Ephesus; Chalcedon; Constantinople II and III; modern common declarations.
Grace and freedom	Salvation becomes autonomous achievement, passive determinism, or a privilege unavailable through ordinary grace.	Every saving beginning is grace; the healed creature truly responds; Christ’s redemption is necessary and sufficient.	Carthage; Orange II; Trent; post-Tridentine proposition censures.
Church and sacrament	Holiness is restricted to a rigorist remnant, sacramental efficacy depends on the minister’s worth, or visible mediation is emptied.	Christ acts in his Church and sacraments; holiness and discipline matter without making grace the property of a pure caste.	Anti-Donatist settlement; medieval Eucharistic professions; Trent.
Revelation and reason	Faith is reduced to private illumination, historical consciousness, autonomous reason, or an unchanging verbal shell detached from living transmission.	Revelation is God’s historical self-gift, entrusted to Scripture and Tradition and authentically interpreted in the Church; faith surpasses but does not destroy reason.	Vatican I; <i>Lamentabili</i> ; <i>Pascendi</i> ; <i>Humani generis</i> ; Vatican II’s positive synthesis.
Last things	Bodily resurrection is denied, realized entirely now, or placed inside a compulsory earthly schedule.	Christ is bodily risen; the dead will rise; history ends by God’s act, not an esoteric calendar or political technique.	Apostolic witness; creeds; medieval and modern millenarian clarifications.

These comparisons describe doctrinal resemblance rather than institutional descent. Historical genealogy requires documents, transmission, and social contact. Where those are absent, this survey says *recurrence* or *analogy*, not lineage.

10.2 What condemnation can and cannot do

A doctrinal condemnation can protect the faithful, identify an incompatible proposition, remove a teacher from office, require a profession, or establish language within which Catholic theology must work. Its deepest historical fruit is often positive: *homooousios* protects the Son's full divinity; *Theotokos* protects the one incarnate subject; Chalcedon's four adverbs protect unity and distinction together; Constantinople III protects Christ's complete obedient humanity; Trent binds grace, faith, renewal, and sacrament without permitting salvation to become either self-redemption or legal fiction.

No act automatically supplies a complete intellectual biography of its target, proves that every follower understood the issue, or guarantees wise enforcement. A proposition list can detach a sentence from its argumentative setting; an *in globo* censure can leave the grade of a particular sentence unstated; an author's submission can end a juridical case without resolving every historian's question. That is why this survey keeps target, extract, censure, and aftermath in separate fields.

10.3 The pattern of aftermath

The aftermaths fall into no single script. Some disputes ended in rapid reconciliation; some created rival hierarchies; some names survived long after the originating school disappeared; some formulas were received only after translation and conceptual work; some local movements dissolved under preaching, social change, or force; and some separations hardened into enduring communions. Coercion sometimes reduced public adherence while corrupting witness, obscuring facts, and leaving wounds longer-lived than the targeted movement.

Modern ecumenical work adds a further kind of aftermath: partners can determine that inherited polemical labels do not accurately express one another's present confession. The Catholic-Coptic, Catholic-Syriac, and Catholic-Assyrian Christological declarations do not erase Ephesus or Chalcedon; they distinguish their doctrinal objects from later misunderstandings and present faith. The Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification does not declare every Reformation disagreement unreal; it establishes consensus on basic truths and explains why the sixteenth-century condemnations do not apply to the partner's teaching as now presented there. Historical fidelity and reconciliation require the same discipline: say exactly what was condemned, and say exactly what is now confessed.

10.4 A practical test for a heresy claim

Before repeating that a person, movement, or present community "is heretical," ask:

1. What exact proposition is meant, in whose words, and from what date?
2. What truth requiring divine and Catholic faith would it deny, or what exact historical act censured it?
3. Did the act call that proposition heretical, attach several grades collectively, or impose a disciplinary penalty without grading doctrine?
4. Is the object a text, a person's demonstrated position, a school, a movement, a schism, or a later population being labeled by ancestry?
5. Does the target text survive, and is the quoted wording its own, a judicial extract, or an opponent's report?
6. Was there recantation, reconciliation, later qualification, or a modern common declaration?
7. Are civil punishment and ecclesial doctrine being confused?

If those questions cannot be answered, the label may still be a lead for research, but it is not yet a responsible historical judgment.

10.5 The unity beneath the negative form

Catholic faith is not a museum built from negations. The condemnations matter because of the realities they defend: the goodness of creation; the truth of the Incarnation and Passion; the coequal Trinity; Christ's complete humanity and saving obedience; grace that precedes and elicits free response; sacraments in which Christ remains faithful; a Church called to holiness without pretending that all her members are pure; reason opened rather than annihilated by revelation; and the promised resurrection of the body.

The sober use of this history is therefore neither name-calling nor indifference. It is gratitude for clarified truth, repentance for distortion and coercion, patience with historical complexity, and readiness to state both Catholic conviction and another person's actual position truthfully. The final timeline records the many acts by which boundaries were drawn; the census appendix records what the resulting names can—and cannot—honestly mean.

A Historical Timeline of Heresies and Responses

This chronology is event-based. A movement can appear more than once because refutation, synodal judgment, definition, civil enforcement, reconciliation, and later ecumenical clarification are different events. An asterisk marks a primarily civil or coercive measure included to keep the aftermath visible; it is not a magisterial act. Dates prefaced by *c.* are approximate. The source and qualification for every row are recorded in the repository's timeline audit.

Date	Place / authority	Object	Response and positive doctrine	Aftermath / evidence
c. 49	Jerusalem; apostles and elders	Claim that Gentile converts require circumcision and the Mosaic law for salvation	Acts 15 rejects that necessity and gives limited communion requirements; Galatians locates justification and covenant membership in Christ.	Foundational apostolic doctrinal judgment; grade A.
c. 107	Smyrna/Rome; Ignatius of Antioch	Teachers who made Christ's flesh and suffering an appearance	Ignatius insists that Jesus was truly born, ate, suffered, died, and rose, and binds Eucharistic and ecclesial communion to that confession.	Early episcopal refutation; target school uncertain; grade B/C.
c. 144	Rome; presbyterate	Marcion's rival god, edited canon, and docetic Christ	Marcion was excluded from the Roman community; Justin, Irenaeus, and Tertullian answered him by the one Creator, one economy, and apostolic Scriptures.	No extant Roman proposition decree; a durable Marcionite church followed; grade C.
c. 150–190	Rome and Lyons; Justin and Irenaeus	Simonian, Menandrian, Cerinthian, Saturnilian, Basilidean, Carpocratian, Valentinian, and related systems	Apologies and <i>Against Heresies</i> set witness-specific accounts beside one Creator, one incarnate Son, public apostolic faith, moral judgment, and bodily salvation.	Patristic refutations, not one council or proof that the named schools formed a single institution; grade B–D by claim.
c. 200	Asia Minor; regional bishops	Montanist or New Prophecy claims and discipline	Eusebius reports synods examining and rejecting the movement; later writers contest prophecy, ecclesial authority, and rigorism.	Acts lost; original and later Montanism must be distinguished; grade C.
251	Rome; Pope Cornelius and Roman synod	Novatian's rival episcopate and rigorist refusal of reconciliation after grave post-baptismal sin	The Roman synod upheld Cornelius, excluded Novatian and his party, and defended the Church's power to reconcile the penitent.	Novatian communities endured for centuries; mixed schism and ecclesiological error; grade B.
268	Antioch; regional synod	Paul of Samosata's dynamic or adoptionist Christology	The synod deposed Paul and rejected a Christology in which the divine Word was not a subsisting divine person incarnate.	Imperial enforcement removed Paul only later; fragments are mediated by opponents; grade B.
314	Arles; western council	Donatist challenge to Caecilian and sacramental communion	Arles rejected the Donatist appeal and treated ordination and baptism as not nullified by a minister's unworthiness.	Rival African hierarchy continued; imperial coercion later intensified; grade B.
325	Nicaea I; ecumenical council	Arius's created and mutable Son	The creed confesses the Son begotten from the Father's substance, true God from true God, consubstantial with the Father; attached anathemas reject "there was when he was not" and creature language.	Arius exiled by imperial order*; decades of formula conflict followed; grade A/B.

Date	Place / authority	Object	Response and positive doctrine	Aftermath / evidence
341–351	Antioch and Sirmium; eastern synods	Marcellian and Photinian accounts of Word, kingdom, and Incarnation	Successive synods deposed or condemned Marcellus and Photinus and issued competing creedal formulas.	Local acts became entangled with the post-Nicene party struggle; not one ecumenical settlement; grade B.
359–360	Rimini, Seleucia, Constantinople; imperial councils	Homoian formula refusing substance-language	Court-backed councils imposed “like according to the Scriptures” and proscribed <i>ousia</i> terminology.	Coercive reception was brief; these were not ecumenical definitions received by the Catholic Church; grade A/B.
362	Alexandria; synod under Athanasius	Divisions among Nicenes and early denial of the Spirit’s divinity	The <i>Tomus ad Antiochenos</i> recognizes orthodox uses of one and three hypostases, confesses the Spirit’s inseparability, and safeguards Christ’s complete humanity.	Important bridge to Constantinople I; grade A.
377–382	Rome and Constantinople; Damasus and Constantinople I	Eunomians, Arians, Pneumatomachi, Sabellians, Marcellians, Photinians, and Apollinarians	Roman acts and the 381 council reaffirm Nicene faith; the creed confesses the Spirit as Lord and life-giver, and canon 1 names the rejected groups.	Conciliar reception fixed the pro-Nicene Trinitarian grammar; full 381 acts do not survive; grade A/B.
380	Saragossa; regional council	Ascetic practices associated with Priscillianist circles	Canons correct secret meetings, liturgical absence, fasts, and ascetic disruptions without supplying a complete dogmatic system.	Later heresiological charges exceed this act; grade B.
385	Trier; imperial court*	Priscillian and companions after episcopal proceedings	The secular court executed them for <i>maleficium</i> ; Martin of Tours and others opposed the capital procedure.	First famous execution of Christians for heresy-related charges; civil sentence is not a creed; evidence contested.
c. 390–393	Rome and Milan; Siricius and western bishops	Jovinian’s propositions on baptismal security, ascetical merit, fasting, reward, and Mary’s virginal childbirth	A Roman council excluded Jovinian and associates; the Milanese bishops received the judgment while defending both marriage’s goodness and virginity’s distinctive excellence.	No durable Jovinian communion can be traced; Jerome’s polemic is not the sentence; grade B/C.
411	Carthage; imperial conference*	Catholic and Donatist episcopal claims	A state-appointed official ruled for the Catholic party after a mass conference; Augustine’s theology distinguished sacramental validity from fruitful communion.	Repressive laws followed; Donatism declined unevenly and survived into later centuries; grade A/B.
418	Carthage and Rome; African council and Pope Zosimus	Pelagian and Caelestinian claims about original sin, infant baptism, grace, and sinlessness	African canons affirm inherited sin, baptism’s remission, and grace necessary not only for knowledge but for willing and doing good; Zosimus confirmed the condemnation.	Pelagius’s own positions and later Pelagian systems require distinction; grade A/B.
431	Ephesus; ecumenical council	Nestorius’s refusal of Cyril’s Christological and Marian language	The council received Cyril’s second letter, condemned Nestorius, and defended one incarnate subject truly born from Mary as <i>Theotokos</i> .	Rival session and political conflict followed; the 433 reunion clarified language; grade A.
433	Alexandria and Antioch; Formula of Reunion	Post-Ephesine division over unity and distinction in Christ	Cyril and John of Antioch confess one Christ, perfect God and perfect man, with union without confusion and Mary as <i>Theotokos</i> .	Demonstrates reconciliation through mutually interpreted formulas; grade A.
448–451	Constantinople and Chalcedon; synods and ecumenical council	Eutyches’s account of Christ after the union and the violence of the 449 council	Chalcedon received Leo’s Tome and defined one and the same Son in two natures, without confusion, change, division, or separation; it deposed Dioscorus on conciliar-procedural grounds.	Imperial enforcement* and lasting separation followed; Eutyches is not a synonym for every non-Chalcedonian; grade A.
c. 473	Arles; regional bishops	Propositions attributed to the priest Lucidus on grace, freedom, Christ’s saving will, and predestination to evil	Lucidus subscribed a profession repudiating the listed claims and confessing grace’s priority without divine predestination to sin.	Retraction text may reflect an accuser’s construction; no ecumenical act or durable Lucidian school; grade B/C.
484–519	Rome and Constantinople; Acacian schism	Reception of Chalcedon and the imperial <i>Henotikon</i>	Roman and Constantinopolitan sees broke communion; the Formula of Hormisdas restored it in 519 with an explicit Chalcedonian confession.	Primarily a communion crisis with doctrinal stakes, not a new single heresy; grade A.

Date	Place / authority	Object	Response and positive doctrine	Aftermath / evidence
529	Orange II; regional council confirmed by Boniface II	Gallic propositions later called “Semi-Pelagian”	Canons make even the beginning of faith and desire for cleansing the work of prevenient grace, reject natural unaided saving good, and also reject predestination to evil.	Retrospective movement name; positive synthesis became authoritative in the West; grade A.
543	Constantinople; Emperor Justinian and eastern bishops	Origenist propositions including pre-existence and necessary restoration	An imperial edict and subscribed anathemas rejected a defined set of propositions.	Relation of the famous fifteen anathemas to the 553 council remains disputed; grade B.
553	Constantinople II; ecumenical council	Theodore of Mopsuestia, specified writings of Theodoret, and Ibas’s letter—the Three Chapters	The council condemned the person and writings while receiving Ephesus and Chalcedon and insisting on the unity of the incarnate Word.	Western resistance and the northern Italian schism followed; not a newly organized “Three Chapters heresy”; grade A.
c. 557–567	Alexandria and Constantinople; rival episcopal parties	Tritheist formulations treating the three hypostases as three particular natures or deities	Chalcedonian and non-Chalcedonian theologians rejected the conclusion; Alexandrian censures and Constantinopolitan negotiations preserved the one undivided divine essence.	Fragmentary, partisan record and no separate Catholic ecumenical canon against Philoponus; grade B/C.
c. 600	Alexandria and Rome; Eulogius and Gregory I	Agnoete claim that Christ’s humanity was ignorant of the day and hour	Eulogius refuted the claim; Gregory’s <i>Register</i> 10.39 endorsed the response and distinguished knowledge in Christ’s humanity from knowledge derived from human nature as source.	Papal theological correspondence, not an ecumenical proposition list; named party fades; grade B/C.
649	Rome; Lateran synod under Martin I	Monoenergist and Monothelite formulas and imperial <i>Ecthesis/Typos</i>	The synod confesses two natural wills and operations in the one Christ and condemns named authors and documents.	Martin was arrested and exiled by imperial power*; the teaching prepared Constantinople III; grade A.
680–681	Constantinople III; ecumenical council	One will or operation in Christ	The council defines two natural wills and operations, the human will freely following the divine, and anathematizes named teachers including Honorius.	Pope Leo II confirmed the council in 682 while characterizing Honorius’s fault precisely; grade A.
754	Hieria; imperial council*	Defense of sacred images	The iconoclast council prohibited images and claimed conciliar authority.	Later rejected as a false council; iconophile persecution accompanied its policy; grade A for its act, not Catholic authority.
787	Nicaea II; ecumenical council	Iconoclasm	The council distinguishes worship due to God from honor shown to images and teaches that honor passes to the prototype.	Reception continued through Byzantine conflict and western translation disputes; grade A.
792–799	Regensburg, Frankfurt, Rome; western synods	Spanish Adoptionism of Elipandus and Felix	Western councils reject calling Christ, as man, God’s adoptive son and confess the one natural Son in both natures.	Felix recanted at Rome; pockets of dispute remained in Spain; grade A/B.
843	Constantinople; Byzantine restoration	Renewed iconoclasm after Nicaea II	Empress Theodora’s government restored images and the synodical feast of Orthodoxy received the council.	End of official Byzantine iconoclasm, though not every western image controversy; grade A/B.
848–853	Mainz, Quierzy, and Soissons; Carolingian synods	Gottschalk’s double-predestination formulations	Mainz and Quierzy condemned and imprisoned Gottschalk; competing theologians and later councils articulated differing formulas on predestination and grace.	No simple universal “Gottschalk heresy” verdict resolves the Carolingian dispute; coercive imprisonment* continued; grade B.
1050–1079	Vercelli, Rome, and Tours; papal councils	Berengar’s Eucharistic account	Repeated councils rejected denials of substantial conversion and required professions, culminating in the 1079 formula of true conversion and Christ’s substantial presence.	Berengar submitted; language developed toward the later term transubstantiation; grade A/B.

Date	Place / authority	Object	Response and positive doctrine	Aftermath / evidence
c. 1112–1124	Utrecht and Antwerp; canons and Norbert	Propositions and a personal cult attributed to Tanchelm	Utrecht canons requested detention and judgment; Norbert later preached Catholic ministry and Eucharistic communion at Antwerp.	Accusation and pastoral response survive, but no target text or synodal sentence; Tanchelm's killing was not an extant conciliar judgment; grade C/D.
1139	Lateran II; ecumenical council	Unnamed groups rejecting Eucharist, infant baptism, priesthood, and marriage	Canon 23 condemns those who feign religion while repudiating these sacramental and ecclesial goods.	Often associated with several dissenting currents, but the canon does not supply one secure sociology; grade B.
1140–1141	Sens; regional council and Innocent II	Propositions attributed to Peter Abelard	Sens condemned a list concerning Trinity, grace, Christ, and sin; Innocent ordered silence and burning of the book.	Abelard appealed, then submitted and reconciled at Cluny; attribution/context remain debated; grade B.
1148	Reims; council under Eugene III	Gilbert of Poitiers's Trinitarian terminology	The council required corrections distinguishing God, divinity, persons, and essence.	Gilbert submitted; no durable Gilbertine church resulted; proposition wording is mediated; grade B.
1163	Tours; papal council	Heretics in southern France, often associated with dualist currents	Canonical measures prohibited sheltering them and directed secular princes to restrain them.	Pre-inquisitorial repression; nomenclature does not yet prove one transregional Cathar organization; grade B.
1179	Lateran III; ecumenical council	Cathars, Patarenes, Publicani, and related names	Canon 27 anathematizes named groups and their defenders and promises spiritual privileges to armed opponents.	Joined doctrine to coercive response; labels are regional and inconsistent; grade A/B.
1184	Verona; Lucius III and Frederick I	Cathars, Patarenes, Humiliati, Poor of Lyon, Passagians, Josephines, Arnoldists	<i>Ad abolendam</i> lists groups, imposes episcopal inquiry, and coordinates ecclesial excommunication with secular penalties*.	Major legal framework; group listing does not mean identical doctrine; grade A.
1199	Innocent III	Protection and spread of heresy	<i>Vergentis in senium</i> compares pertinacious heresy to treason and provides confiscatory consequences*.	Influential penal analogy; not a new dogmatic definition; grade A.
1208	Rome; Innocent III	Waldensian reconciliation	Durand of Huesca and companions profess Catholic faith, sacraments, hierarchy, and the legitimacy of oaths and temporal property.	Shows that reconciliation and differentiated treatment accompanied repression; grade A.
1209–1229	Languedoc; papal and princely forces*	Albigensian/Cathar presence and political resistance	The Albigensian Crusade used warfare against territories and protectors while preaching and councils pursued doctrinal and pastoral response.	Enormous violence and political conquest cannot be treated as a doctrinal formula; regional Cathar evidence remains contested.
1210	Paris; local ecclesial and royal action*	Amalricians and David of Dinant's writings	Amalrician propositions were condemned; persons were degraded and executed or imprisoned, and David's books prohibited.	Target texts fragmentary and reports hostile; local acts, grade B/D.
1215	Lateran IV; ecumenical council	Cathar dualism; Joachim's criticism of Peter Lombard's Trinitarian language	Constitution 1 confesses one Creator, Incarnation, sacraments, resurrection, and judgment; constitution 2 rejects Joachim's proposition while expressly protecting his monastery and acknowledging his submission; constitution 3 legislates against heretics*.	Doctrinal precision and coercive law must be separated; grade A.
1231	Gregory IX	Heresy procedure and recurring groups	<i>Excommunicamus</i> consolidates canonical penalties and authorizes papally delegated inquiry.	Institutional papal inquisition developed; procedure is not itself a new creed; grade A.
1252	Innocent IV and Lombard cities*	Secular prosecution of convicted heretics	<i>Ad extirpanda</i> regulates civil enforcement and permits torture under stated limits.	Coercive and morally grave aftermath, not magisterial definition; grade A.
1255	Anagni; Alexander IV commission	Gerard of Borgo San Donnino's Joachite <i>Introduction to the Eternal Gospel</i>	A commission censured the work's radicalized age-of-the-Spirit claims; papal suppression and Franciscan discipline followed.	Distinguish Gerard's construction from everything Joachim wrote; grade B.

Date	Place / authority	Object	Response and positive doctrine	Aftermath / evidence
1270/1277	Paris; Bishop Stephen Tempier	Academic propositions concerning intellect, necessity, providence, ethics, and theology	Tempier condemned 13 and later 219 propositions within his jurisdiction.	Local university censures, not 232 universal heresies; influence on scholastic debate remains contested; grade A/B.
1311–1312	Vienne; ecumenical council	Errors attributed to certain Beguards/Beguines; soul-body doctrine	<i>Ad nostrum</i> condemns specified perfectionist propositions; <i>Fidei catholicae fundamento</i> teaches the rational soul as per se and essential form of the body.	The council did not condemn every Beguine community; grade A.
1317–1323	Avignon; John XXII	Spiritual Franciscan/Fraticelli disobedience and absolute-poverty proposition	<i>Sancta Romana</i> and <i>Gloriosam Ecclesiam</i> condemn factions; <i>Cum inter nonnullos</i> calls pertinacious assertion that Christ and the apostles owned nothing individually or in common erroneous and heretical.	Some friars submitted; others were imprisoned or executed*; distinguish poverty doctrine from movement identity; grade A.
1327	Avignon; John XXII	Marsilius of Padua and John of Jandun	<i>Licet iuxta doctrinam</i> rejects five conclusions subordinating or dissolving ecclesial spiritual authority.	Authors remained under imperial protection; mixed political and doctrinal controversy; grade A.
1329	Avignon; John XXII	Meister Eckhart's propositions	<i>In agro dominico</i> grades 17 articles as erroneous or tainted with heresy and 11 as suspect, while noting Eckhart's conditional revocation.	Later reception must preserve individual grades and the fact that not all his work was condemned; grade A/B.
1377	Rome; Gregory XI	Nineteen conclusions from John Wyclif	Papal letters send propositions for examination, calling some heretical and others erroneous and dangerous.	Wyclif retained protection; later English and conciliar proceedings expanded the lists; grade A/B.
1382	London; Blackfriars council	Wycliffite Eucharistic and ecclesial propositions	Archbishop Courtenay's council grades ten conclusions heretical and fourteen erroneous.	Oxford restrictions followed; Lollard reception was diverse; grade A/B.
1415	Constance; council and civil authority*	Wyclif's memory and Jan Hus	Constance condemns extracted articles, orders Wyclif's remains removed, and sentences Hus after disputed attribution and recantation demands; the secular authority executes Hus.	Proposition grades and conciliar authority differ by decree/session; Hussite war and division followed; grade A/B.
1418	Constance/Rome; Martin V	Wycliffite and Hussite adherence	<i>Inter cunctas</i> supplies interrogation articles and describes the earlier materials collectively as heretical, erroneous, rash, seditious, or offensive.	Definitively blocks the claim that every listed article bore one censure; grade A.
1433–1436	Basel/Bohemia; council parties and estates	Utraquist communion and Hussite demands	The Compactata permit a regulated communion-under-both-kinds settlement while requiring Catholic Eucharistic doctrine and ecclesial order.	Limited settlement with Utraquists; Taborite and later reception differed; disputed conciliar setting; grade A/B.
1460	Rome; Pius II	Appeal from papal judgment to a future council	<i>Execrabilis</i> condemns such appeals as an abuse contrary to ecclesial order.	Principal anti-conciliarist reference; jurisdictional-doctrinal act, not a catalogue of every conciliar theory; grade A.
1513	Lateran V; ecumenical council	Soul mortality and one-intellect theses	<i>Apostolici regiminis</i> affirms each human soul's immortality and multiplicity and requires philosophy teaching compatible with faith.	Aimed at academic propositions, not Aristotle or philosophy as such; grade A.

Date	Place / authority	Object	Response and positive doctrine	Aftermath / evidence
1520	Rome; Leo X	Forty-one propositions from Martin Luther's works	<i>Exsurge Domine</i> condemns the propositions collectively as heretical, scandalous, false, offensive, seductive, or contrary to Catholic truth and requires retraction.	The act does not assign an individual grade to every proposition; Luther burns it; grade A.
1521	Rome/Worms; Leo X and Charles V*	Luther's refusal to retract	<i>Decet Romanum Pontificem</i> declares excommunication; the Edict of Worms imposes imperial outlawry*.	Ecclesial penalty and civil enforcement remain distinct; confessional separation expands; grade A.
1525	Toledo; Spanish Inquisition	Forty-eight propositions judicially attributed to Aluminbrados, <i>dezados</i> , or <i>perfectos</i>	An edict of faith states and qualifies the allegations individually, addressing abandonment, prayer, sacraments, moral effort, and claims of impeccability.	Inquisitorial construction, not one movement's confession or a universal papal definition; later individual sentences followed; grade B.
1525–1527	Zürich and other cities; civic-church councils*	Anabaptist rejection of infant baptism and rebaptism of adults	Local disputations reject the teaching; Catholic and Protestant governments impose exile and, in some places, death*.	Anabaptists were highly diverse; coercion by several confessions is not a doctrinal proof; grade A/B.
1546	Trent, sessions IV–V; ecumenical council	Reformation disputes over revelation, Scripture, tradition, original sin, and baptism	Trent receives Scripture and apostolic traditions, identifies the canonical books and authentic Vulgate use, and defines original sin and its remission without including Mary in the decree.	First conciliar phase; canons target propositions rather than naming every communion; grade A.
1547	Trent, sessions VI–VII	Justification and sacraments in general; Baptism and Confirmation	The council teaches prevenient grace, faith, hope, charity, real interior renewal, merit in grace, seven sacraments instituted by Christ, and sacramental efficacy not dependent on ministerial faith.	Canonical condemnations preserve precise opposites; Catholic and Protestant readings continued to develop; grade A.
1551	Trent, sessions XIII–XIV	Eucharist, Penance, and Extreme Unction	The council defines true, real, substantial presence and transubstantiation; sacramental confession and absolution; and Anointing as a true sacrament.	Zwinglian, Reformed, Lutheran, and Catholic positions must not be collapsed; grade A.
1553	Geneva; civic court*	Michael Servetus's anti-Trinitarian and anti-baptismal teaching	Reformed Geneva convicts and executes Servetus after consultation with other Swiss churches.	Not a Catholic judgment; included as confessional aftermath and warning against coercion; target writings survive, grade A.
1562–1563	Trent, sessions XXI–XXV	Communion, sacrifice of the Mass, Orders, Matrimony, purgatory, saints, images, indulgences	The council completes proposition-level definitions and reform decrees, distinguishing sacramental doctrine from disciplinary reform.	Becomes the Catholic confessional answer to the Reformations; grade A.
1567/1579	Rome; Pius V and Gregory XIII	Seventy-nine propositions associated with Michael Baius	<i>Ex omnibus afflictionibus</i> condemns the list with several censures applied collectively; <i>Provisionis nostrae</i> reaffirms the judgment, especially on nature, original justice, freedom, grace, and merit.	Baius submitted with later disputes about wording and censure distribution; not every item may be called individually heretical; grade A/B.
1607	Rome; Paul V	Thomist–Molinist dispute over grace and free choice	After the <i>de auxiliis</i> congregations, Paul V permits both schools to teach within stated limits and forbids mutual censure.	A decisive exclusion from the heresy census: unresolved Catholic schools are not heresies.
1612–1613	Sens, Aix, and Rome; provincial councils and Paul V	Edmond Richer's restriction of papal and ministerial jurisdiction	Sens censures the book's propositions <i>as they sound</i> under mixed notes; Aix follows, Paul V confirms the episcopal response, and the Index prohibits the book.	No numbered papal syllabus or one-grade censure of every sentence; Richerist influence persists; grade A/B.
1642	Rome; Urban VIII	Jansenius's <i>Augustinus</i>	<i>In eminenti</i> prohibits the book as renewing condemned Baian and grace propositions.	Publication and reception continue, leading to proposition-level judgment; grade A.

Date	Place / authority	Object	Response and positive doctrine	Aftermath / evidence
1653	Rome; Innocent X	Five propositions on commandments, grace, freedom, and Christ's death	<i>Cum occasione</i> condemns four as heretical and one as false or heretical according to its stated qualification.	The "fact" dispute—whether Jansenius taught them in the condemned sense—follows; grade A.
1656	Rome; Alexander VII	Jansenist fact/right distinction	<i>Ad sanctam beati Petri sedem</i> confirms that the five propositions are in <i>Augustinus</i> in the condemned sense.	Formulary controversy and "respectful silence" persist; grade A/B.
1665–1679	Rome; Alexander VII and Innocent XI	Laxist moral propositions	Roman decrees condemn successive lists permitting grave conduct through distorted probability, intention, restitution, and sacramental reasoning.	Condemned moral errors with varied notes, not a single organized heresy; grade A.
1682/1690	Paris and Rome; French assembly and Alexander VIII	Four Gallican Articles on temporal power, conciliar limits, custom, and reformability of papal judgments	<i>Inter multiplices</i> declares the 1682 proceedings and articles null and void; Vatican I later defines primacy and infallibility under exact conditions.	A broad ecclesial-political tendency, not four identically graded heresies; grade A.
1687	Rome; Innocent XI	Sixty-eight propositions associated with Miguel de Molinos	<i>Caelestis Pastor</i> condemns Quietist propositions that empty ascetic effort, petition, resistance to temptation, and ecclesial mediation in the name of passive annihilation.	Molinos abjures and is imprisoned; broader mystical theology is not condemned; grade A/B.
1690	Rome; Alexander VIII	Jansenist/rigorist and moral propositions	<i>Sanctissimus Dominus</i> condemns thirty-one propositions, including distortions of grace, freedom, ecclesiology, and moral action.	Demonstrates Roman rejection of both laxism and rigorism; proposition-level act, grade A.
1699	Rome; Innocent XII	Twenty-three propositions from Fénelon's <i>Maxims of the Saints</i>	<i>Cum alias</i> condemns the propositions on pure love and indifference to salvation as rash, scandalous, ill-sounding, offensive, dangerous, or erroneous.	Fénelon submits; not every article is styled heresy and not all mystical disinterested love is rejected; grade A.
1713	Rome; Clement XI	101 propositions from Pasquier Quesnel	<i>Unigenitus Dei Filius</i> condemns the propositions collectively under multiple grades, concerning grace, Scripture, Church, sacraments, and authority.	Appeals and Gallican/Jansenist resistance divide France; individual-grade caution required; grade A.
1764	Rome/German lands; Index and Clement XIII	Febronius's reduction of papal jurisdiction and strong national-episcopal theory	The book is prohibited and Clement XIII directs the German bishops against it.	Book-level suppression, not a proposition-by-proposition dogmatic definition; Josephinism is treated as a related state policy, grade A/B.
1794	Rome; Pius VI	Eighty-five propositions of the Synod of Pistoia	<i>Auctorem fidei</i> assigns proposition-specific or grouped censures on Church, grace, sacraments, liturgy, and discipline.	Reform program suppressed; this act is a model for exact censure parsing, not a blanket label; grade A.
1832	Rome; Gregory XVI	Religious indifferentism and an unbounded liberty-of-conscience proposition	<i>Mirari vos</i> rejects indifference among religions and liberty detached from truth and the common good.	Vatican II later teaches civil immunity from religious coercion while preserving the duty to seek truth; genres and objects differ, grade A.
1835	Rome; Gregory XVI	Georg Hermes's method and works	<i>Dum acerbissimas</i> prohibits the works for positive doubt and rationalist treatment of faith and associated doctrines.	Mixed lower censures and book prohibition; no blanket personal-heretic verdict, grade A/B.
1835–1840	Rome; Gregory XVI and Augustin Bautain	Fideist propositions on reason and revelation	Bautain signs theses affirming natural rational knowledge of God, motives of credibility, and reason's genuine capacity while requiring revelation for mysteries.	Personal submission through required propositions; philosophical fideism, not faith itself, is corrected; grade A.
1855	Rome; Holy Office and Augustin Bonnetty	Radical traditionalist propositions	Required theses affirm reason's capacity to know God and demonstrate credibility while maintaining revelation's supernatural necessity.	Corrective subscription, not an act declaring every traditionalist a heretic; grade A.

Date	Place / authority	Object	Response and positive doctrine	Aftermath / evidence
1857	Rome; Pius IX	Anton Günther's philosophical theology	<i>Eximiam tuam</i> confirms the prohibition of works whose rational reconstruction endangered Trinity, creation, soul, and Incarnation.	Günther submits; the act does not condemn philosophical inquiry as such; grade A/B.
1861	Rome; Holy Office	Seven Ontologist propositions	The decree rejects immediate knowledge of God as the necessary ground of all human cognition and related accounts of being and creation.	A precise philosophical censure; grade A.
1864	Rome; Pius IX	Naturalism, religious indifferentism, coercive secular absolutism, and related errors	<i>Quanta cura</i> directly condemns specified propositions; the attached <i>Syllabus</i> indexes earlier papal acts across eighty headings.	Genre and original-source context control interpretation; not every modern liberty is condemned under one undifferentiated note; grade A.
1870	Vatican I; ecumenical council	Pantheism, materialism, rationalism, fideism, denial of revelation's credibility, and denial of papal primacy/infallibility	<i>Dei Filius</i> defines God, revelation, faith, and faith-reason harmony; <i>Pastor aeternus</i> defines Roman primacy and ex cathedra infallibility under exact conditions.	Old Catholic resistance and separation follow; definitions are narrower than later polemical slogans; grade A.
1873–1875	Rome; Pius IX	Old Catholic rejection of Vatican I and construction of a rival hierarchy	<i>Etsi multa</i> identifies the doctrinal denials and invalid episcopal election; <i>Graves ac diuturnae</i> addresses the separated and schismatic body.	Apply the council's definitions to propositions and <i>Unitatis redintegratio</i> 3 to later descendants; grade A.
1887	Rome; Holy Office	Forty propositions extracted from Antonio Rosmini	<i>Post obitum</i> condemns the propositions as not consonant with Catholic truth.	The CDF's 2001 note later distinguishes heterodox interpretations from Rosmini's authentic thought and removes reasons for prior doctrinal concern; grade A with later qualification.
1899	Rome; Leo XIII	Tendencies reported under the name "Americanism"	<i>Testem benevolentiae</i> conditionally rejects minimizing external guidance, vows, traditional virtues, and inherited methods, while expressing confidence that American bishops did not hold the views.	Not evidence of one organized American heresy; grade A.
1907	Rome; Holy Office and Pius X	Modernist propositions on revelation, dogma, Scripture, Christ, sacraments, and Church	<i>Lamentabili</i> condemns sixty-five propositions; <i>Pascendi</i> constructs and refutes an interconnected Modernist system; <i>Praestantia Scripturae</i> confirms the acts and attaches penalties.	Individual propositions and authors still require exact attribution; "Modernism" is not a synonym for modern scholarship; grade A.
1910	Rome; Pius X	Persistence of Modernist method among clergy and teachers	<i>Sacrorum antistitum</i> imposes the anti-Modernist oath and disciplinary vigilance.	Oath later discontinued; disciplinary response must be distinguished from each doctrinal censure; grade A.
1937	Rome; Pius XI	Atheistic communism as a materialist and collectivist worldview	<i>Divini Redemptoris</i> rejects denial of God, soul, afterlife, personal dignity, and the class-struggle system.	A condemned rival ideology, often held by the unbaptized, not ordinarily canonical heresy under canon 751; grade A.
1944	Rome; Holy Office	Mitigated or spiritual millenarianism	A decree states that a system in which Christ would visibly reign on earth before the final judgment cannot safely be taught, even in mitigated form.	Censure is "cannot safely be taught," not a newly defined universal heresy name; grade A.
1949	Rome; Holy Office	Support for Communist organizations and profession of materialist anti-Christian doctrine	A 1 July decree distinguishes enrollment/support/publication conduct and the profession or defense of materialist Communist doctrine.	Penal and doctrinal provisions; Communism itself is not simply a baptized Christian sect; grade A.
1949	Rome/Boston; Holy Office	Restrictive reading of "outside the Church no salvation" associated with Leonard Feeney's circle	<i>Suprema haec sacra</i> teaches the Church's necessity while affirming implicit desire ordered by supernatural faith and charity; later disciplinary action concerns refusal of obedience.	The doctrine is neither indifferentism nor a claim that only registered Catholics can be saved; grade A.

Date	Place / authority	Object	Response and positive doctrine	Aftermath / evidence
1950	Rome; Pius XII	Errors concerning dogmatic development, relativism, reason, Scripture, original sin, and evolution	<i>Humani generis</i> warns against specified false or dangerous opinions, permits research on human bodily origins under conditions, and excludes polygenism as then irreconcilable with received original-sin doctrine.	The encyclical does not declare evolution as such a heresy or condemn all renewed theology; grade A.
1953	Rome; Holy Office	Leonard Feeney's continued refusal of obedience	A decree declares excommunication after repeated summons and contumacy.	The penalty is for grave disobedience, not a decree formally adjudging personal heresy; grade A.
1956	Rome; Holy Office	Situation ethics	An instruction rejects making personal intuition or circumstances, rather than objective moral law, finally determinative.	Prohibited moral system, not a formal dogmatic definition of a named heresy; grade A.
1964	Vatican II; ecumenical council	Enduring Christian divisions and historical polemic	<i>Unitatis redintegratio</i> 3 excludes imputing the sin of the original separation to those born into separated communities; paragraph 4 requires truth and fairness in representation and provides for dialogue; paragraph 11 rejects false irenicism and teaches a hierarchy of truths.	Promulgated 21 November 1964; a positive doctrinal and pastoral qualification of how historical labels are used; grade A.
1966	Rome; CDF	Postconciliar errors involving Scripture, dogma, Christ, Eucharist, penance, original sin, morality, and ecumenism	A circular letter to episcopal conferences identifies propositions requiring vigilance and correction.	Inventory of errors, not one new named heresy; grade A.
1967	Rome; CDF	Profession of faith and anti-Modernist oath discipline	A new profession replaces the earlier Tridentine formula and anti-Modernist oath for specified uses.	Disciplinary replacement does not reverse the substantive doctrinal acts of 1907; grade A.
1973	Rome; Paul VI and Shenouda III	Catholic–Coptic Christological inheritance	Common declaration professes one incarnate Lord, perfect God and perfect man, without mixing, commingling, confusion, alteration, division, or separation.	Historic Eutychian propositions remain rejected; present Coptic Orthodox faith is not simply labeled Eutychian; grade A.
1973	Rome; CDF	Relativizing dogmatic formulas and Church indefectibility	<i>Mysterium Ecclesiae</i> distinguishes historical expression and legitimate development from treating dogmatic meaning as indefinitely replaceable.	Modern doctrinal clarification, not a new named-heretic register; grade A.
1979	Rome; CDF	Hans Küng's positions on ecclesial infallibility, Magisterium, and Eucharistic ministry	<i>Christi Ecclesia</i> judges departure from integral Catholic truth and withdraws authorization to teach as a Catholic theologian.	Text/office judgment, not a formal personal-heresy trial; grade A.
1984/1986	Rome; CDF	Reductive uses of Marxist analysis and Christian liberation	The two instructions reject class-struggle hermeneutics, violence, materialist anthropology, and reduction of salvation while affirming integral liberation and the preferential concern for the poor.	They do not condemn every liberation theology or struggle for justice; grade A.
1984	Rome; John Paul II and Ignatius Zakka I	Catholic–Syriac Christological inheritance	Common declaration confesses the same incarnate Word and says the confusions and schisms over the Incarnation have no real basis in the faith now jointly confessed.	Requires qualified present terminology while preserving historic acts; grade A.
1988	Rome; John Paul II; later status in 2009	Lefebvre episcopal consecrations and SSPX status	<i>Ecclesia Dei</i> calls the consecrations a schismatic act; Benedict XVI's 2009 <i>Ecclesiae unitatem</i> states that remission of censures did not grant canonical status and doctrinal questions remained.	Canonical/communion boundary, not a declaration that the SSPX is one heresy; grade A.
1994	Rome; John Paul II and Mar Dinkha IV	Catholic–Assyrian Christological inheritance	Common declaration professes one Lord Jesus Christ, true God and true man, and explains that earlier anathemas concerned persons and formulas amid misunderstanding.	“Nestorian Church” is rejected as an adequate current label for the Assyrian Church of the East; grade A.

Date	Place / authority	Object	Response and positive doctrine	Aftermath / evidence
1994/1995	Rome; John Paul II and CDF	Reservation of priestly ordination to men	<i>Ordinatio sacerdotalis</i> states the Church lacks authority and the teaching is definitively to be held; the CDF responsum identifies ordinary-universal infallibility.	Definitive doctrine; the 1998 commentary places it in the second assent category rather than automatically calling every denial technical heresy; grade A.
1998	Rome; CDF	Confusion among revealed dogma, definitive doctrine, and other authentic teaching	Doctrinal commentary on the <i>Professio fidei</i> distinguishes three categories of teaching and corresponding assent.	Governs why every corrected error is not technically heresy; grade A.
1998	Rome; CDF	Writings of Anthony de Mello	A notification identifies positions incompatible with Catholic faith concerning God, Christ, revelation, and religions.	Text-level doctrinal judgment; no inference about every work or subjective culpability; grade A.
1999	Augsburg; Catholic Church and Lutheran World Federation	Sixteenth-century dispute over justification	Joint Declaration and official common statement identify consensus on basic truths of justification and say the historic condemnations do not apply to the partner's teaching as presented there.	Remaining differences and continuing significance of Trent and Lutheran confessions are expressly retained; grade A.
2000	Rome; CDF	Relativist accounts of Christ, revelation, Church, and religions	<i>Dominus Iesus</i> reaffirms the definitive and complete revelation in Christ, his unique universal mediation, and the Church's relation to other religions and Christian bodies.	Doctrinal declaration, not a judgment that every non-Catholic person is a formal heretic; grade A.
2001	Rome; CDF	Interpretation of the Rosmini propositions	A doctrinal note explains that the censured propositions do not belong to Rosmini's authentic position when read in the sense clarified by his full works and later doctrine.	A rare formal illustration of afterlife qualification without denying the 1887 act; grade A.
2001	Rome; CDF	Jacques Dupuis's theology of religious pluralism	A notification requires clarifying propositions on Christ, revelation, Church, and religions while expressly not judging subjective intention.	Text-level clarification, not a personal heresy sentence; grade A.
2006–2007	Rome; CDF	Jon Sobrino's Christological works	A notification identifies propositions judged erroneous or dangerous concerning Christ's divinity, Incarnation, self-consciousness, kingdom, and saving death.	Judgment of writings without judgment of subjective intention; grade A.
2018	Rome; CDF and Francis	Analogical “neo-Gnosticism” and “neo-Pelagianism”	<i>Placuit Deo</i> and <i>Gaudete et exsultate</i> warn against salvation reduced to inner knowledge or autonomous effort.	The documents expressly use general analogy rather than asserting historical identity or a new juridical sect; grade A.
13 May 2026	Rome; DDF prefect	Announced SSPX episcopal consecrations without papal mandate	The DDF warned that the proposed act would be schismatic.	Prospective warning when issued, not proof that the later consecrations occurred and not a named-heresy judgment; grade A.
29 June 2026	Rome; Leo XIV	Intended SSPX episcopal consecrations without papal mandate	Leo XIV asked the Society to desist and warned of the sacramental consequences of separation.	Distinct prospective papal letter, not proof of the later event or permission for it; grade A.
2 July 2026	Ècône and Rome; DDF	Four episcopal consecrations performed on 1 July and the resulting canonical determinations	The signed decree records five reserved canon 1387 cases—de Galarreta and four recipients—and applies canon 1364 §1 separately to de Galarreta and Fellay; the note determines current minister, formal-adherence, and sacramental consequences.	Dispositive canonical status acts, not a declaration of one SSPX heresy, of six reserved penalties, or of every minister or lay visitor's individual censure; checked through 16 July; grade A.

B Census, Aliases, Contexts, and Exclusions

What this appendix counts

This is the reader-facing account of an enumeratively complete census against the disclosed working corpus. It is not an official list of “all heresies,” a critical edition, or an independently reviewed specialist register. A normalized head may be a historical movement, a family of related trajectories, or a proposition-complex answered by a particular act. A source notice may preserve little more than an opponent’s label. An alias is not another group, and a contextual controversy or explicit exclusion is not a heresy count. Completion here means that every admitted object and catalogue occurrence has a stable route; it does not erase the stated evidence limits.

B.1 Counting rules and completed state

Stable keys use five object namespaces plus a catalogue-occurrence namespace. In the lists below, a printed era prefix plus the displayed slug forms the full key: for example, under HC.D.PAT, ARIANISM means HC.D.PAT.ARIANISM. The disposition abbreviations are D=DOSSIER, a dedicated four-field dossier; R=ROUTED, treatment within a named combined dossier; P=ERROR, a proposition- or error-level dossier that retains the act’s own grade; N=NOTICE; A=ALIAS; C=CONTEXT; and X=EXCLUDE. A completion code describes the form of treatment, not personal culpability or an automatic declaration that every attributed sentence was heretical.

Class	Stable prefix	Present count	Meaning in this survey
Normalized heads	HC.D	125	Sixty-nine D, eleven R, and forty-five P. These are not 125 official declarations of named heresy.
Source notices	HC.N	55	Completed, visibly source-limited records for obscure, opponent-only, late, or doubtful labels; all N.
Aliases/subgroups	HC.A	34	Routing entries; all A and never independent counts.
Contexts	HC.C	26	Historical or interpretive boundary entries; the four Philastrian topical ranges are completed as catalogue context, not adjudged movements.
Explicit exclusions	HC.X	25	Reasoned boundary decisions; all X.
Catalogue occurrences	HC.CAT	427	The numbered positions in Epiphanius 1–80, Philastrius 1–156, Augustine 1–88, and John Damascene 1–103. They crosswalk to the five classes above and are not 427 independent groups or witnesses.

Counts describe the bounded inventory fixed on 16 July 2026. A future corpus expansion may add keys, but an existing key is not silently recycled. Dependent catalogues are source occurrences, not corroborating witnesses merely because a name appears again.

B.2 The normalized heads

The following is the complete head ledger in compact form. The displayed disposition belongs to the head, not to every sentence ever attributed to its subject.

Apostolic boundary (prefix HC.D.APO; 3). JUDAIZING-NECESSITY—circumcision or Mosaic observance imposed on Gentiles as necessary for salvation [D]; RESURRECTION-DENIAL—denial or evacuation of bodily resurrection [D]; INCARNATION-DENIAL—denial that Jesus Christ truly came in the flesh [D].

Second and third centuries (prefix HC.D.EARLY; 18). DOCETISM—Docetic Christologies [D]; EBIONISM—Ebionite currents [D]; CERINTHIANISM—teaching attributed to Cerinthus [D]; SIMONIANISM—Simonian teaching [D]; MENANDRIANISM—Menandrian teaching [D]; SATURNILIANISM—Saturnilus and his attributed school [D]; BASILIDEANISM—Basilides and Basilidean trajectories [D]; CARPOCRATIANISM—Carpocratian teaching [D]; Gnostic-CURRENTS—related ancient Gnostic currents as a comparative complex [D]; VALENTINIANISM—Valentinus and Valentinian schools [D]; MARCIONISM—Marcionite doctrine and church [D]; ENCRATISM—Encratite and Tatian-associated rejection of marriage or created foods [D]; ELCHASAITISM—Elchasaite,

Elkesai, and Sampsaeon currents [R]; MONTANISM—New Prophecy or Montanist trajectories [D]; DYNAMIC-MONARCHIANISM—dynamic-Monarchian or adoptionist Christologies [D]; PAUL-SAMOSATA—propositions attributed to Paul of Samosata [R]; MODALIST-MONARCHIANISM—Noetian, Praxeian, Patripassian, and Sabellian formulas [D]; NOVATIANISM—Novatianist rigor, ecclesiology, and schism [D].

Fourth through sixth centuries (prefix HC.D.PAT; 21). DONATISM—Donatist ecclesiology and sacramental claims [D]; ARIANISM—Arius and Arian trajectories [D]; ANOMOEANISM—Aetian or Eunomian “unlike” theology [D]; PNEUMATOMACHIANISM—Pneumatomachian or Macedonian denial concerning the Holy Spirit [D]; MARCELLIANISM—propositions associated with Marcellus of Ancyra [R]; PHOTINIANISM—Photinus’s Christology [R]; APOLLINARIANISM—denial of a complete human rational soul or mind in Christ [D]; PRISCILLIANISM—propositions attributed to Priscillian and followers [D]; JOVINIANISM—propositions attributed to Jovinian [D]; MESSALIANISM—Messalian or Euchite propositions [D]; PELAGIANISM—Pelagian and Caelestinian propositions on sin, grace, and freedom [D]; SEMIPELAGIAN-CONTROVERSY—Massilian propositions later called “Semi-Pelagian” [D]; NESTORIAN-PROPOSITIONS—Christological propositions condemned at Ephesus [D]; EUTYCHIANISM—Eutyches’s condemned Christological formulations [D]; STRICT-MONOPHYSITE-FORMULAS—strict one-nature formulas incompatible with Chalcedon [D]; ORIGENISM-FIRST—first Origenist controversy and attributed propositions [D]; ORIGENISM-SIXTH—sixth-century Origenist propositions [R]; APOKATASTASIS-NECESSITATED—necessitated universal-restoration or finite-punishment propositions [R]; APHTHARTODOCETISM—Julianist or Gaianite incorruptibility teaching [D]; AGNOETISM—the Agnoete proposition concerning Christ’s human knowledge [D]; TRITHEISM—tritheist formulations [D].

Seventh through tenth centuries (prefix HC.D.BYZ; 7). MONENERGISM—one-operation formula in Christ [R]; MONOTHELITISM—one-will formula in Christ [D]; ICONOCLASM—rejection of the defined legitimacy of venerating sacred images [D]; SPANISH-ADOPTIONISM—Elipandus and Felix-era Spanish Adoptionism [D]; LUCIDUS-PREDESTINATION—propositions retracted by Lucidus [D]; GOTTSCHALK-PREDESTINATION—Gottschalk’s double-predestination controversy [D]; PAULICIANISM—Paulician movements and attributed teaching [D].

Eleventh through thirteenth centuries (prefix HC.D.MED; 21). BOGOMILISM—Bogomil movements [D]; BERENGARIANISM—Berengar’s Eucharistic controversy [D]; CATHARISM—Cathar or Albigensian dualist movements [D]; TANCHELM—teaching attributed to Tanchelm [D]; PETROBRUSIANS—Petrobrusian teaching [D]; HENRICIANS—teaching attributed to Henry of Lausanne and followers [R]; ARNOLDISTS—Arnoldist teaching named in *Ad abolendam* [D]; WALDENSIAN-ERRORS—early Poor of Lyon disputes and later Waldensian development [D]; HUMILIATI-FACTION—the faction called Humiliati in *Ad abolendam* [D]; PASSAGIANS—Passagian or Pasagian propositions [D]; JOSEPHINES—Josephines named in *Ad abolendam* [D]; AMALRICIANISM—propositions associated with Amalric of Bène and followers [D]; DAVID-DINANT—propositions attributed to David of Dinant [P]; JOACHIM-TRINITY—the Trinitarian proposition condemned from Joachim’s work [P]; RADICAL-JOACHIMISM—later radical Joachinite claims [D]; ABELARD-PROPOSITIONS—propositions censured in Abelard’s cases [P]; GILBERT-POITIERS—Gilbert of Poitiers controversy [P]; LATIN-AVERROIST-ERRORS—one-intellect, eternity, and related Latin Aristotelian propositions [P]; APOSTOLIC-BRETHREN—Apostolic Brethren and Dolcinian development [D]; FREE-SPIRIT—propositions grouped under “Free Spirit” [D]; VIENNE-BEGUARD-ERRORS—eight errors attributed to certain Beguards and Beguines [P].

Fourteenth and fifteenth centuries (prefix HC.D.MED; 12). FRATICELLI—Fratricelli movements [D]; ABSOLUTE-POVERTY—the absolute-poverty proposition concerning Christ and the apostles [P]; MARSILIANISM—propositions extracted from Marsilius of Padua [P]; VIENNE-SOUL-FORM—denial that the rational soul is essentially the form of the body [P]; ECKHART-PROPOSITIONS—propositions from Meister Eckhart’s works [P]; WYCLIFFISM—Wyclif’s attributed and censured propositions [D]; LOLLARDY—English Lollard receptions [D]; HUSSITISM—Hus and Hussite doctrinal complexes [D]; UTRAQUISM—necessity claims and discipline concerning communion under both kinds [D]; TABORITISM—Taborite doctrinal and apocalyptic currents [R]; RADICAL-CONCILIARISM—categorical conciliar superiority in the relevant radical sense [P]; LATERAN-V-SOUL—soul-mortality or one-soul-for-all propositions answered at Lateran V [P].

Sixteenth-century Reformations (prefix HC.D.REF; 10). LUTHER-PROPOSITIONS—propositions censured in *Exsurge Domine* and related acts [P]; LUTHERAN-CONFESSIONS—Lutheran confessional doctrines in Catholic comparison [D]; SACRAMENTARIANISM—Zwinglian and related Eucharistic positions [D]; REFORMED-DOCTRINES—Reformed or Calvinist doctrines in Catholic comparison [D]; ANABAPTIST-CURRENTS—heterogeneous Anabaptist teachings [D]; SCHWENCKFELDIANISM—Schwenckfeldian teaching [R]; RADICAL-SPIRITUALISM—Radical Spiritualist and Familist currents [D]; SERVETIAN-ANTITRINITARIANISM—Servetus’s anti-Trinitarian propositions [R]; SOCINIANISM—Socinian and early Unitarian trajectories [D]; ANGLICAN-FORMULARIES—English Reformation formularies in Catholic comparison [D].

Post-Reformation controversies (prefix HC.D.POST; 14). BAIANISM—propositions associated with Michael Baius [P]; JANSENISM—the five propositions and Jansenist grace controversy [P]; JANSENIST-FACT-SILENCE—the Jansenist fact,

right, and respectful-silence controversy [P]; **QUESNELLISM**—Quesnel’s propositions [P]; **MOLINOS-QUIETISM**—Molinos’s Quietist propositions [P]; **FENELON-PROPOSITIONS**—Fénelon’s condemned pure-love propositions [P]; **RICHERISM**—Richerist ecclesiological propositions [P]; **GALLICAN-ARTICLES**—the Four Gallican Articles of 1682 [P]; **FEBRONIANISM**—Febronian ecclesiology [P]; **JOSEPHINISM**—the Josephinist church-state and doctrinal program [P]; **PISTOIA**—propositions of the Synod of Pistoia [P]; **LAXIST-PROPOSITIONS**—seventeenth-century condemned laxist moral propositions [P]; **RIGORIST-PROPOSITIONS**—condemned rigorist moral or sacramental propositions [P]; **ALUMBRADO-PROPOSITIONS**—propositions attributed to particular Alumbrado groups [P].

Modern and contemporary (prefix HC.D.MOD; 19). **RATIONALISM-NATURALISM**—rationalist and naturalist proposition-complexes [P]; **PANTHEISM-MATERIALISM**—pantheist and materialist propositions answered by Vatican I [P]; **FIDEISM-TRADITIONALISM**—fideist and philosophical-Traditionalist errors about reason and faith [P]; **HERMESIANISM**—Hermesian propositions [P]; **GUNTHERIANISM**—Güntherian propositions [P]; **ONTOLOGISM**—Ontologist propositions [P]; **INDIFFERENTISM-LIBERALISM**—religious-indifferentist and doctrinal-liberal propositions [P]; **ROSMINI-PROPOSITIONS**—the forty propositions of *Post obitum*, with the 2001 qualification [P]; **OLD-CATHOLIC-VATICAN-I**—rejection of Vatican I definitions in the Old Catholic separation [P]; **AMERICANISM**—tendencies conditionally rejected as “Americanism” [P]; **MODERNISM**—the proposition list and synthesis addressed in 1907 [P]; **HUMANI-GENERIS-ERRORS**—specific opinions treated in *Humani generis* [P]; **MILLENARIANISM**—millenarian and mitigated-millenarian propositions [P]; **FEENEY-ERROR**—the restrictive interpretation associated with Leonard Feeney [P]; **SITUATION-ETHICS**—the prohibited situation-ethics method [P]; **CDF-1966-ERRORS**—anonymous error-clusters in the 1966 CDF circular letter [P]; **LIBERATION-THEOLOGY-ERRORS**—propositions corrected in Roman documents concerning liberation theologies [P]; **WOMENS-ORDINATION**—the thesis that priestly ordination can be conferred on women [P]; **RELIGIOUS-PLURALISM**—relativist theses concerning revelation, Christ, the Church, and religions [P].

B.3 Source-limited notices

These fifty-five records complete the treatment of labels too thin for full dossiers. “Response” here may mean only a named refuter’s answer or the catalogue’s adverse attestation; where no formal act survives, none is invented. The evidence limit controls the notice even when the attributed proposition is grave.

Stable key / label	Attributed proposition or object	Attestation or response	Aftermath and evidence limit
HC.N.EARLY.NICOLAITANS Nicolaitans	Revelation names their deeds or teaching; later catalogues add idol-food and sexual allegations.	Revelation 2 rejects the named teaching; Irenaeus and Epiphanius elaborate it, but no separate judicial act survives.	No secure later community is traceable; the founder story and the relation of Revelation 2.14–15 to 2.6 are disputed.
HC.N.EARLY.BORBORITES Borborites, Phibionites, Straticotics	Barbelo-type cosmology and ritual obscenities are attributed to a cluster of names.	Epiphanius, <i>Panarion</i> 26, is the dominant adverse witness and refutes the reported rites; no target rule or formal act survives.	No institutional aftermath is securely recoverable; sensational allegations and shifting names require grade-D restraint.
HC.N.EARLY.OPHITES Ophites or Naassenes	Some catalogues assign the serpent a saving revelatory role and describe an ascent through hostile rulers.	Irenaeus I.30, Hippolytus V, and Epiphanius 37 preserve differing constructions and answer them from one Creator and the Incarnation.	“Ophite” is a catalogue grouping, not a demonstrated single church; recovered texts do not map neatly onto it.
HC.N.EARLY.CAINITES Cainites	Refuters say they honored Cain and other biblical adversaries, rejected the lawgiver, and denied bodily resurrection.	Irenaeus I.31 and dependent catalogues condemn the reported inversion; no Cainite writing or sentence survives.	No secure succession can be traced; the notice is opponent-only and does not authenticate every moral allegation.
HC.N.EARLY.SETHIANS Sethians	A heavenly Seth, revealer genealogy, and multi-level cosmology are attributed under the name.	Hippolytus V and Epiphanius 39 transmit and refute versions; later recovered “Sethian” texts provide comparison, not simple identity.	An organized group matching every ancient and modern use cannot be followed; taxonomy is the principal limit.
HC.N.EARLY.ARCHONTICS Archontics	The universe and successive heavens are attributed to archons through whom souls must pass.	Epiphanius 40 and Augustine 20 provide adverse catalogue testimony rather than an extant act or target confession.	No independent institutional history is recoverable; evidence is late and opponent-heavy.

Stable key / label	Attributed proposition or object	Attestation or response	Aftermath and evidence limit
HC.N.EARLY.LUCIANISTS early Lucianists	Epiphanius describes a pre-Constantinian Marcionite offshoot that repeated Marcion's dualism and further rejected marriage.	Epiphanius 43 and dependent epitomes supply the adverse notice; no separate condemnation text is known.	No aftermath is traceable; the figure must not be confused with Lucian of Antioch.
HC.N.EARLY.APELLEANS Apelleans	Apelles is credited with one supreme principle, a subordinate creator, rejection of prophetic authority, and a body of Christ assembled from cosmic elements.	Tertullian, Hippolytus, and Epiphanius argue against differing fragments; no formal Apellean act survives.	Apelles is historically visible, but a continuing school and its exact distance from Marcion remain uncertain.
HC.N.EARLY.SEVERIANS Encratite Severians	The catalogue assigns rejection of wine, marriage, and created goods, including a myth that the vine came from the serpent.	Epiphanius 45 and dependent Latin catalogues reject the ascetical claim; no target text survives.	No secure later body is traceable; these Severians are unrelated to Severus of Antioch.
HC.N.EARLY.ALOGI Alogi or Alogians	Rejection of John and Revelation, sometimes by assigning them to Cerinthus, is the catalogue object.	Epiphanius 51 coins or transmits the hostile label and defends the Johannine books and Logos confession.	No self-named group or formal act is known; the notice may collect several critical positions.
HC.N.EARLY.ADAMITES Adamites or Adamians	Nude assembly, imitation of prelapsarian Eden, and rejection of ordinary marriage are attributed.	Epiphanius 52 and Augustine 31 transmit the report and reject its ritual and anthropology; no target witness survives.	The ancient group cannot be traced; later reuse of "Adamite" does not prove descent.
HC.N.EARLY.MELCHIZEDEKIANS Melchizedekians	Different catalogues elevate Melchizedek as a heavenly power, sometimes above Christ or in a Theodotian scheme.	Hippolytus, Epiphanius 55, Philastrius, and Augustine 34 preserve non-identical reports and answer them from Hebrews.	No single creed or succession is recoverable; the name covers more than one attributed claim.
HC.N.EARLY.BARDESANISTS Bardesanists	Later followers are assigned cosmological, fatalist, or docetic positions not uniformly found in Bardaisan's surviving Syriac tradition.	Eusebius, Epiphanius 56, and later catalogues provide mixed attestation and refutation; no universal act names the school.	Bardaisan's own development and the later school diverge; no clean institutional aftermath can be stated.
HC.N.EARLY.VALESIANS Valesians	Compulsory castration and severe food or marriage restrictions are attributed to an ascetical group.	Epiphanius 58 and Augustine 37 report and reject the practice; no target rule or formal sentence survives.	No later history is securely traceable; evidence is source-limited and polemical.
HC.N.EARLY.ANGELICS Angelici	Ancient cataloguers themselves are unsure whether the name concerned worship of angels or a claim to angelic life.	Epiphanius 60 and Augustine 39 preserve the name while admitting uncertainty; no proposition-level response can honestly be reconstructed.	Neither a group nor aftermath is recoverable; the admitted ignorance is the controlling evidence limit.
HC.N.EARLY.APOTACTICS Apostolics or Apotactics	Renunciation of property and marriage is made obligatory, with married or property-holding Christians excluded from salvation.	Epiphanius 61 and Augustine 40 reject the compulsory inference; broader patristic teaching distinguishes voluntary asceticism from contempt for creation.	No stable organization or formal universal act is demonstrated; practice alone cannot bear every doctrinal allegation.
HC.N.EARLY.ORIGENISTS-OBSCENE first "Origenists"	Epiphanius alleges an obscene ritual under a name he explicitly separates from followers of Origen Adamantius.	Epiphanius 63 and Augustine 42 repeat the adverse report; no corroborating target or act is known.	No group can be traced; historicity is doubtful and the allegation is retained only as a catalogue occurrence.
HC.N.EARLY.HIERACITES Hieracites	Hieracas is said to deny resurrection of the flesh and to make sexual renunciation a condition of the kingdom, excluding children.	Epiphanius 67 and Augustine 47 preserve and refute the profile; no formal conciliar list survives.	A limited Egyptian following is reported but not securely followed; the teaching is mediated principally by opponents.
HC.N.PAT.AUDIANS Audians or Anthropomorphites	A disciplinary schism is joined in later reports to reading the divine image as bodily form and to a separate Paschal practice.	Epiphanius 70 distinguishes the initial schism from later errors and argues against the anthropomorphic reading; Augustine 50 depends on the tradition.	The label joins several phases; no single Audian creed or continuous aftermath is established.
HC.N.PAT.HOMOIOUSIAN-TRAJECTORIES Homoiousians or "Semi-Arians"	The Son is confessed as like the Father in essence, in formulas ranging from anti-Anomoean to incompletely Nicene.	Fourth-century creeds and controversies supply direct formula evidence; Constantinople I receives the Nicene confession rather than one blanket sentence on every Homoiousian.	Many participants moved into pro-Nicene settlement; the retrospective umbrella cannot be treated as one lasting sect.

Stable key / label	Attributed proposition or object	Attestation or response	Aftermath and evidence limit
HC.N.PAT.AERIANS Aerians	Equality of presbyter and bishop, rejection of offerings or prayers for the dead, and opposition to appointed fasts and Paschal observance are attributed.	Epiphanius 75 and Augustine 53 are the principal adverse witnesses; no surviving universal sentence is identified.	No secure institutional history follows; doctrinal and disciplinary objections must remain distinct.
HC.N.PAT. ANTIDICOMARIANITES Antidicomarianites	The label marks denial of Mary's perpetual virginity, particularly intercourse and children after Christ's birth.	Epiphanius 78 supplies the name and Marian refutation; later debate overlaps Helvidius but is not automatically identical.	No independent community or formal act is traceable; the evidence is substantially Epiphanian.
HC.N.PAT.COLLYRIDIAN Collyridians	Women are said to offer cakes to Mary in a manner Epiphanius treats as divine worship.	Epiphanius 79 is effectively the sole substantive witness and rejects both denigration and divinization of Mary.	Scale, location, and even organized existence remain uncertain; no target voice or later aftermath survives.
HC.N.PAT.HELVIDIAN Helvidians	Helvidius denied perpetual virginity after Christ's birth and challenged the superior excellence claimed for virginity over marriage.	Jerome's <i>Against Helvidius</i> is the main response, defending perpetual virginity while affirming marriage's goodness; no extant universal sentence is identified.	No Helvidian organization is traceable; Jerome is an interested and rhetorically forceful witness.
HC.N.PAT.BONOSIAN Bonosians	Denial of Mary's perpetual virginity is securely associated with Bonosus; later sources also attach Christological or adoptionist claims.	Siricius-era and Ambrosian correspondence and regional proceedings reject the attributed teaching, but no single extant universal proposition list unites the later claims.	Marian and Christological receptions diverge; a continuous Bonosian body is not securely mapped.
HC.N.PAT.VIGILANTIUS Vigilantius	Jerome attributes objections to relic veneration, vigils, saintly intercession, and ascetical disposal of wealth.	Jerome's letters and <i>Against Vigilantius</i> provide the principal refutation; no checked formal sentence against a named movement survives.	No organized school or aftermath is traceable; the target's position is filtered overwhelmingly through Jerome.
HC.N.PAT.METANGISMONITES Metangismonites	The Son is pictured as contained in the Father like a smaller vessel inside a larger one.	Philastrius 51 and Augustine 58 preserve and reject the spatial metaphor; no target text or separate act survives.	No historical group can be followed; the label may be a catalogue abstraction from an analogy.
HC.N.PAT. SELEUCIAN-HERMIAN Seleucians or Hermians	Coeternal matter and a composite cosmology of souls or created powers are attributed in varying combinations.	Philastrius 55 and Augustine 59 transmit the adverse summary; no target confession or judicial act is extant.	Identity and proposition boundaries remain uncertain; no institutional aftermath is recoverable.
HC.N.PAT. PROCLIAN-HERMEONITES Proclians or Hermeonites	A related cosmological complex, sometimes joined to denial of Christ's bodily advent, is assigned under variant names.	Philastrius 56 and Augustine 60 are the principal catalogue witnesses; their relation to the Seleucian entry is unresolved.	No separate group or response can be traced beyond catalogue refutation; evidence grade D.
HC.N.PAT.PATRICIAN Patricians	Human flesh is attributed to the devil rather than God, with self-destruction reportedly following from contempt for the body.	Philastrius 62 and Augustine 61 reject the anti-creator proposition; no target text or formal act is known.	The name has no connection with Saint Patrick; no historical aftermath is recoverable.
HC.N.PAT.ASCITAE Ascitae	A ritual involving an inflated skin or wineskin at an altar is reported without a recoverable doctrinal system.	Philastrius and Augustine 62 preserve the adverse ritual notice; no independent refutation act or target explanation survives.	No group can be traced; the report cannot support broader sacramental or moral claims.
HC.N.PAT. PASSALORHYNCHITES Passalorhynchites	Ascetics are said to press a finger to nose or lips and maintain ritual silence in prayer.	Epiphanian, Philastrian, and Augustinian catalogue traditions report the practice under varying related names.	A disciplinary custom is not by itself heresy; group identity and relation to Tascodrugites remain uncertain.
HC.N.PAT.AQUARIAN Aquarians or Hydroparastatae	Water is used without wine in the Eucharistic cup.	Philastrius and Augustine 64 attach the label; patristic sacramental argument defends the received wine-and-water practice, but no named-group sentence is preserved.	The practice appears under several labels; its rationale and organized aftermath cannot be recovered.
HC.N.PAT.COLUTHIAN Coluthians	A local Alexandrian schism and unauthorized ordinations are later joined to a dispute over how evil relates to divine providence.	Alexandrian records and the catalogue tradition attest Coluthus differently; the latter does not preserve a reliable complete creed.	The ecclesial rupture is clearer than the doctrinal object; no durable Coluthian school is traceable.

Stable key / label	Attributed proposition or object	Attestation or response	Aftermath and evidence limit
HC.N.PAT.FLORINIANS Florinians	Florinus is associated with making God the source of evil and with Valentinian teaching; later catalogues conflate Florinians, Carpocratians, or <i>milites</i> .	Irenaeus wrote against Florinus, but the work is lost; Philastrius and Augustine 66 preserve unstable summaries.	No school or aftermath is securely recoverable; even the label's extension varies by source.
HC.N.PAT.RHETORIANS Rhetorians	The group is said to praise or affirm all heresies indiscriminately.	Philastrius 91 and Augustine 72 provide nearly the whole attestation and reject the claim by reporting it.	No target, formal act, location, or aftermath can be identified; this is a thin catalogue abstraction.
HC.N.PAT.ARABICI Arabici	The soul is said to die with the body and revive at the resurrection.	Eusebius VI.37 reports an Arabian council and a conference in which Origen persuaded the disputants; Augustine 83 preserves the label.	The reported resolution was reconciliation, not a lasting sect; details of the target's own wording are lost.
HC.N.PAT.PATERNIANS Paternians or Venustians	Lower bodily parts are attributed to the devil, with sexual license inferred from that anthropology.	Augustine 85 is the principal concise adverse witness; no target text or independent formal act survives.	No group or aftermath is traceable; the moral inference remains opponent testimony.
HC.N.PAT.TERTULLIANISTS Tertullianists at Carthage	Augustine reports a distinct remnant linked to Tertullian's later rigorist separation; a precise separate creed is not supplied.	Augustine 86 records the group and says it returned to Catholic communion, with its basilica transferred to the Church.	Reconciliation is the only stated aftermath; relation to every phase or writing of Tertullian must not be assumed.
HC.N.PAT.ABELONIANS Abelonians or Abeloites	Married pairs are said to abstain permanently and adopt a boy and a girl rather than procreate.	Augustine 87 reports the local North African practice; no formal act or target rule is known.	Augustine's notice is effectively the whole history; the group disappears from traceable evidence.
HC.N.PAT.BARSANOUPHITES Barsanouphites or Semidalites	They allegedly extended old consecrated particles with fine flour and received the flour in place of a new Eucharistic oblation.	John Damascene 86 supplies the detailed adverse account and links them inconsistently with Gaianite and Theodosian positions.	John is the controlling late witness; independent activity, response, and doctrinal coherence are not securely recoverable.
HC.N.PAT.HICETAE Hicetae	Otherwise orthodox ascetics are said to sing and dance with female ascetics in imitation of Miriam's Red Sea chorus.	John Damascene 87 gives the sole substantive notice and himself calls them orthodox in other respects.	No formal response or aftermath is known; the reported object is disciplinary rather than demonstrably heretical.
HC.N.PAT.GNOSIMACHI Gnosimachi	Scriptural or doctrinal study is called superfluous because good deeds alone are said to be required.	John Damascene 88 states and rejects the contrast between knowledge and practice; no other controlling act is identified.	No historical group or aftermath can be traced; the category may be a catalogue abstraction.
HC.N.PAT.HELIIOTROPITES Heliotropites	Heliotrope plants are assigned a divine power causing their movement and are therefore honored.	John Damascene 89 answers that the motion is natural; no formal sentence or target text survives.	No group or aftermath is known; John is the sole substantive routing witness.
HC.N.PAT.THNETOPSYCHITES Thnetopsychites	The human soul is likened to that of beasts and said to perish with the body.	John Damascene 90 supplies the catalogue statement; the positive boundary is personal survival and resurrection, but no named-group act is preserved.	No organized group can be traced; do not merge automatically with the earlier Arabici.
HC.N.PAT.AGONOCINITAE Agonocinites	They are said never to kneel but always to stand during prayer.	John Damascene 91 records the custom without a proposition-level judgment or formal act.	No aftermath is recoverable; posture by itself is a disciplinary custom, not proof of heresy.
HC.N.PAT.THEOCATAGNOSTAE Theocatagnostae	They are accused of faulting words and deeds of Christ, the saints, and Scripture.	John Damascene 92 calls them blasphemers but preserves no target examples, defense, or separate sentence.	The object is too indeterminate for a dossier; no group or aftermath is traceable.
HC.N.PAT.CHRISTOLYTAE Christolytae	Christ is said to have left his ensouled body below after the resurrection and ascended in divinity alone.	John Damascene 93 preserves the proposition; the received confession of bodily resurrection answers it, but no named formal act survives.	No target text, group history, or aftermath is known; evidence is source-unique.

Stable key / label	Attributed proposition or object	Attestation or response	Aftermath and evidence limit
HC.N.PAT.ETHNOPHRONES Ethnophrones	Christians otherwise are said to adopt fate, astrology, divination, omens, incantations, and pagan feasts.	John Damascene 94 supplies and rejects the catalogue bundle; no single act or target community is identified.	Practice and doctrine are mixed, and no later body is traceable; the list must not be imputed beyond the source.
HC.N.PAT.ETHICOPROSCOPTAE Ethicoproscopae	The entry alleges rejection of praiseworthy moral teaching and approval of blameworthy conduct without specifying a stable creed.	John Damascene 96 is the only substantive attestation and supplies no formal response beyond the adverse classification.	No proposition, group, or aftermath can be reconstructed with greater precision; the indeterminacy is dispositive.
HC.N.PAT.PARERMENEUTAE Parermeneutae	Old and New Testament passages are allegedly manipulated to support the interpreters' own purposes and errors.	John Damascene 97 gives this generic criticism but no recoverable target exegesis or judicial act.	The category is not a securely attested school; no aftermath can be traced.
HC.N.PAT.LAMPETIANS Lampetians	Lampetius is said to permit self-chosen monastic rules and dress and, in hostile report, non-resistance to natural passions.	John Damascene 98 preserves the accusation and compares some opinions with Aerius; no target rule or formal act survives.	The disciplinary and moral claims are late and opponent-only; no secure institutional aftermath is known.
HC.N.BYZ.AUTOPROSCOPTAE Autoproscopae	John calls them doctrinally orthodox but self-separated over minor canonical pretexts, while accusing them of inconsistent conduct.	John Damascene 100 in common numbering supplies both the schism notice and its rebuttal; no other controlling act is identified.	This is principally schism and moral polemic; recensional wording varies and no later group is traceable.
HC.N.BYZ.APOSCHISTAE Aposchistae or Doxarii	They are portrayed as glory-seeking self-separators unwilling to submit to ecclesial rulers or ordered communion.	John Damascene 103 in common numbering is the principal or sole witness; no proposition list or independent sentence survives.	Historicity and the 100/103 terminal numbering remain unresolved; no aftermath can be followed.
HC.N.MED.JOSEPHINES-DOCTRINE Josephine doctrine	No securely attributable proposition, leader, book, rite, or locality can be recovered from the name.	<i>Ad abolendam</i> in 1184 names and anathematizes Josephines but supplies no doctrinal content; the full dossier records that absence.	Later identifications are conjectural and no independent aftermath is traceable; evidence grade D.

B.4 Alias and subgroup ledger

Every item below has disposition A; the arrow names its route rather than asserting complete identity.

Early aliases (prefix HC.A.EARLY; 9). Gnostic-GENERIC—Gnostics, false-gnosis, Barbeloite, Borborite, Coddian, Phibionite, Stratiotic, and related names → HC.D.EARLY.GNOSTIC-CURRENTS or a named notice; VALENTINIAN-SCHOOLS—Secundians, Ptolemaeans, Marcosians, Colorbasians, Heracleonites, Epiphanes, Isidore, and Flora → HC.D.EARLY.VALENTINIANISM; MARCIONITE-LINE—Cerdonians, Lucianists, and Apelleans → Marcionism plus source notices; ENCRATITE-LINE—Tatianists, Encratites, Severians, Apotactics, and some Artotyrites → Encratism plus notices; MONTANIST-LINE—Cataphrygians, Phrygians, Montanists, Tascodrugites, Pepuzians, and Quintillians → Montanism; ELCHASAITES-NAMES—Elchasaites, Elkesaites, Helcesaites, and Sampsaeans → Elchasaitism; DYNAMIC-NAMES—Theodotians, Artemonites, and relevant adoptionist formulas → dynamic Monarchianism; MODALIST-NAMES—Noetians, Praxeans, Patrippassians, and Sabellians → modalist Monarchianism; NOVATIAN-NAMES—Novatians, Novatianists, and ancient Cathari → Novatianism, never medieval Catharism.

Patristic aliases (prefix HC.A.PAT; 11). ARIAN-TRAJECTORIES—Eusebian, Homoean, Acacian, “Semi-Arian,” and other non-Nicene labels → Arianism or the Homoiousian notice according to formula and date; ANOMOEAN-NAMES—Aetians, Eunomians, Anomoeans, and Exoucontians → Anomoeanism; PNEUMATOMACHIAN-NAMES—Pneumatomachians, Macedonians, and relevant Tropici → Pneumatomachianism; APOLLINARIAN-NAMES—Dimoerites and Apollinarists → Apollinarianism; PELAGIAN-NAMES—Caelestians and Pelagians → Pelagianism, without merging their authorship; SEMIPELAGIAN-NAMES—Massilians and later “Semi-Pelagians” → the Massilian grace controversy; NESTORIAN-BOUNDARY—“Nestorian” and dyophysite polemical labels → the Ephesine propositions, not an unqualified present-communion label; MONOPHYSITE-BOUNDARY—Eutychians, strict Monophysites, Acephali, Severians, and Damascene “Egyptians” → separate Eutychian, strict-formula, and ecumenical contexts; APHARTHARTODOCETE-NAMES—Aphthartodocetae, Julianists, and Gaianites → Aphthartodocetism; AGNOETE-NAMES—

Agnoetae and Themistians → Agnoetism; MESSALIAN-NAMES—Messalians, Massalians, Euchites, and Euphemites → Messalianism, never Massilianism.

Later aliases (14). HC.A.BYZ.ADOPTIONISM—Elipandianism and Felicianism → Spanish Adoptionism; HC.A.MED.CATHAR-NAMES—Cathars, Albigensians, Patarenes, Publicani, “good men,” and medieval “Manichaeans” → Catharism with regional qualification; HC.A.MED.WALDENSIAN-NAMES—Poor of Lyon, Leonists, Waldenses, and Waldensians → the phased Waldensian dossier; HC.A.MED.APOSTOLIC-BRETHREN—Apostolics, Segarelli’s followers, and Dolcinians → Apostolic Brethren, not ancient Apostolici; HC.A.MED.FREE-SPIRIT—Brethren of the Free Spirit and certain Beghard/Beguard labels → Free Spirit or Vienne’s eight errors; HC.A.MED.FRANCISCAN-POVERTY—Spiritual Franciscans, Fraticelli, Michaelists, and the absolute-poverty proposition → separate movement and proposition heads; HC.A.MED.WYCLIF-LOLLARD—Wycliffites, Wycliffism, and Lollards → separate Wycliffism and Lollardy dossiers; HC.A.MED.HUSSITE-BRANCHES—Hussites, Utraquists or Calixtines, and Taborites → three separate dossiers; HC.A.REF.SACRAMENTARIAN—Sacramentarians, Zwinglians, and memorialist labels → the exact Eucharistic proposition; HC.A.POST.JANSENIST-LINE—Jansenists, Appellants, Quesnellists, and respectful silence → three separate act-objects; HC.A.POST.QUETIST-LINE—Quietism, Molinosianism, “Semi-Quietism,” and Fénelon’s pure love → separate Molinos and Fénelon heads; HC.A.MOD.TRADITIONALISM—philosophical or fideist Traditionalism → the reason-and-faith dossier; HC.A.MOD.MODERNISM—Modernists in the precise 1907 documentary sense → Modernism; HC.A.MOD.FEENEYISM—“Feeneyism” as editorial shorthand → the Feeney-error dossier.

B.5 Contexts and exclusions

Historical and interpretive contexts (22). HC.C.APO.JEWISH-CHRISTIAN-DIVERSITY—Jewish-Christian observance and identity [c]; HC.C.EARLY.MANICHAISM—Manichaeism as a rival religion deeply involved in Christian polemic [c]; HC.C.EARLY.QUARTODECIMAN—Quartodeciman Paschal practice [c]; HC.C.PAT.MELETIAN—the Meletian schisms [c]; HC.C.PAT.LUCIFERIAN—the Luciferian schism [c]; HC.C.PAT.AUDIAN—the initial Audian schism [c]; HC.C.PAT.THREE-CHAPTERS—the Three Chapters controversy [c]; HC.C.BYZ.HONORIUS—Honorius I within the Monothelite controversy [c]; HC.C.BYZ.PHOTIAN—the Photian conflict and schism [c]; HC.C.ECUM.ORIENTAL-ORTHODOX—present Oriental Orthodox churches and common declarations [c]; HC.C.ECUM.ASSYRIAN—the present Assyrian Church of the East and the 1994 confession [c]; HC.C.ECUM.REFORMATION-AFTERMATH—present separated descendants and ecumenical qualification [c]; HC.C.MED.COERCION—crusade, inquisition, imprisonment, torture, execution, and civil penalties [c]; HC.C.MED.PARIS-1277—the local Paris condemnation of 1277 [c]; HC.C.MED.TEMPLARS—the Templar proceedings [c]; HC.C.MED.EAST-WEST-1054—the 1054 rupture and its later reception [c]; HC.C.MED.FLAGELLANTS—Black Death flagellant companies and the 1349 prohibition [c]; HC.C.REF.TRENT-TOPICS—Trent’s canons by doctrinal axis [c]; HC.C.POST.DE-AUXILIIS—the permitted *de auxiliis* dispute [c]; HC.C.MOD.INDEX—the Index of Forbidden Books [c]; HC.C.MOD.DDF-NOTIFICATIONS—modern notifications concerning individual authors or books [c]; HC.C.MOD.NEO-GNOSTIC-PELAGIAN—recent analogies to neo-Gnosticism or neo-Pelagianism [c].

Philastrian catalogue contexts (4). These ranges complete the source-occurrence accounting for Philastrius’s catalogue miscellanea. A heading concerning cosmology, chronology, exegesis, liturgy, or discipline is not thereby evidence of an organized historical movement or of a formal ecclesial censure. HC.C.PHIL.TOPICAL-093-106—Philastrius 93–106, cosmological, anthropological, and chronological topics [c]; HC.C.PHIL.TOPICAL-107-120—Philastrius 107–120, last-things, chronology, cosmology, Genesis, and marriage topics [c]; HC.C.PHIL.TOPICAL-121-136—Philastrius 121–136, flood, soul, Christological, biblical, and canonical topics [c]; HC.C.PHIL.TOPICAL-137-156—Philastrius 137–156, exegetical, liturgical, translation, fasting, and angelological topics [c].

Explicit exclusions (25). The following keys are complete statements of this survey’s boundary, not claims that the excluded objects are harmless or unimportant: HC.X.RELIGION.JUDAISM—Judaism and the Jewish people [x]; HC.X.RELIGION.ISLAM—Islam as a religion [x]; HC.X.RELIGION.PAGAN—pagan religions and cults [x]; HC.X.PHILOSOPHY.ANCIENT-SCHOOLS—ancient philosophical schools as schools [x]; HC.X.DISCIPLINE.SCHISM-ONLY—schism without a defining doctrinal proposition [x]; HC.X.DISCIPLINE.ABUSES—simony, sacrilege, abuse, ordinary sin, or discipline as such [x]; HC.X.ALLEGATION.WITCHCRAFT-SECTS—alleged witchcraft or satanic sects without reliable doctrinal evidence [x]; HC.X.ALLEGATION.TEMPLAR-HERESY—the Templars as one coherent heretical system [x]; HC.X.PERSON.SAVONAROLA—Savonarola as a named heresy [x]; HC.X.PERSON.GALILEO—the Galileo affair as a named heresy [x]; HC.X.POLITICS.ACTION-FRANCAISE—Action Française [x]; HC.X.POLITICS.SILLON—Le Sillon as a named heresy [x]; HC.X.IDEOLOGY.FREEMASONRY—Freemasonry as a Christian doctrinal school [x]; HC.X.IDEOLOGY.COMMUNISM—Communism or socialism as Christian heresies [x]; HC.X.IDEOLOGY.NAZISM—Nazism and racial totalitarianism as Christian heresies [x]; HC.X.IDEOLOGY.THEOSOPHY-SPIRITISM—Theosophy, Spiritism, and occult systems as external movements [x]; HC.X.SCHOOL.PROBABILISM—Probabilism as such [x]; HC.X.SCHOOL.NOUELLE-THEOLOGIE—*nouvelle théologie* as a blanket label [x]; HC.X.POLEMIC.NEO-MODERNISM—generic “neo-Modernism” [x]; HC.X.CURRENT.SSPX—the SSPX canonical rupture as a named heresy [x]; HC.X.CURRENT.SEDEVACANTISM—sedevacantism as one universally adjudicated named heresy [x]; HC.X.CURRENT.LIVING-PERSONS—unadjudicated living per-

sons [x]; HC.X.LOGIC.UNATTESTED-NEGATIONS—every logically possible but unattested denial [x]; HC.X.BOOKS.ALL-INDEXED—every prohibited or investigated book [x]; HC.X.NOTIFICATION.EVERY-MODERN-CASE—every modern doctrinal investigation as a new named heresy [x].

Routes for additional boundary dossiers. The following prose destinations complete live boundary dossiers that do not create further named-heresy counts. Proposition-level destinations appear here only to make their routing visible and remain in the normalized-head ledger above.

Destination	Controlling route	Disposition
Manichaeism as a rival religion	HC.C.EARLY.MANICHAEISM	C
The Three Chapters controversy	HC.C.PAT.THREE-CHAPTERS	C
The Photian conflict	HC.C.BYZ.PHOTIAN	C
The rupture of 1054	HC.C.MED.EAST-WEST-1054	C
The Templar proceedings	HC.C.MED.TEMPLARS; HC.X.ALLEGATION.TEMPLAR-HERESY	C/x
The Black Death flagellants	HC.C.MED.FLAGELLANTS	C
Trent as doctrinal response	HC.C.REF.TRENT-TOPICS	C
Ecumenical aftermath	HC.C.ECUM.REFORMATION-AFTERMATH	C
The <i>de auxiliis</i> non-condemnation	HC.C.POST.DE-AUXILIIS	C
Atheistic communism	HC.X.IDEOLOGY.COMMUNISM	X
Hans Küng; modern notifications	HC.C.MOD.DDF-NOTIFICATIONS	C
SSPX and sedevacantist claims	HC.X.CURRENT.SSPX; HC.X.CURRENT.SEDEVACANTISM	X
Neo-Gnostic and neo-Pelagian analogies	HC.C.MOD.NEO-GNOSTIC-PELAGIAN	C
Situation ethics	HC.D.MOD.SITUATION-ETHICS	P
Priestly ordination reserved to men	HC.D.MOD.WOMENS-ORDINATION	P
Religious pluralism	HC.D.MOD.RELIGIOUS-PLURALISM	P

B.6 Numbered patristic catalogue crosswalk

Every integer in the displayed ranges has an implicit zero-padded occurrence key: thus Epiphanius 21 is HC.CAT.EPIPH.021, Philastrius 107 is HC.CAT.PHIL.107, Augustine 88 is HC.CAT.AUG.088, and John Damascene 101 is HC.CAT.DAM.101. The names below are finding labels, not newly verified translations. “Route” means account for the occurrence; it does not certify the catalogue’s genealogy, prove an organized group, or turn a dependent epitome into an independent witness.

Epiphanius, *Panarion* 1–80.

Nos.	Names in order	Route
1–4	Barbarism; Scythianism; Hellenism; Judaism	religions/civilizational constructs: x
5–8	Stoics; Platonists; Pythagoreans; Epicureans	philosophies: x
9–13	Samaritans; Essenes; Sebuaeans; Gorothenes; Dositheans	non-Christian groups: x/context
14–20	Sadducees; Scribes; Pharisees; Hemerobaptists; Nasaraeans; Ossaeans; Herodians	Jewish groups: x
21–26	Simonians; Menandrians; Saturnilians; Basilidians; Nicolaitans; Gnostics/Borborites	early dossiers and notices
27–32	Carpocratians; Cerinthians; Nazoraeans; Ebionites; Valentinians; Secundians	dossiers, context, alias
33–38	Ptolemaeans; Marcosians; Colorbasians; Heracleonites; Ophites; Cainites	Valentinian aliases; notices
39–44	Sethians; Archontics; Cerdonians; Marcionites; Lucianists; Apelleans	notices; Marcionite routes

45–50	Severians; Tatianists; Encratites; Cataphrygians/Montanists/Tascodrugites; Pepuzians/Quintillians/Artotyrites; Quartodecimans	Encratite/Montanist routes; Paschal context
51–56	Alogi; Adamites; Sampsaean/Elkesaites; Theodotians; Melchizedekians; Bardesanists	dossiers and notices
57–62	Noetians; Valesians; Cathari/Novatians; Angelics; Apostolics/Apotactics; Sabellians	modalist/Novatian routes; notices
63–68	first “Origenists”; Origenists of Adamantius; Paulianists; Manichaeans; Hieracites; Meletians	notice, dossiers, contexts
69–74	Arians; Audians; Photinians; Marcellians; Semi-Arians; Pneumatomachians	dossiers; Audian/Homoiousian notices
75–80	Aerians; Anomoeans; Dimoerites/Apollinarians; Antidicomarianites; Collyridians; Messalians	dossiers and notices

Standard macro-numbering 1–80 supplies this edition’s working occurrence sequence. Spelling, compound aliases, tome divisions, and subgroup status have not been newly collated against the selected GCS text.

Philastrius, *Diversarum hereseon liber* 1–156.

Nos.	Names or topics in order	Route
1–7	Ophites; Cainites; Sethians; Dositheus; Sadducees; Pharisees; Samaritans	notices; 4–7 x
8–14	Nazoraean; Essenes; Heliognosti/Deinvictiaci; frog worshippers; Musoritae; fly-of-Accaron worshippers; Troglodytes	context/x
15–21	Queen/Fortune of Heaven; Baal; Astarte/Chemosh; Moloch/Remphan; Topheth; Puteoritae; bronze serpent	biblical/pagan classifications: x
22–28	cave images; Tammuz; Baalite idols; Baal/Balaam; medium raising Samuel; Astar/Astaroth; Herodians	biblical, pagan, or Jewish: x
29–37	Simon; Menander; Saturnilus; Basilides; Nicolaus and Gnostics; “Judas” item; Carpocrates; Cerinthus; Ebion	dossiers/notices; Judas item as catalogue context
38–47	Valentinus; Ptolemy; Secundus; Heracleon; Marcus; Colorbasus; Cerdo; Marcion; Lucanus; Apelles	Valentinian and Marcionite routes
48–56	Tatian; Montanus; Theodotus; Metangismon; Melchizedek claim; Noetians; Sabellian/Patripassian/Praxean; Seleucus/Hermias; Proclians/Hermeonites	dossiers/notices
57–65	Florinians; Paschal dispute; Chilontaeitae; rejecters of John/Revelation; Manichaeans; Patricians; Symmachians; Paul of Samosata; Photinus	mixed routes; Symmachians as catalogue context
66–73	Arians; Semi-Arians; Eunomians; incarnation errors; Tropitae; Passion errors; Aerians/Encratites; Borborians	dossiers, notices, and catalogue context
74–81	Artotyrites; Ascodrugitae; Passalorhynchites; Aquarians; continuing prophets; Coluthians; world-not-changing; barefoot-walking	aliases, notices, and catalogue context
82–92	Novatians; Montenses; Abstinentes; Circutores; refusing meals; Pascha with Jews; apocrypha only; denial of Pauline Hebrews; Meletians; Rhetorius; passible divinity	dossiers, notices, and catalogue context
93–106	God; heaven; earth; water; body; soul/inspiration; soul/intellect; animals; bad kings/false prophets; earthquakes; stars; languages; language’s name; announced year	TOPICAL-093-106: C
107–120	end; giants; divine origin of paganism denied; chronology of religions; paganism’s origin; years from creation; weekday names; innumerable worlds; Adam’s expulsion, sight, and skins; angel and Moses; Deuteronomy; marriage	TOPICAL-107-120: C
121–136	Noah’s division; Deucalion; zodiacal birth; transmigration denied; descent into hell; soul’s substance; Savior’s generation; Pharaoh; David/Psalter; Cain twice; stars; Ecclesiastes; Song of Songs; commandment	TOPICAL-121-136: C
137–156	divine image; God’s languages; four living creatures; Epiphany date; feasts; Septuagint/Aquila; translators; Theodotion/Symmachus; jar books; foreign gods; Melchizedek; fasts; Solomon; Joshua; Adam’s breath; Zechariah; Elijah; cherubim/seraphim; Isaiah	TOPICAL-137-156: C

These labels follow the CSEL 38 *Conspectus operis*, not a new chapter-text collation. That edition reports a principal manuscript omitting chapters 107, 115, 117, 140, 151, and 154. The CSEL sequence is therefore the disclosed working reference; the six restored chapters and their witnesses remain edition-sensitive.

Augustine, *De haeresibus* 1–88.

Nos.	Names or topics in order	Route
1–10	Simonians; Menandrians; Saturninians; Basilidians; Nicolaitans; Gnostics; Carpocratians; Cerinthians/Merinthians; Nazoraeans; Ebionites	dossiers, notices, context
11–20	Valentinians; Secundians; Ptolemaeans; Marcossians; Colorbasians; Heracleonites; Ophites; Cainites; Sethians; Archontics	aliases/notices
21–30	Cerdonians; Marcionites; Apelleans; Severians; Tatianists/Encratites; Cataphrygians; Pepuzians/Quintillians; Artotyrites; Quartodecimans; Alogi	dossiers, aliases, notices, context
31–40	Adamians; Elchasaites/Sampsaeans; Theodotians; Melchizedekians; Bardesanists; Noetians; Valesians; Cathari/Novatians; Angelics; Apostolics	dossiers, notices, aliases
41–50	Sabellians/Patripassians; first “Origenists”; Origenists of Adamantius; Paulianists; Photinians; Manichaeans; Hieracites; Meletians; Arians; Audians	dossiers, notices, contexts
51–60	Semi-Arians; Macedonians; Aerians; Aetians; Apollinarists; Antidicomarianites; Massalians; Metangismonites; Seleucians; Proclianites	dossiers/notices
61–70	Patricians; Ascitae; Passalorhynchites; Aquarians; Coluthians; Florinians; world-state dissenters; barefoot walkers; Donatists; Priscillianists	dossiers, notices, and catalogue context
71–80	refusing meals; Rhetorians; passible divinity; “triform God”; coeternal water; soul not God’s image; innumerable worlds; souls becoming demons/animals; universal liberation in Christ’s descent; temporal beginning of the Son’s generation	notices or completed proposition/context routes
81–88	Luciferians; Jovinianists; Arabici; Helvidians; Paternians/Venustians; Tertullianists; Abelonians; Pelagians/Caelestians	contexts, dossiers, notices

The 1–88 sequence supplies this edition’s working occurrence order, but headings, Latin spelling, dependence on the *Anacephalaecosis*, and Augustine’s corrections have not been newly collated against a critical edition. Matching numbers in Augustine and Epiphanius do not identify matching entries.

John Damascene, *De haeresibus* 1–103 in common modern numbering.

Nos.	Names or topics in order	Route
1–20	Epiphanian pre-Christian architecture, Barbarism through Herodians	context/x; dependent
21–46	Epiphanian Christian entries, Simonians through Tatianists	early dossiers/notices; dependent
47–80	Encratites through Messalians	Epiphanius routes; dependent
81–83	Nestorians; Eutychians; “Egyptians/Schematics/Monophysites”	dossiers and ecumenical boundary
84–88	Aphthartodocetae/Gaianites; Agnoetae/Themistians; Barsanouphites/Semidalites; Hicetae; Gnosimachi	two dossiers; three notices
89–93	Heliotropites; Thnetopsychites; Agonoclitinae; Theocatagnostae; Christolytae	notices
94–98	Ethnophrones; Donatists; Ethicoproscopae; Parermeneutae; Lampetians	dossier and notices
99–103	Monothelites; Autoproscopae; Ishmaelites; Christianocategori/iconoclasts; Aposchistae/Doxarii	dossiers/notices; Islam x/context

Modern presentations commonly place Islam at 101, iconoclasts at 102, and Aposchistae at 103. The work’s closing reference to “a hundred,” recensional variation, and differently organized final material leave the 100/103 problem unresolved pending collation against Kotter, PTS 22.

Non-serial witnesses. Irenaeus, *Adversus haereses* I.1–9 and 11–21 routes Valentinian material; I.23 Simon and Menander; I.24–28 Saturnilus, Basilides, Carpocrates, Cerinthus, Ebionites, Nicolaitans, Cerdo, Marcion, and Tatian/Encratites; I.29–31 Barbelo-type, Ophite-type, and Cainite material. Hippolytus, *Refutatio* I–IV routes philosophies, astrology, and magic to context or exclusion; V the Naassenes, Peratae, Sethians, and Justin’s group; VI–VII Simon, Valentinian schools, Basilides, Saturnilus, Marcion, Carpocrates, Cerinthus, Ebionites, and Theodotus; VIII–IX Docetae, Monoimus, Tatian, Hermogenes, Quartodecimans, Montanists, Encratites, Noetus, Callistus, Elchasaites, and Jewish groups; X is recapitulation, not a new count. Authorship and chapter numbering vary by edition, so no fictitious serial key has been imposed.

B.7 Completion and remaining scholarly limits

This appendix completes the enumerative accounting promised by this survey: every admitted normalized head, source notice, alias, context, exclusion, and numbered catalogue occurrence has a stable route. The dossier and timeline audits separately identify the witnesses and acts that control the compressed historical treatment.

That bounded completion does not turn this work into a critical edition or an exhaustive register of every ecclesial accusation and act. Future work may collate the patristic headings and passages afresh against the selected critical editions, especially the Philastrian restored chapters and the Damascene 100/103 problem; expand the baseline to checked individual occurrences in Pseudo-Tertullian and Theodoret; extend the act census beyond the conciliar, papal, synodal, canonical, and modern Roman materials expressly admitted here; deepen target-side and specialist-language checking; and obtain independent historical, theological, canonical, textual, and ecumenical review.

The resulting maturity claim is therefore *enumeratively complete against the disclosed working corpus and source-mapped*, not an official catalogue, an exhaustive register of every local accusation, a critical edition, or independently specialist-reviewed.

C Scope, Terms, and Qualifications

Governing distinction

Christian heresy is not a synonym for an unpopular idea, moral failure, political rebellion, or disagreement with a churchman. In present Catholic usage it concerns a baptized person’s obstinate denial or doubt of a truth that must be believed with divine and Catholic faith. Because historical sources use *heresy* long before that formula was fixed, this survey reports each act in its own terms and never converts the later definition into a retrospective verdict on personal guilt.

C.1 Terms and dossier questions

The current Latin Code distinguishes heresy, apostasy, and schism in canon 751; canon 749 §3 cautions that no doctrine is understood as infallibly defined unless that fact is manifest. The *Catechism of the Catholic Church* 2089 repeats the same conceptual boundary. Those texts govern present terminology. They do not make every ancient anathema a penal judgment under the 1983 Code, every excommunicated person a heretic, or every censured sentence a dogma’s contradictory.

This book asks four narrower questions of each historical dossier: What proposition or doctrinal pattern was actually at issue? Who formulated it, or who attributed it to whom? By what identifiable authority and act was it answered? What happened afterward? The answers often differ. A council can define the faith without preserving reliable minutes; an opponent can summarize a lost book; a medieval list can mix propositions called heretical with others called rash or scandalous; a civil ruler can punish someone after an ecclesial judgment; and a later communion can reject the proposition once imputed to its ancestors.

C.2 Corpus boundary

There is no identified magisterial catalogue entitled “all heresies in Catholic history.” Ancient heresiologists counted schools differently, sometimes repeated one group under several names, and included pre-Christian philosophies or non-Christian religions. Medieval acts often targeted a local proposition rather than an enduring movement. Modern Roman documents commonly censure a book or tendency without founding a new entry in a list of named heresies.

This survey is comprehensive by an explicit census. Its repository-owned *corpus inventory* reconciles the principal ancient Greek and Latin catalogues; the doctrinal acts of the ecumenical councils received by the Catholic Church; consequential papal, Roman, regional-synodal, and medieval canonical condemnations; Reformation propositions answered by papal acts and Trent; and principal modern Roman doctrinal censures through 16 July 2026. Every census item is assigned to a full dossier, an alias or subgroup, a compact source-limited notice, a contextual controversy, or a reasoned exclusion. Appendix B gives the reader-facing accounting. This is a bounded documentary claim, not a claim to omniscience.

C.3 Distinctions that prevent false history

Question	What is kept distinct	Why it matters	Example
Object	Proposition, author, school, organized movement, communion, schism, practice, and allegation are not interchangeable.	Condemning a sentence does not prove every member of a named population held it.	The Council of Constance attached several different censures to extracts connected with Wyclif and Hus.
Censure	Heretical, erroneous, rash, scandalous, offensive, prohibited, anathematized, excommunicated, and deposed retain their own meanings.	A mixed list cannot honestly be summarized as “every article was heresy.”	<i>Exsurge Domine</i> , <i>Unigenitus</i> , and <i>Auctorem fidei</i> require proposition-level care.
Authority	Patristic refutation, episcopal sentence, local synod, papal act, ecumenical council, profession, and civil law are identified separately.	Their jurisdiction, doctrinal force, and object differ.	Imperial exile after Nicaea is not part of the Nicene creed.
Evidence	The target’s words, a judicial extract, an opponent’s paraphrase, and a late catalogue are labeled.	Polemic may preserve evidence without functioning as a stenographic transcript.	Many Gnostic systems survive principally in their refuters, supplemented unevenly by recovered texts.
Afterlife	Recurrence, influence, and direct institutional descent require different proof.	Similar propositions centuries apart do not establish a secret continuous lineage.	Modern dualism is not thereby a surviving Cathar church.

C.4 Evidence grades and the repeated dossier

Grade A means that both the formal act and the target text survive. Grade B means that an act survives but the target is known through extracts, attributed propositions, or summary. Grade C marks a near-contemporary report without an extant formal act. Grade D marks late, hostile, legendary, or substantially disputed reconstruction. The grade measures documentary access, not the proposition’s seriousness.

Every dossier repeats four visible fields. **Object and setting** identifies persons, place, date, category, and source limit. **Propositions at issue** gives brief exact wording only when verified; otherwise it supplies a source-identified paraphrase. **Ecclesial response** names the authority, act, date, locus, censure, and positive Catholic doctrine. **Aftermath and qualification** records recantation, survival, separation, coercion, later clarification, and current terminology. References use section, canon, proposition, or standard collection loci so the condensed account can be checked.

C.5 People are not reducible to condemned propositions

Material error and formal culpability are not the same judgment. Some figures retracted, some denied that the judicial extract expressed their meaning, some died before a final act, and some were judged through procedures no modern

historian should romanticize. This volume states what the record permits and leaves the internal forum to God. It also follows the Second Vatican Council's teaching in *Unitatis redintegratio* 3: people now born into communities separated from full Catholic communion cannot be accused of the personal sin of the original separation.

The same restraint governs present names. Modern common declarations show substantial shared Christological faith between the Catholic Church and the Coptic Orthodox, Syriac Orthodox, and Assyrian Church of the East. Consequently, "Monophysite church" and "Nestorian church" are not used here as unqualified current labels. Likewise, ecumenical agreement on justification identifies consensus on basic truths without pretending that every sixteenth-century dispute or remaining difference has disappeared.

C.6 Doctrine, discipline, and coercion

The Church's doctrinal response is the subject of this survey, but its historical aftermath sometimes included imperial exile, confiscation, forced attendance, crusade, prison, torture, or execution. These acts are named without being smuggled into a creed or defended merely because Catholic actors participated. Ecclesial judgment, canonical or inquisitorial procedure, and secular punishment appear as separate facts. The martyrs killed by non-Catholic rulers and those punished by Catholic societies do not become abstractions in a history of propositions.

C.7 How to read the brevity

Each dossier is deliberately compressed. It identifies the doctrinal center and response; it cannot reproduce the full social history, manuscript record, regional diversity, or modern scholarly debate. The bibliography points to formal acts, critical corpora, direct writings, and responsible studies. A label should send the reader toward evidence, not end inquiry.

C.8 Source control, currentness, rights, and review

The formal act named in a dossier, not the bibliography or a private compendium, controls the reported censure. Original languages and current critical editions control when a wording dispute matters. Freely available translations linked in the references are identified as working access texts unless the issuing authority supplies them.

The specialized modern histories listed in the references disagree materially about category formation, continuity, popular adherence, and coercive records. The publication preserves those disputes at the dossiers they affect. Online sources were last checked 16 July 2026. No linked text is represented as project-owned merely because it is public, official, old, or freely accessible.

The source and corpus audit is internal. Independent specialist review in history, theology, canon law, source languages, conciliar studies, patristics, coercion history, and ecumenism remains outstanding, as does complete line-by-line collation of every proposition against its best current critical edition.

D References

D.1 Scripture, law, catechism, and levels of teaching

- Sacred Scripture, especially Acts 15; Romans 3–9; 1 Corinthians 15; Galatians 2–5; Colossians 1–2; the Pastoral Epistles; Hebrews; 1–2 John; and Revelation 2. The publication paraphrases short doctrinal centers rather than reproducing a modern translation in bulk.
- 1983 *Code of Canon Law*, canons 9, 17–18, 749–755, especially canon 751's definitions of heresy, apostasy, and schism: official Holy See English text.
- 1990 *Code of Canons of the Eastern Churches*, especially canons 598–606 and 1436–1437, consulted for present Eastern Catholic terminology where relevant: promulgating constitution and Holy See access.
- *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, 27–49, 185–267, 385–421, 456–483, 638–682, 748–870, 976–987, 1987–2029, and 2088–2089: Holy See edition. The Catechism supplies positive synthesis, not the historical act for every dossier.
- Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, doctrinal commentary on the concluding formula of the *Professio fidei* (1998), especially 5–11 on revealed truths, definitive teachings, and other authentic teaching: official text.

D.2 Conciliar and documentary corpora

- Norman P. Tanner, ed., *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, 2 vols. (Georgetown University Press edition, 2016; first published 1990). Latin or Greek and English documentary collection for the first twenty-one councils; a scholarly edition, not itself the promulgating authority: publisher record.
- Giuseppe Alberigo et al., eds., *Conciliarum Oecumenicorum Decreta*, 3rd ed. (Bologna: Istituto per le Scienze Religiose, 1973), consulted as an original-language conciliar crosscheck.
- *Acta Conciliarum Oecumenicorum*, series I–III, for Ephesus, Chalcedon, Constantinople II, and later acts. The current project describes the corpus, editions, and translation work: ACO project.
- Giovanni Domenico Mansi, *Sacrorum conciliarum nova et amplissima collectio*, used as a finding and documentary collection where a newer critical edition was not available; not treated as a critical text by default.
- Heinrich Denzinger and Peter Hünermann, *Enchiridion symbolorum definitionum et declarationum de rebus fidei et morum*, 45th ed. (Freiburg: Herder, 2017), with DH/DS numbers used only as stable locators to the underlying acts. No substantial text from this copyrighted compendium is reproduced.
- *Acta Sanctae Sedis* and *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, official publication record for modern Roman acts: Holy See archive.
- DDF/CDF complete document index, checked through 16 July 2026: official index.

D.3 Ancient target texts and heresiological witnesses

- St. Ignatius of Antioch, *Letters to the Smyrnaeans* 1–7 and *Trallians* 9–11, on Christ’s real flesh, Passion, Resurrection, and Eucharist: Smyrnaeans working translation; Trallians working translation.
- St. Justin Martyr, *First Apology* and *Dialogue with Trypho*; Irenaeus, *Against Heresies*, especially books I, III, and V. Irenaeus’s book I is a census witness; books III and V state the public rule of faith, apostolic succession, recapitulation, Eucharist, and bodily resurrection: working translation index.
- The early-school dossier uses Justin, *First Apology* 26 and 56; Irenaeus, *Against Heresies* I.1–28, II.31–32, and the response loci in III and V; Clement of Alexandria’s preserved target fragments; and Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* III.26–28 and IV.7. Simon, Menander, Cerinthus, Saturnilus, Basilides, Carpocrates, and the Valentinian schools remain witness-specific; no lost council sentence is inferred from a refuter.
- Tertullian, *Against Marcion*, *Against Praxeas*, *Prescription against Heretics*, and *On the Flesh of Christ*; Hippolytus, *Refutation of All Heresies*; Pseudo-Tertullian, *Against All Heresies*. These are interested witnesses and sometimes hostile intra-Roman polemics, not neutral transcripts.
- Eusebius of Caesarea, *Ecclesiastical History*, especially books V–VII for Montanist synods, Monarchian controversies, Novatian, and Paul of Samosata: working translation index.
- St. Epiphanius, *Panarion*; St. Augustine, *De haeresibus*; St. Philastrius, *Diversarum hereseon liber*; Theodoret, *Haereticarum fabularum compendium*; St. John Damascene, *De haeresibus*. Their numbered lists are crosswalked in the research inventory and are not concatenated as though each named one distinct organization.
- Coptic and Greek Gnostic codices, including securely identified Valentinian, Sethian, and related writings, consulted through current scholarly editions where a target-side proposition matters. A recovered text is not assigned to Irenaeus’s opponent merely because modern editors place both under “Gnosticism.”
- Manichaean Coptic, Middle Persian, Parthian, Sogdian, and Latin witnesses, Augustine’s anti-Manichaean works, and imperial legislation. Manichaeism is identified as a rival universal religion historically classed by Christian heresiologists, not simply a baptized Catholic faction.

D.4 Trinity, Christology, grace, and images

- Nicaea I (325), creed and attached anathemas; Constantinople I (381), creed and canon 1; Athanasius’s *Orations against the Arians*, Hilary’s *De synodis*, Basil’s *On the Holy Spirit*, and Gregory Nazianzen’s theological orations. Complete stenographic acts for 325 and 381 do not survive.
- Antioch (268) on Paul of Samosata, preserved fragments and Eusebian record; Roman and eastern synods on Sabellius, Marcellus, Photinus, Apollinaris, and related formulas. The source audit marks opponent-mediated proposition wording.
- Carthage (418) on grace and original sin; Augustine’s *On Nature and Grace*, *On the Spirit and the Letter*, *On the Proceedings of Pelagius*, and later anti-Pelagian works: working translation access. Orange II (529), canons and Boniface II’s confirmation, controls the western response to propositions later called Semi-Pelagian.
- Siricius’s Roman notification and Ambrose, *Letter* 42, for Jovinian; Lucidus’s c. 473 *Libellus* of submission; sixth-century Philopon and anti-Tritheist fragments; and Gregory the Great, *Register* X.39, for the Agnoete controversy: working translation of Gregory’s letter. These source-poor dossiers expressly do not claim an extant ecumenical proposition list.
- Ephesus (431): Cyril’s second and third letters to Nestorius, the conciliar proceedings and sentence, the rival session, and the Formula of Reunion (433). A working conciliar translation is available at New Advent; ACO controls detailed textual claims.

- Chalcedon (451): Definition, Leo's Tome, acta, and canons: working translation. Eutyches's synodal record and the 449 proceedings are kept separate from present Oriental Orthodox faith.
- Constantinople II (553): sentence and anathemas concerning the Three Chapters. The 543 anti-Origenist act and disputed fifteen-anathema dossier are audited separately rather than silently inserted into the extant conciliar sessions.
- Lateran synod of 649 and Constantinople III (680–681), definitions and acts on Christ's two wills and operations; Leo II's confirmation and characterization of Honorius. Nicaea II (787), definition and acts on images, together with Hieria (754) and the later Byzantine restoration.

D.5 Medieval acts and witnesses

- Berengar of Tours: council records and the 1059 and 1079 professions; Lateran II (1139), canon 23; Sens (1140/1141) on Abelard; Reims (1148) on Gilbert of Poitiers. Later scholastic terminology is not projected into the earliest stages.
- The Utrecht canons' accusatory letter and the *Life of Norbert* for Tanchelm; Paris acts of 1210 and Robert of Courçon's 1215 statutes for David of Dinant; and the 1255 Anagni commission protocol for Gerard of Borgo San Donnino. Each remains bounded by the survival and genre of its witness.
- Lucius III, *Ad abolendam* (1184); Innocent III, *Vergentis in senium* (1199); Durand of Huesca's profession (1208); Lateran IV (1215), especially constitutions 1–3. Texts are checked in Tanner, papal registers, or Friedberg as applicable.
- Gregory IX, *Excommunicamus* (1231); Innocent IV, *Ad extirpanda* (1252). These juridical and coercive measures are never cited as though their penalties defined the doctrinal object.
- Stephen Tempier's Paris condemnations of 1270 and 1277 in an identified critical edition; Nicholas III, *Exiit qui seminat* (1279); John XXII, *Sancta Romana, Gloriosam Ecclesiam, Cum inter nonnullos, Licet iuxta doctrinam*, and *In agro dominico*. Every proposition list retains local scope and individual or collective censure.
- Vienne (1311–1312), *Ad nostrum* and *Fidei catholicae fundamento*; Gregory XI's Wyclif letters (1377); Blackfriars (1382); Constance's Wyclif and Hus materials; Martin V, *Inter cunctas* (1418); the Bohemian Compactata; Pius II, *Execrabilis* (1460); Lateran V, *Apostolici regiminis* (1513).
- Medieval heresy evidence in MGH, papal registers, the *Corpus Iuris Canonici*, episcopal registers, chronicles, polemics, sermons, and inquisitorial depositions. Digital MGH access: dMGH. Every deposition is treated as a scribally and procedurally mediated record.
- Critical-edition programs used or identified for future collation: CSEL; Corpus Christianorum; Sources Chrétiennes.

D.6 Reformation and post-Tridentine acts

- Leo X, *Exsurge Domine* (1520) and *Decet Romanum Pontificem* (1521), checked in the papal register/*Bullarium Romanum* and DH 1451–1492. The collective censure is not redistributed into invented article-by-article grades.
- Martin Luther's relevant disputations, treatises, and confessional reception; the Augsburg Confession and Apology; Zwingli's and Calvin's sacramental writings; Reformed confessions; representative Anabaptist confessions and trial records; Schwenckfeld and the Racovian Catechism. Counterparty sources control what later communities actually taught.
- Michael Servetus, *Christianismi restitutio* (Vienne, 1553), in the BnF/Gallica first-edition witness NUMM-109340: catalogue and digital-facsimile record. The witness fixes the target book; it does not make Geneva's civic sentence a Catholic act.
- Toledo inquisitorial edict of 23 September 1525, forty-eight propositions judicially attributed to Alumbrados, using Vicente Beltrán de Heredia's published transcription as a working witness; the underlying cases and later regional edicts remain separate. Edmond Richer's *De ecclesiastica et politica potestate* (1611), Sens and Aix provincial censures (1612), Paul V's confirming briefs, and the 1613 Index decree control the Richerist dossier.
- Council of Trent, sessions IV–VII, XIII–XIV, XXI–XXV, decrees and canons on Scripture and Tradition, original sin, justification, sacraments, Eucharist, Penance, Anointing, Communion, Mass, Orders, Matrimony, purgatory, saints, images, and indulgences. Tanner and the original-language decree text control; individual canons are cited by session and canon.
- Pius V, *Ex omnibus afflictionibus* (1567), propositions associated with Baius; Urban VIII, *In eminenti* (1642); Innocent X, *Cum occasione* (1653); Alexander VII, *Ad sanctam beati Petri sedem* (1656); Clement XI, *Unigenitus Dei Filius* (1713).
- Alexander VII and Innocent XI on laxist propositions; Innocent XI, *Caelestis Pastor* (1687) on Molinos; Alexander VIII, *Sanctissimus Dominus* (1690); Innocent XII, *Cum alias* (1699) on Fénelon; Pius VI, *Auctorem fidei* (1794) on Pistoia. The relevant censure applies exactly as the act states.
- Thomist, Molinist, Augustinian, Jesuit, and Dominican grace sources around the *de auxiliis* congregations. Paul V's 1607 non-condemnation boundary controls: permitted Catholic schools are not added to a heresy list.

D.7 Modern Roman and conciliar sources

- Gregory XVI-era professions required of Louis-Eugène Bautain; Pius IX, *Eximiam tuam* (1857) on Günther; Holy Office decree on Ontologism (1861); Pius IX, *Quanta cura* and the *Syllabus* (1864): Holy See Italian/Latin access.
- Vatican I, *Dei Filius* (24 April 1870) and *Pastor aeternus* (18 July 1870): Holy See text of *Dei Filius*; original Latin controls where the English page is incomplete.
- Holy Office, *Post obitum* (1887), and CDF note on Rosmini (2001): official English note. Walter Elliott, *Le Père Hecker*, anonymous authorized French translation/adaptation, introduction by John Ireland, preface by Félix Klein, 5th ed. (Paris: Victor Lecoffre, 1897): complete facsimile. Leo XIII, *Testem benevolentiae* (1899): Holy See Latin text.
- Holy Office, *Lamentabili sane exitu* (1907); Pius X, *Pascendi dominici gregis*: Holy See English text; *Praestantia Scripturae* and *Sacrorum antistitum*.
- Holy Office decree on millenarianism (1944); Holy Office, *Suprema haec sacra* (1949); Pius XII, *Humani generis* (1950): Holy See Latin text. Holy Office, instruction *De “Ethica Situationis”* (2 February 1956), *AAS* 48 (1956), 144–145: official AAS facsimile.
- Vatican II, *Dei Verbum* 11–12; *Gaudium et spes*; and especially *Unitatis redintegratio* 3–4, 11 (21 November 1964).
- CDF, *Mysterium Ecclesiae* (1973), *Donum veritatis* (1990), and *Dominus Iesus* (2000); the complete official DDF index supplies document genre and publication data.
- CDF, *Instruction on Certain Aspects of the Theology of Liberation* (1984) and *Instruction on Christian Freedom and Liberation* (1986). The two are read together so doctrinal criticism is not misreported as rejection of integral liberation or concern for the poor.
- DDF prefect, statement concerning announced SSPX episcopal ordinations (13 May 2026): official text. Its conditional future wording is retained for the warning as issued.
- Leo XIV, letter to the SSPX superior general (29 June 2026): official English text, asking that the intended act be abandoned.
- DDF, signed decree (2 July 2026): official Italian decree, controlling the five reserved canon 1387 cases and Fellay’s separate canon 1364 §1 case; DDF, official Italian explanatory note, controlling the minister, lay-adherence, and sacramental consequences. Vatican News’s 1 July event report is used only to establish and publicly report the completed event, not to allocate penalties.

D.8 Ecumenical afterlife controls

- Paul VI and Shenouda III, Catholic–Coptic common declaration (10 May 1973): Holy See text.
- John Paul II and Ignatius Zakka I, Catholic–Syriac common declaration (23 June 1984): Dicastery for Promoting Christian Unity text.
- John Paul II and Mar Dinkha IV, Common Christological Declaration between the Catholic Church and the Assyrian Church of the East (11 November 1994): Holy See text.
- Catholic Church and Lutheran World Federation, *Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification*, official common statement, and annex (31 October 1999): official twentieth-anniversary documentary edition.

D.9 Historical scholarship

Specialized modern histories were used to test dates, terminology, social setting, and scholarly disagreement, but not substituted for formal acts. Major orientations include Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition*; R. P. C. Hanson, *The Search for the Christian Doctrine of God*; John Behr, Lewis Ayres, Aloys Grillmeier, John Meyendorff, and Pauline Allen on patristic and Christological controversies; Robert Markus and Peter Brown on late antiquity; Bernard Hamilton, Malcolm Lambert, R. I. Moore, Mark Pegg, Caterina Bruschi, and Peter Biller on medieval dissent and its historiography; Heiko Oberman, Scott Hendrix, Diarmaid MacCulloch, Carlos Eire, and the confessional primary corpora on the Reformations; and document-specific studies of Jansenism, Modernism, and twentieth-century doctrinal procedure.

Last revised (UTC): 2026-07-24T13:15:10Z

Reuse and rights. To the extent Triptych holds the rights, project-created content and design are licensed under CC BY 4.0. Scripture, liturgical or official texts, received prayers or hymns, quotations, fonts, and other third-party material retain their own status; public-domain material remains public domain. Identify changes. Attribution implies neither Triptych nor ecclesiastical approval. See `LICENSE` and `THIRD_PARTY.md` in the source.