



HAL
open science

Theology, Fallacious Reasoning and Heresy on the Borders of the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries: Some Remarks on the Fallaciae in theologia and Amalricians

Irene Caiazzo

► To cite this version:

Irene Caiazzo. Theology, Fallacious Reasoning and Heresy on the Borders of the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries: Some Remarks on the Fallaciae in theologia and Amalricians. Leone Gazziero; Laurent Cesalli; Charles H. Manekin; Shahid Rahman; Tony Street; Michele Trizio. Fallacies in the Arabic, Byzantine, Hebrew and Latin Traditions, 4, Brepols Publishers, pp.119 - 130, 2024, Ad argumenta, 978-2-503-60819-8. 10.1484/m.adarg-eb.5.137518 . hal-04851960

HAL Id: hal-04851960

<https://hal.science/hal-04851960v1>

Submitted on 20 Dec 2024

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Irene Caiazzo

Theology, Fallacious Reasoning and Heresy on the Borders of the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries: Some Remarks on the *Fallaciae in theologia* and Amalricians*

Treatises on fallacies – i.e. logical traps, directly inspired by Aristotle’s *Sophistical Refutations* – constitute a new genre that emerged in the second half of the twelfth century. Several treatises on fallacies have come down to us. First, the *Fallaciae Londinenses*, preserved in a single manuscript, were edited by Lambertus Maria de Rijk. These fallacies closely follow the Aristotelian *Sophistical Refutations* and are not written specifically for theology. Then, the *Fallaciae* and *Loci Theologici* of Guillelmus de Montibus which, according to Yukio Iwakuma, who edited them, should be dated after 1186 and before 1200¹. The treatises of Guillelmus de Montibus are “explicitly addressed to theologians” and their “aim is didactic”, as Luisa Valente writes². The *Fallaciae in theologia* or *Fallaciae in sacra pagina* (*inc.* “Columnae basis triplicis innititur fides nostra”), according to the different title given in the manuscripts, still unpublished, is an anonymous text on the errors that can be committed in theological discourse. It was discovered by Jean Leclercq³, who edited the prologue, where we have an explicit mention of heretics and their sophisms (*cavillationes*) which must be rejected – the reference to heretics will be discussed below. This one text in particular and the theological fallacies as a genre have been studied by Franco Giusberti⁴ and Luisa Valente⁵.

* I would like to thank Luisa Valente (Università degli Studi di Roma, La Sapienza), Michael Chase (CNRS, Centre Jean Pépin), Leone Gazziero (CNRS, “Savoirs, textes, Langages”), and the anonymous reviewers for their suggestions and reading of this article.

1. IWAKUMA 1993, p. 4. The *Fallaciae Magistri Willelmi* were first edited by L.M. de Rijk in volume two of his *Logica modernorum*.

2. VALENTE 1999, p. 221. See also ROSIER-CATACH 1988.

3. LECLERCQ 1945.

4. Cf. GIUSBERTI 1982.

5. Cf. VALENTE 2008 where the author puts the role of fallacies into perspective by showing the two-way influence between logic and theology.

1. Manuscripts

Jean Leclercq knew of only three manuscripts of the *Fallaciae in theologia*: Florence (no. 1 in the list below), Paris, Mazarine (no. 3), and Paris, français 19951 (no. 4)⁶. Franco Giusberti reports seven⁷, and we can add manuscripts from Leipzig (no. 2), Paris, latin 14417 (no. 5)⁸, and Princeton (no. 6). Thus, from seven we have now reached ten manuscripts; this is a very considerable number for an anonymous scholastic text from the late twelfth/early thirteenth century:

- 1) FLORENCE, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut.20 dex.13, ff. 123ra-125ra
- 2) LEIPZIG, Universitätsbibliothek, MS 835, ff. 64rb-69rb
- 3) PARIS, Bibliothèque Mazarine, 891, ff. 127a-130c
- 4) PARIS, Bibliothèque nationale de France, français 19951, ff. 331r-62r
- 5) PARIS, Bibliothèque nationale de France, latin 14417, ff. 312rb-313va
- 6) PRINCETON, University Library, MS 189, ff. 11r-14v
- 7) ROME, Biblioteca Vallicelliana, B 82, ff. 220r-226v
- 8) TOULOUSE, Archives départementales de la Haute-Garonne, 5 (D 56), ff. 254vb-257vb
- 9) VENICE, Biblioteca dei PP. Redentoristi (S. Maria della Consolazione, detta “della Fava”), 4 (lat. CLXXIII), ff. 69va-71vb
- 10) ZAGREB, Nacionalna i sveučilišna knjižnica, MR 97

In the thirteenth-century Leipzig manuscript (no. 2) the *Fallaciae* is entitled *Tractatus de fallaciis in sacra scriptura occurrentibus*. It is sandwiched between Alain of Lille’s *Contra haereticos* (ff. 26ra-64rb) and the *Summa contra hereticos* by Pseudo-Iacobus de Capellis (ff. 69rb-104ra), an anonymous anti-Cathar text dated 1230s⁹.

The thirteenth-century Parisian manuscript (no. 5) is made up of two separate volumes from the library of Saint Victor. The second volume is of interest here because it contains the *Fallaciae in theologia* with the title *Ars refellendi hereticos*. It also includes works by authors such as Richard of St. Victor, Stephen Langton, Praepositinus of Cremona, Hugh of St. Victor, and the questions entitled after their incipit ‘Quare’. All these indications lead us back to the teaching of theology in Paris at the turn of the twelfth/thirteenth centuries¹⁰.

6. LECLERCQ 1945, p. 44.

7. GIUSBERTI 1982, p. 97. Giusberti reports that Francesco Del Punta told him he had found another manuscript in Wrocław. Unfortunately, I have not been able to locate it.

8. This manuscript is already listed in the online index “In principio”, by Brepols (<http://apps.brepols.net/BrepolsPortal/default.aspx>).

9. Cf. PS. IACOBUS DE CAPELLIS, *Summa contra hereticos*, ed. P. Romagnoli, p. 42.

10. Here is a summary of the contents of the volume according to the Paris National Library’s catalogue (<https://archivesetmanuscrits.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cc75171d/cdoe532>): Stephanus Langton, *Reportatio super Historiam scholasticam Petri Comestoris* (ff. 129-158); *Glosa in Isaiam, Danielem et Prophetas Minores* (ff. 159-241); Praepositinus, *Summa super Psalterium* (ff. 242-308); Hugo de Sancto Victore, *Didascalicon* (excerpta) (309); Richardus de Sancto Victore, *Liber Exceptionum* (excerpta) (ff. 309-312); *Questiones de ecclesiasticis officiis* intitulate “Quare” (ff. 313-315).

No. 6 in the list is an Italian manuscript from the fifteenth century (between 1460 and 1469), of unknown provenance. It contains both medieval texts and writings by humanist authors such as Leonardo Bruni, Gasparino Barzizza and Giorgio Valagussa¹¹. The *Fallaciae* is untitled¹².

The Vallicelliana manuscript (no. 7) is composite. The third codicological unit (ff. 220-254) that interests us here dates from the fourteenth century, according to the online catalogue 'Manus'¹³. Our treatise on the *Fallaciae*, which appears at the beginning of this third part, is acephalous: "[...] si non unus Deus solus est...". A title has been added by a hand different from that of the scribe: *Tractatus theologicus de fallaciis*. The *Fallaciae* is followed by the *Hierarchia Alani* (*Tractatus de angelica yerarchya* in the Vallicelliana manuscript), ff. 226v-231r, edited by Marie-Thérèse d'Alverny. This is followed by Alain of Lille's *Regulae theologicae*, ff. 231v-254v. It should be noted that the Florence manuscript (no. 1 in the list) also contains both the *Hierachia Alani* and the *Fallaciae in theologia*¹⁴.

No. 8 is a French manuscript from the fourteenth or fifteenth century: the *Fallaciae in theologia* follows Nicole Oresme's *De communicatione idiomatum* with no break in continuity¹⁵. This fact should be noted, because in manuscript no. 4 as well, the *Fallaciae* has been bound in a single volume with a fifteenth-century copy of Nicole Oresme's *Livre des divinations*.

It is probably too early to draw conclusions. In any case, the *Fallaciae in theologia* can be found in the manuscripts that I have been able to consult in the company of works by Parisian theologians of the twelfth or early thirteenth century (in three cases with Alain of Lille); or in two cases with works by Nicole Oresme. Their presence in a fifteenth-century Italian manuscript shows that the *Fallaciae* had a wide circulation. However, the older manuscripts, those of the thirteenth century, point to a French or even Parisian milieu.

11. High resolution images of the ms. available on the Princeton Library Special Collections – Manuscripts website: <https://catalog.princeton.edu/catalog/11547901>. The best description of the manuscript can be found on the website "Les enluminures" (<https://www.textmanuscripts.com/medieval/leonardo-bruni-barzizza-valagussa-60431&p=6>): "[Miscellany of Humanistic Texts], including Leonardo Bruni, *Ad Petrum Paulum Histrum Dialogus*; Gasparino Barzizza, *Tractatus de Compositione*; Giorgio Valagussa, *Elegantiae Ciceroniae*, ff. 69v-74; Cicero, *De inventione*, Book I, v. 1-6, ff. 75-88v; [Anonymous], *Commentary on the grammatical aspects of the Decretals*: incipit Prologue, '[I]stud proemium in quatuor divido partes. In prima quarum salutatio ponitur...'; rubrics, *De summa tri[nitate] et fid[e] ca[tolica]*; *De constituti omnibus*; *De rescriptis*; *De constitudine*; *De postulatione*; *De electione*; incipit, 'Fideli. Errore grecorum quod volebant...'; explicit, '... episcopus per alios faciat episcopos expediri'. This is a commentary on the grammatical aspects of the *Decretals*, compiled by masters of the University of Bologna. It is not recorded in BURSILL-HALL 1981 and is likely unpublished".

12. The first folio is available on the website "Les Enluminures".

13. https://manus.iccu.sbn.it/opac_SchedaScheda.php?ID=16498

14. The latter knew the Vallicelliana and Florence manuscripts. See D'ALVERNY 1965, pp. 219-221.

15. The manuscript contains Jacobus de Altavilla, *Commentarium in Sententias*; Nicole Oresme, *De Communicatione idiomatum*; *De Fallaciis in theologia*.

2. Author

Another clue to the origin of the *Fallaciae in theologia* can be found in the text itself – this is an example that the author puts forward when examining the *fallacia compositionis et divisionis*:

“I send a servant to Tours, proposing to him two different routes: one via the city of Chartres where he has many enemies, and the other via Orléans where I have acquaintances and friends”¹⁶.

It is obvious that the author who speaks in the first person is in Paris, because it is from Paris that one can reach Tours either via Orléans or via Chartres; these are still the two possible routes even today. A few lines later the two alternative cities are proposed again. This passage has not been noticed by other specialists – with the exception of Marie-Thérèse d’Alverny¹⁷. *Turonis, Carnotum, Aurelianum* read perfectly in the Leipzig manuscript, although I have not collated all the manuscripts. The example is inserted in the context of the discourse on predestination and free will. Convinced by a whole series of arguments, the servant chooses to travel via Orléans and not via Chartres, but in the course of his journey he comes across criminals and is killed. Texts produced in a school context often contain concrete examples that speak to the listeners and such examples are often indicative of the identity of the teacher or, as in this case, of the place where he teaches.

3. The *Fallaciae in theologia* and the Amalrician Heresy

Fallacious reasoning in theology is often mentioned in attacks on heretics. This aspect is admittedly known to scholars, but has not been thoroughly investigated. As indicated above, the fight against heretics and their sophisms is expressly mentioned in the prologue of *Fallaciae in theologia*, once edited by Jean Leclercq¹⁸. However, the text has never been studied from this perspective. For this rea-

16. *Fallaciae in theologia*, ms. PARIS, BnF, français 19951, f. 52r (transcription Francesco Del Punta): “Item, ego destino servum Turonis proponens ei duplicem viam: unam per Carnotum ubi multos habet inimicos, aliam per Aurelianum ubi notos habeo et amicos”. I was able to consult Francesco del Punta’s transcription of the *Fallaciae* thanks to the generosity of Luisa Valente (Università degli Studi di Roma, La Sapienza) and Leone Gazziero (CNRS, UMR 8163 “Savoirs, textes, Langages”). I would like to thank them for this.

17. D’ALVERNY 1965, pp. 220-221: “Ce ms. contient ff. 123-125, – she is describing the Florence manuscript (no. 1) – un traité *De fallaciis in sacra pagina*, rédigé en France d’après des allusions aux villes de Tours, Chartres et Orléans”. However, Marie-Thérèse d’Alverny does not suggest that the author is in Paris.

18. LECLERCQ 1945, p. 45; ms. PARIS, BnF, français 19951, f. 33r (transcription Francesco Del Punta): “Sicut autem triplici funiculo subsistit et roboratur fides nostra, sic triplici laborat incommodo. Nam eam persequitur materialis gladius, manifestus haereticus et hostis domesticus. Contra duo ul-

son, the present study will investigate the *Fallaciae in theologia* in the context of the Amalrician heresy. Amaury de Bène (Almaric of Bena) was excommunicated *post mortem* by a Provincial Synod presided over by Peter of Corbeil, the Archbishop of Sens, in Paris in 1209 or 1210. Ten of his followers were degraded and handed over to the secular arm, i.e. to the officers of King Philip Augustus, who condemned them to be burned, while four others were sentenced to life imprisonment. No text by Amaury of Bène or his disciples has been preserved. Their doctrine is only known from the chroniclers and from his detractors, such as Garnier of Rochefort, author of the *Contra Amaurianos*. The latter text was discovered and studied by Barthélemy Hauréau¹⁹. It was first published by Clemens Baeumker in 1926, who proposed to attribute it to the Cistercian Garnier of Rochefort, abbot of Clairvaux, and bishop of Langres for some years; it was republished by Paolo Lucentini in 2010. It is clear that the *Contra Amaurianos* is an exceptional witness, written before the arrest of the Amalricians, and more importantly before the Provincial Synod of 1209 or 1210, as there is no reference to the condemnation of Amaury and his followers. Thirteen theses are attributed to the Amalricians in the *Contra Amaurianos*. Thesis no. 9 is undoubtedly the best known of all: *Deus est omnia in omnibus*. As Clemens Baeumker once indicated, to illustrate this thesis Garnier of Rochefort re-uses a part of a chapter from his *Isagogae theophaniarum symbolicae*, still unpublished, which is preserved in ms. Troyes, Médiathèque du Grand Troyes, 455. This is very important, because Garnier of Rochefort now attributes to the Amalricians statements that in the *Isagogae* he had attributed to the Manichaeans. Paolo Lucentini, for his part, has shown that Garnier of Rochefort had in fact used the *Summa* “*Quoniam homines*” of Alain of Lille in both works²⁰. The *Contra Amaurianos* should also be compared with the *Fallaciae in theologia*.

Three fallacies are mentioned in chapter 9 of the *Contra Amaurianos*, which illustrates thesis no. 9 of the Amalricians: *Deus est omnia in omnibus*. Garnier of Rochefort combats the Amalricians as follows:

“Moreover, taking the authority of the Apostle who says: ‘God will be all in all’ [*I Cor* 15:28], they say that God is all in all. They proceed in this way: God will be all in all. But all that will be is, since change does not affect God. So, God is all in all. But what is more absurd than that God is stone in stone, Godin in Godin? Let Godin therefore be worshipped, not only by dulia but by latria, since he is God. Moreover, let the mole or the bat be worshipped, since God in the mole is a mole, and in

tima incommoda, hoc est contra cavillationes manifesti haeretici et domestici hostis insidias, modum et artem repellendi earum versutiam suscepimus in tractatum. Cavillatur autem multipliciter”.

19. HAURÉAU 1880, pp. 85-90.

20. LUCENTINI 2005. In the same paper, Paolo Lucentini links chapter 1 of the *Contra Amaurianos* with the *Summa* “*Qui producit ventos*” by Praepositinus of Cremona, and with the *Epistola de incarnatione verbi* by Anselm of Canterbury.

the bat a bat. The poor [*Amalricians*] do not understand why this is said. [...]. But the argument can be refuted as follows: ‘God will be – he says – all in all’. And all that will be, is. So, God is all in all. Falsification: ‘The charity of God will be in all who are to be saved. And all that will be charity, is the charity of God. Therefore, the charity of God is in all who are to be saved’. And this is false, since many are to be saved who are not yet born. But to this they object: All that is in God is God²¹. But all are in God, since ‘that which has come to be was life in Him’ [*John 1:3-4*]. Therefore, God is all. They are therefore mistaken, for they do not understand the Scriptures, nor do they pay attention to the reason for what is said. [...]. Falsification: ‘The power of God is the same as the charity of God. But the power of God is in the stone. Therefore, the charity of God is in the stone’. Or: ‘The father is distinct from the Son in fatherhood. But the divine essence is the Father. Therefore, in the fatherhood [*lege in the divine essence*] he is distinct from the Son’²².

In the third falsification (*fallacia*) one must correct *paternitate* to *divina essentia*, otherwise the conclusion is identical to the major premise of the syllogism. In the apparatus of the sources, Paolo Lucentini brought the first “fallacy” closer to Praepositinus of Cremona’s *Summa “Qui producit ventos”*: “Instantia: Dei essentia nihil aliud est quam caritas. Et divina essentia est in lapide. Ergo caritas est in lapide”²³.

The anonymous author of the *Fallaciae in theologia* says in the prologue that “cauillatur autem multipliciter”. He therefore examines the different types of

21. On this saying quoted by the masters in *sacra pagina* of the twelfth century, see VALENTE 2000. This saying is very often attributed to Augustine, but it is not found as such in his works. It is quoted by Abelard and in the writings of his school, by the Porretans, by Alain of Lille and others: the uses and interpretations that have been made of it are multiple. Luisa Valente brings Garnier of Rochefort closer to Alain of Lille and Simon of Tournai – a master of theology in Paris in the second half of the twelfth century, who died in 1201, author of the *Institutiones in sacram paginam*. For Garnier of Rochefort, as Luisa Valente put it, this sentence means that “the theological propositions express no inherence but identity” (VALENTE 2000, p. 733).

22. GARNERIUS DE RUPEFORTI, *Contra Amaurianos*, IX, ed. LUCENTINI, pp. 26-30: “Item. Occasione illius auctoritatis, quam inducit Apostolus dicens: *Deus erit omnia in omnibus*, dicunt quod Deus est omnia in omnibus. Sic enim procedunt: *DEVS ERIT OMNIA IN OMNIBVS. SED QVICQVID ERIT, EST, QVIA MVTATIO NON CADIT IN DEVM. ERGO DEVS EST OMNIA IN OMNIBVS*. Sed quid est absurdius quam quod Deus est lapis in lapide, Godinus in Godino? Adoretur ergo Godinus, non solum dulia sed latria, quia Deus est. Immo et talpa uel uespertilio adoretur, quia Deus in talpa talpa est et in uespertione uespertilio. Non intelligunt miseri quid propter quid dicatur. [...]. Sic autem potest argumentum refelli: ‘Deus erit – inquit – omnia in omnibus. Et quicquid erit, est. Ergo Deus est omnia in omnibus’. Fallacia: ‘Caritas Dei erit in omnibus saluandis. Et quicquid erit caritas, est caritas Dei. Ergo caritas Dei est in omnibus saluandis’. Et hoc falsum est, quia multi saluandi sunt qui necdum nati sunt. Sed ad hoc instant: *QVICQVID IN DEO EST, DEVS EST. SED IN DEO SVNT OMNIA, QVIA QVOD FACTVM EST IN IPSO VITA ERAT. ERGO DEVS EST OMNIA*. Ideo errant, quia non intelligunt Scripturas, nec quid propter quid dicatur attendunt. [...]. Fallacia: ‘Idem est potentia Dei et caritas Dei. Sed potentia Dei est in lapide. Ergo caritas Dei est in lapide’. Vel sic: ‘Pater paternitate distinguitur a Filio. Sed essentia diuina est Pater. Ergo paternitate [*lege diuina essentia*] distinguitur a Filio’.

23. PRAEPOSITINUS DE CREMONA, *Summa “Qui producit ventos”*, I, 6, 12, ed. ANGELINI, p. 238, ll. 50-52.

fallacies, according to the list of *Sophistical Refutations*, as well as the other *fallaciae* texts of his time. As observed by Jean Leclercq, the author will neither contemplate “sophisms *ex accentu*, which do not occur in connection with Holy Scripture, nor *petitio principii* and the paralogism *propter non causam*. But with regard to all the others, he accumulates examples, in order to train the mind of the theologian to discern easily the apparent contrarities and to reconcile them”²⁴. Luisa Valente follows Jean Leclercq’s lead: “the *Fallaciae in theologia* is intended to prepare students of *sacra pagina* for the practice of refutation”²⁵; and she points out that these themes are dealt with in theological summas which, unfortunately, are still mostly unpublished: “We can often find the same questions in the theological summas of the time [...]. In the end, one could say that this work constitutes a collection of theological questions ordered, not according to the systematic subdivision of the subjects treated, a structure usual in the summas, but according to the systematic subdivision of the instruments used to resolve the questions, a subdivision modelled on the scheme of the *Fallaciae*”²⁶. It must be emphasized that the author selects from the *Sophistical Refutations* those sophisms that are useful for theology. We are thus in the presence of a case of Christian Latin appropriation of Aristotle’s philosophy. Whether Aristotle’s *Sophistical Refutations* had a decisive impact on the development of theology in the West is a complex matter, and one that is not unanimously agreed upon by scholars. Moreover, following a suggestion by Franco Giusberti, Luisa Valente has brought the *Fallaciae in theologia* closer to Peter the Chanter’s *De tropis loquendis*²⁷. She believes that these two texts, eccentric in relation to the theological production of the time, come from the same intellectual circle. However, the *De tropis loquendi* is more concerned with exegesis and preaching, and it takes up only two types of fallacies from the *Sophistical Refutations*²⁸, while the *Fallaciae in theologia* is more concerned with speculative theology and disputation. For my part, I place more emphasis on the fact that the *Fallaciae in theologia* faithfully reproduce the pattern of the *Sophistical Refutations* and on their practical aspect, which serves to counteract the fallacious reasoning of heretics and bad dialecticians. This text is a weapon for unmasking heretics and refuting their sometimes-tantalizing demonstrations. If we have to situate its writing in Paris, we can imagine that it is the work of a member of “Peter the Chanter’s circle”, to echo the expression with which Baldwin²⁹ referred to the theologians who gravitated around Peter. One may also add that, more recently, Jean-

24. LECLERCQ 1945, p. 45.

25. VALENTE 1999, p. 222.

26. VALENTE 1999, p. 223.

27. VALENTE 1997, pp. 54-55.

28. GIUSBERTI 1982, pp. 92-93.

29. BALDWIN 1970

Pierre Rothschild³⁰ noted that the *De tropis loquendi* was used, or even taken up verbatim in Garnier of Rochefort's *De contrarietatibus in Sacra Scriptura*.

Fallacia equivocationis is the first type of fallacy analyzed in the *Fallaciae in theologia*. Since it is the most relevant to the present topic – i.e. the fallacious reasoning in the statements made by Amalricians according to Garnier of Rochefort's *Contra Amaurianos* – it is also the only type of fallacy I will be discussing in this article.

In his translation of the *Sophistical Refutations*, Boethius renders the word *ὀμωνυμία* as *equivocatio*. The anonymous author of the *Fallaciae in theologia* provides a definition of *equivocatio*: “Equivocation is a different meaning of the same word. The fallacy of equivocation is the error that arises from the different meanings of the same word”³¹. The author then distinguishes several types of fallacy of equivocation, eight types to be exact. The following examples fall into two types, namely “*ex varia transumptione*”³² and “*ex vario officio*”:

“Now the changing transfer of the word occurs in this example: The Holy Spirit is in this stone, or everywhere, but the Holy Spirit is charity, so charity is in this stone or everywhere. Now the meaning of this name ‘charity’ changes; for although it is said in the proper sense of the virtue, it is transferred to the Holy Spirit. Now, in the phrase ‘charity is in this stone’, the virtue is meant, or this preposition ‘in’ indicates the inherence of the form in the subject, not its essence. But in the phrase ‘the holy spirit is in this stone’, what is meant is that it is in it by essence, not by inherence. There is thus a double equivocation: the first comes from the transfer of the noun, the second from the changing role of the preposition”³³.

In the *fallacia ex vario officio* the equivocation is caused by the different roles played in a proposition by the different parts of speech. It is the preposition “in” that is examined in the following extract:

“The sentence is misleading because of the changing role in it [*of the preposition ‘in’*], as follows: ‘everything that is in God is God’, but the punishment of this one is

30. ROTHSCHILD 2013.

31. *Fallaciae in theologia*, ms. PARIS, BnF, français 19951, f. 33v (transcription Francesco Del Punta): “Equivocatio est dissimilis eiusdem vocis acceptio; fallacia equivocationis est deceptio proveniens ex dissimili eiusdem vocis acceptione”.

32. GIUSBERTI 1982, p. 97 writes “*ex vocabuli transumptione*” but I follow Del Punta’s transcription “*ex varia transumptione*”.

33. *Fallaciae in theologia*, ms. PARIS, BnF, français 19951, f. 41v (transcription Francesco Del Punta): “*Ex varia transumptione* [...]. Incidit autem varia transumptio in hoc exemplo: ‘Spiritus Sanctus est in hoc lapide vel ubique, sed caritas est Spiritus Sanctus; ergo caritas est in hoc lapide vel ubique’. Variatur autem significatio huius nominis ‘caritas’, nam cum proprie dicatur de virtute a se transumitur ad Spiritum Sanctum. Dicto autem ‘caritas est in hoc lapide’, supponitur virtus, vel hec prepositio ‘in’ notat inherentiam non essentiam forme ad subiectum. Sed dicto ‘Spiritus Sanctus est in hoc lapide’, intelligitur quod est in eo per essentiam non per inherentiam. Est ergo hic duplex equivocatio: una surgens ex transumptione nominis, alia ex vario officio prepositionis”.

in God, so the same punishment is God. Here we are misled by the fact that the role of the preposition changes. In fact, in the sentence ‘all that is in God, is God’, this preposition ‘in’ indicates the essence, since all that is in God by essence, is God Himself. But when it is said ‘the punishment of this one is in him’, this must be understood to mean that it is in God according to foreknowledge. In the same way, when it is said, ‘All that is in the Father is the Father, but the Son is in the Father, therefore the Son is the Father’: in the first proposition the essence is designated, in the second the separation of persons; for it is said that the Son is in the Father according to generation. In the same way, this example which we have adduced above can explain another case: ‘The Holy Spirit is in everything, but the Holy Spirit is charity, therefore charity is in everything’, which is false. Indeed, in the conclusion [*of the syllogism*] this preposition ‘in’ indicates the inherence of the form in the subject; yet, in the major premise it indicates the essence, i.e. ‘he is everywhere’. [...]. One is misled in both cases by the fact that the ablative can indicate the formal cause or the efficient cause”³⁴.

The anonymous author explains the various pitfalls behind the prepositions: ‘in’, ‘ex’, ‘à’, ‘apud’. It is all these subtle distinctions that help to unmask false reasoning. The *Fallaciae in theologia* clearly illustrate all the logical traps and their application to theology. It is perhaps an attempt to create a foundation for theology as a science by laying down precise logical rules that should be observed in theological discourse.

In conclusion, the *Fallaciae in theologia* seems to be useful for understanding Garnier of Rochefort’s *Contra Amaurianos*. However, all these discussions can be better understood if they are situated in the theological debate of the second half of the twelfth century. Simon of Tournai also, like Alain of Lille, argues for the impropriety of using terms that properly apply to creatures to speak of God, in other words he defends the equivocity of theological discourse: the terms are applied to God, only in an improper sense. There is thus a *translatio*, that is to say a transfer or a *transumptio*, as the author of the *Fallaciae in theologia* says. Praepositinus of Cremona, on the other hand, was an advocate of the univocity of language; the same terms apply according to the same meaning to creatures and

34. *Fallaciae in theologia*, ms. PARIS, BnF, français 19951, f. 44r (transcription Francesco Del Punta): “*Ex vario officio dictio* his fallitur hoc modo: ‘quidquid est in Deo Deus est, sed damnatio istius est in Deo; ergo ipsa Deus est’. Hic fallitur ex eo quod prepositionis variatur officium. Dicto enim ‘quidquid est in Deo Deus est’, hec prepositio ‘in’ notat essentiam, quia quidquid est in Deo per essentiam est Deus ipse. Sed cum dicitur ‘damnatio istius est in eo’, ea ratione †dictum intelligeret† quod est in Deo secundum prescientiam. Simile est cum dicitur ‘quidquid est in Patre, Pater est, sed Filius est in Patre; ergo Filius Pater est’: in prima propositione notatur essentia, in secunda disiunctio personarum; dicitur enim Filius esse in Patre per generationem. Ad idem spectat hoc exemplum, quod supra posuimus ad aliud ostendendum: ‘Spiritus Sanctus est in qualibet re’, sed Spiritus Sanctus est caritas; ergo caritas est in qualibet res, quod falsum est. Nam in conclusione notat hec prepositio ‘in’ inherentiam forme ad subiectum; in maiori autem propositione notatur essentia iuxta quam modum, scilicet ‘est ubique’ [...] [f. 46v] Fallitur iterum ex eo quod ablativus potest notare causam formalem vel causa efficientem”.

to God³⁵. It is most probably this theory of univocity that Amaury of Bène had followed and interpreted in a crude way, judging from what Garnier of Rochefort suggests. At the meantime, several studies converge to show that Garnier of Rochefort had used works by Parisian masters to expose and to contest the theses of the Amalricians. Further research will be necessary on unpublished texts, in particular on the *summas* of theology from the end of the twelfth and beginning of the thirteenth centuries, in order to shed light on this period, which is ultimately very poorly known, marked by the beginnings of the University of Paris.

Bibliography

Sources

- ALANUS AB INSULIS, *Hierarchia*, ed. M.-T. D'ALVERNY, in EAD., *Alain de Lille. Textes inédits, avec une introduction sur sa vie et ses œuvres*, Vrin, Paris 1965.
- ANONYMI *Fallaciae Londinenses*, ed. L.M. DE RIJK, in ID., *Logica Modernorum. A Contribution to the History of Early Terminist Logic*, Van Gorcum, Assen 1967.
- GARNERIUS DE RUPEFORTI, *Contra Amaurianos*, ed. C. BAEUMKER, in ID., *Contra Amaurianos: Ein anonymes, wahrscheinlich dem Garnerius von Rochefort zugehöriger Traktat gegen die Amalrikaner aus dem Anfang des XIII. Jahrhunderts. Mit Nachrichten über die übrigen unedierten Werke des Garnerius nach der Handschrift zu Troyes*, Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Münster 1926.
- GARNERIUS DE RUPEFORTI, *Contra Amaurianos*, ed. P. LUCENTINI, Brepols, Turnhout 2010.
- GUILIEMUS DE MONTIBUS, *Fallaciae*, ed. L.M. DE RIJK, in ID., *Logica Modernorum. A Contribution to the History of Early Terminist Logic*, Van Gorcum, Assen 1967.
- GUILIEMUS DE MONTIBUS, *Fallaciae*, ed. Y. IWAKUMA, in ID., *The Fallaciae and Loci of William de Montibus. An Edition*, in *Journal of Fukui Prefectural University*, 2 (1993), pp. 1-44.
- PS. IACOBUS DE CAPELLIS, *Summa contra hereticos*, ed. P. ROMAGNOLI, Vita e pensiero, Milano 2018.
- PRAEPOSITINUS DE CREMONA, *Summa "Qui producit ventos"*, ed. G. ANGELINI, in ID., *L'ortodossia e la grammatica. Analisi di struttura e deduzione storica della Teologia Trinitaria di Prepositino*, Università gregoriana, Roma 1972.

Studies

- D'ALVERNY 1965 = M.-T. D'ALVERNY, *Alain de Lille. Textes inédits, avec une introduction sur sa vie et ses œuvres*, Vrin, Paris 1965.
- BALDWIN 1970 = J.W. BALDWIN, *Masters, Princes, and Merchants: The Social Views of Peter the Chanter and His Circle*, Princeton University Press, Princeton 1970.

35. On these topics, see the works of Valente and Rosier already cited in the previous notes, and VALENTE 2005. See also MARMO 2014 and GAZZIERO 2016.

- BURSILL-HALL 1981 = G.L. BURSILL-HALL, *A Census of Medieval Latin Grammatical Manuscripts*, Frommann-Holzboog, Stuttgart 1981.
- GAZZIERO 2016 = L. GAZZIERO, *Simon de Tournai: la rumeur et la légende*, in *Medievalia. Textos e estudos*, 35 (2016), pp. 53-75.
- GIUSBERTI 1982 = F. GIUSBERTI, *Materials for a Study on Twelfth Century Scholasticism*, Bibliopolis, Napoli 1982.
- HAURÉAU 1880 = B. HAURÉAU, *Histoire de la philosophie scolastique*, Durand et Pedone-Lauriel, Paris 1880.
- IWAKUMA 1993 = Y. IWAKUMA, *The Fallaciae and Loci of William de Montibus. An Edition*, in *Journal of Fukui Prefectural University*, 2 (1993), pp. 1-44.
- LECLERCQ 1945 = J. LECLERCQ, *Un traité De Fallaciis in theologia*, in *Revue du Moyen Âge latin*, 1 (1945), pp. 43-46.
- LUCENTINI 2005 = P. LUCENTINI, *I falsi di Guarniero di Rochefort nel Contra amaurianos. Amalrico di Bène, Roscellino di Compiègne e i catari*, in *Giornale critico della filosofia italiana*, 84 (2005), pp. 269-97.
- MARMO 2014 = C. MARMO, *De virtute sermonis/verborum. L'autonomie du texte dans le traitement des expressions figurées ou multiples*, in N. BÉRIOU / J.-P. BOUDET / I. ROSIER-CATACH (dir.), *Le pouvoir des mots au Moyen Âge*, Brepols, Turnhout 2014, pp. 49-69.
- QUINTO 2006 = R. QUINTO, *Manoscritti medievali nella biblioteca dei Redentoristi di Venezia. Catalogo dei manoscritti. Catalogo dei sermoni. Identificazione dei codici dell'antica biblioteca del convento domenicano dei Santi Giovanni e Paolo di Venezia*, Il Poligrafo, Padova 2006.
- ROTHSCHILD 2013 = J.-P. ROTHSCCHILD, *Un De contrarietibus in Sacra Scriptura attribué à Garnier de Rochefort, tiré du De tropis loquendi de Pierre le Chantre*, in J. ELFASSI / C. LANÉRY / A.-M. TURCAN-VERKERK (dir.), *Amicorum societas. Mélanges offerts à François Dolbeau pour son 65^e anniversaire*, Sismel - Edizioni del Galluzzo, Firenze 2013, pp. 741-768.
- ROSIER-CATACH 1988 = I. ROSIER-CATACH, *Évolution des notions d'equivocatio et univocatio au XII^e siècle*, in I. ROSIER-CATACH (dir.), *L'Ambiguïté: cinq études historiques*, Presses universitaires de Lille, Villeneuve-d'Ascq 1988, pp. 117-130.
- VALENTE 1997 = L. VALENTE, *Phantasia contrarietatis. Contraddizioni scritturali, discorso teologico e arti del linguaggio nel De tropis loquendi di Pietro Cantore († 1197)*, Olschki, Firenze 1997.
- VALENTE 1999 = L. VALENTE, *Fallaciae et théologie pendant la seconde moitié du XI^e siècle*, in S. EBBESEN / R.L. FRIEDMAN (eds), *Medieval Analyses in Language and Cognition*, The Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters, Copenhagen 1999, pp. 207-236.
- VALENTE 2000 = L. VALENTE, *Alla ricerca dell'autorità perduta: Quidquid est in Deo, Deus est*, in *Medioevo*, 25 (2000), pp. 713-738.
- VALENTE 2005 = L. VALENTE, *Alain de Lille et Prévostin sur la question de l'équivocité du langage théologique*, in J.-L. SOLÈRE / A. VASILIU / A. GALONNIER (dir.), *Alain de Lille, le docteur universel. Philosophie, théologie et littérature au XII^e siècle*, Brepols, Turnhout 2005, pp. 369-400.
- VALENTE 2008 = L. VALENTE, *Logique et théologie. Les écoles parisiennes entre 1150 et 1220*, Vrin, Paris 2008.

Abstract: The *Fallaciae in theologia* is an anonymous, still unpublished text from the late twelfth or early thirteenth century on the errors that can be made in theological discourse. Ten manuscripts are known, dated from the thirteenth to fifteenth centuries. The author is probably a Parisian master, perhaps from the circle of Peter the Chanter. The *fallacia equivocationis*, as illustrated in the *Fallaciae in theologia*, is related to the fallacies committed by the heretic disciples of Amaury of Bène, according to Garnier of Rochefort in the *Contra Amaurianos*. In general, heretics are often accused of using fallacious reasoning during the Middle Ages.

Keywords: Theology; Amalrician heresy; *fallaciae*; Parisian twelfth-century schools; Garnier of Rochefort.

Irene CAIAZZO
CNRS, PSL, LEM (UMR 8584)
irene.caiazzo@cnrs.fr