

# The Theory of Knowledge and the Unity of Man according to Ramon Llull

Llull unifies the spheres of reality through action. Llull creates real logic. All is individual, but there are shared realities. The unity of man. Only a humanized man can humanize.

Good interculturality. The Law. Customs. Freedom. Inter-religious dialogue. Respect for the conscience of others. The people. Values. The role of Church and State.

Perhaps it may seem strange to some of you to begin a congress on interculturality by speaking about the Theory of Knowledge. But, as a matter of fact, to bring about interculturality we must first learn what a person is, what culture is, what the customs and the ways of peoples are and, above all, how we deal with one another, for this is mainly where culture resides.

We learn from history that man has treated his fellow man in many different ways, from brutal domination to mutual comprehension to dehumanizing indifference; that is, we have come through many different cultural experiences. We have always, however, done this with the idea of developing from what others have done (noéma).

On the other hand, the laws by which we choose to organize our coexistence are expressed by words and propositions (logos), so that, if we should wish to speak of interculturality, we cannot avoid touching on what meaning is, what the possibility of knowing other individuals is, whether there is a universality of thought, of truth, etc. In other words, the mutual understanding between peoples cannot be left in the hands of political and commercial interests.

ooOOoo

Llull knew this.

Before defining the realities that make up authentic interculturality - the human being, the people, their customs, the laws, the institutions, etc. - let us spend a few minutes on quickly reviewing what Lullian logic is, because Llull accesses reality in a different manner than Aristotle.

When Llull determined to solve the question of intercultural dialogue, the first matter that he addressed was the unification of the three spheres of reality: the physical being (physis), thought (noéma) and the world of language (lógos). If we are to agree on the manner that we should behave towards others these three spheres must be well interconnected. Clearly when we think alone about reality there is less possibility of

coming to the wrong conclusion than when we have to dialogue with others, because the latter is based on thoughts and words – ours and those of others. When we are alone we can direct our thoughts directly to the matter, but it would be useless to organize our thoughts if the three spheres were separated. As a matter of fact, a way of thinking does not force us to act in any particular manner. And this is precisely what we are after.

## **Llull unifies the spheres of reality through action**

When Llull, in his Art, describes the Most General Principles, he says they are as much principles of being as of knowledge. I don't think we are fully aware of the profound meaning of this assertion. Llull says in his Art that these Principles are the first, most general and universal, active, principles of reality and knowledge<sup>1</sup>. That is, they are principles of physical and also of logical form. Hence, since principles must always be different from what they rule about, Llull places himself by the side of Aristotle, and surpasses Plato, when, defining them in this manner, he asserts that the Principles of Art are not logical forms<sup>2</sup>.

In fact, the world of nature, according to Llull, is not only a reflection of the world of thought, as Plato had asserted. It is a physical being. Nature's physical objects are entities, that is, they exercise the activity of a being. Thoughts and names are also entities, and because of this he is able to unify the three spheres. He does it from the perspective of action. The act of being can be expressed in many ways and because of this different logical systems will develop, however, we shall always be able to unify them.

On the other hand, if Lullian Principles are principles of physical and logical forms they will also be principles of practical knowledge, that is, that knowledge which results in behavior. For this reason, the subject of Principles is related also to interculturality.

However, thought form action is not the same as physical form action. In individual entities of the physical world, in addition to the particular forms that actualize them, we find those indeterminate forms that reside in them potentially<sup>3</sup>. Accordingly these entities are in motion. In addition, they are immersed in matter. On the contrary, thought forms have neither movement nor matter. Because of this, we will never be able to access physical reality starting from thought, because in thought there is neither movement nor matter. For this reason, articulating thought form will never reveal the structure of physical reality, because the connections and differences of physical individuals are not the same as the connections and differences of thought forms. The

---

<sup>1</sup> Principles are universal entities, which according to the Aristotelian definition, are those that have their being in others and are predicated on these others: *id quod habet esse in multis et de multis*. Mall

<sup>2</sup> We could add, from this Lullian assertion, that our knowledge depends on God because he is the one that has made both things and our thought. In fact, the Principles, which are the principles of all reality, are also those of God. Let us not forget, however, that when we consider them in God, they are infinite and each of them is identified with God's Being. Llull will then call them Dignities.

<sup>3</sup> The being of substances and forms are acts, for this reason we cannot reduce the act to the being of the form. Cf. Garay, Jesús de, [1987], p. 106: "El acto no se reduce al ser de la forma, porque el movimiento es también – de un modo particularmente privilegiado – acto; y el movimiento es siempre otro, mientras que la forma es siempre la misma." And "El acto de la forma no se ha de buscar en la mismidad de la idea ni en sus determinaciones siempre idénticas. Así pues, la forma es acto, pero el acto no se reduce a forma, sino que también es acto el movimiento."

Stagirite had already noted this, and suggested different alternatives, but he ended making the logical predicate the starting point of all categories of entity<sup>4</sup>.

Llull's universe is a set of actions embedded into one another. All is in motion, but some of the motions are sustained by others. Some actions sustain others and all of them are sustained by divine action<sup>5</sup>: such is Llull's cosmos<sup>6</sup>.

Llull constructs a whole theory of action which is his well known theory of correlatives. With its help he studies both material entities, composed of matter and form, and spiritual entities, composed of action and potential, the latter being the action of potential entities. This allows him to unify entities that are composed of matter and spirit, such as human beings. He can also explain with the help of correlative theory how entities in nature, which move, continue being what they are, though not fully<sup>7</sup>.

### Llull creates real logic

Since we shall never be able to accede to the real physical world through thought, Llull produces in his Art a logic that we could call real logic<sup>8</sup>. He says that we must access things from things, that is, from nature. Since the first forms that are presented to our knowledge are forms perceived by our senses, Llull starts with them, but he sees them embedded always in deeper activities, until one arrives to the First Principles. Llull sees things as the product of connecting multiple activities.

To define realities, therefore, he will look for their actions, he will define each by its proper activity, and it will be starting from this activity that he will exercise its predicates. The action allows him to go, in the physical world, from individuals to individual groupings that have the same activity; and, in the world of logic, from particular to universal thought.

In fact, Llull makes out of his Art a new type of non-Aristotelian science which is based on the activity of natural entities: the substances are constituted by a primitive activity, also called proper activity<sup>9</sup>. Its definitions are based on action; predication is

---

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Garay, Jesús de, [1987], p. 10: "Así pues, la substancia es la primera de las categorías, las cuales son en tanto que son substancias. Pero la distinción categorial es una distinción que se establece desde el lenguaje y la estructura predicativa: según las categorías la realidad se nos muestra agrupada y clasificada en unos géneros."

<sup>5</sup> In Brasil there is the *capoeira*, a dance of African origin which is also a fight. But it is principally a dance danced to a musical tune. The dancers must have two habits, that of fighting and that of dancing, and they express it in a single movement. They are two habits, one sustained by the other; but if the dancers had not the physical training of fighting, they could not dance. We have here the example of one act sustained by another.

<sup>6</sup> Considering reality as a series of acts immersed in others gives it a copulative character, opening in this manner a door to predication, and even to put reality as a foundation of logic. Lullian logic has a legitimate claim to truth based on reality. Cf. Garay, Jesús de, [1987], p. 165.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Lull, Ramon, [2008] passim.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. LULLI, Raymundi, *Introductoria artis demonstrativae*, MOG iii, II, i (55): "Metaphysica enim considerat res, quae sunt extra animam, prout conveniunt in ratione entis; logica autem considerat res secundum esse, quod habent in anima, quia tractat de quibusdam intentionibus, quae consequuntur esse rerum intelligibilium, scilicet de genere, specei & talibus, & de iis, quae quae consistunt in actu rationis, scilicet de syllogismo, consequentia & talibus; sed haec Ars tanquam suprema omnium humanarum Scienciarum indifferenter respicit ens secundum istum modum & secundum illum; & sic patet, quod in modo considerandi ex parte subjecti defferant."

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Llull, Ramon, [1998], p. 51: "Si acció e forma se converteixen en lo subjeu en que son. E responem d[i]visén, so es que es acció primitiva (actes propis) e acció secundaria (actes apropiats). Primitiva es

also based on action. There is no doubt that Lullian science is a new way to accede to reality. One must accede to reality from reality itself and not through the logical world of thought. Llull knows that logical properties – universals and singulars are properties of things that are thought, that is, they are logical properties – are based on real properties, and not the contrary.

He also says that the major or minor universality of concepts is based on a real property, on an action. According to the major or minor contraction of the action which makes the thing one obtains a major or minor universality of its concept. For example, the act of “making a substance”, considered in “animal” and in “man”, is more common in “animal” than in “man”. The “act of feeling”, for instance, is found in substances, in animals and in man, but it is more common in substance, less in animals and less in man, even though it is the common activity that these two extremes have – substance and man. Because of this, Llull thinks that in syllogisms the act of feeling can be a term of comparison. In fact, Llull always builds syllogisms in middle terms that are real terms between those things designated by the extremes of the syllogisms. He says he is seeking a middle term of things that is real, primitive, internal and necessary, etc. and he finds it in an action<sup>10</sup>.

Aristotelian logic does not function in this manner: the major or minor universality of terms depends on the position of the concept in the mental proposition. If the term is in the predicate position it will always be a universal if the proposition is negative and will always be a particular if the proposition is affirmative. That is, the universality of the term depends on its logical property: of its position in the thought.

The ultimate subject of predication, for Llull, is the activity of an individual existing entity, and through this he arrives at the foundation of things, because actions are what make things. For this reason, the predicate of real Lullian logic entails a larger necessity than Aristotelian logic - the predicate of which only has the necessity of the subjects that are thought.

Lullian logic upon which he constructs his Art is essentially a new way to argue from the active reality of entities. Since he analyzes and integrates acts, that is, their movements, he can demonstrate that many of the contradictions discovered in entities, are in fact not contradictions. For this reason he defined a new fallacy, the fallacy of contradiction, which he employs, together with its contradictory syllogisms, as an instrument to surpass these apparent contradictions. This will allow him to say, on many occasions – to the followers of Averroes and to the infidels – that “we are not in contradiction, but in misunderstanding”.

### **All is individual, but there are shared realities**

In nature we find only individual entities. In the Middle Ages, until 1250, the existence of the intellection of individual entities was doubted; later Roger Bacon and Thomas Aquinas admitted to an indirect intellection. From 1275, as the Aristotelian theory of abstraction becomes accepted, direct intellection of individual forms is admitted, and culminates in Duns Scott. Llull admits direct intellection of individual forms, but differs from Duns Scotus in that the latter though admitting intelligibility per se

---

substancial o substantiva qui ab si matexa e ab la sua propria materia constituex substantia general, constituída de forma e de matéria substancial. E aytal acció es dita esser convertida ab la sua forma. Enperó la acció secundaria que es actus de la primera forma, en genre de accidens posada, ab forma accidental se convertex, axí con calor que.s convertex ab la sua acció, so es ab la sua activitat.”

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Llull, Ramon, [1978], p. 251-275.

primo of individual material, does not believe it to be possible in human beings in its present state of life<sup>11</sup>. Lull, since he bases himself on the belief that we know individual actions, is very clear: we know individuals intellectually. And he explains this through the union of the act of feeling with the act of understanding<sup>12</sup>.

He discovers that since some individuals execute the same activity we may group them in a class. In the world of logic, universality corresponds to them. One can deduce from all that has been said until now, that Lullian universals are not the same as Aristotelian universals, because they have a different basis: an Aristotelian universal is a property brought about by an act of the mind, that realizes that what it thinks can be predicated about many, hence it is a purely logical property, a property of things that are thought<sup>13</sup>; Lullian universals, however, are based on the community of a shared action by different entities, it is a real property, based on a first intention of the mind<sup>14</sup>.

Lullian predicates are real, because they are non-Aristotelian which have no real correspondence in reality; for Lullian predicates there is correspondence with the reality of a common activity, owing to the permanent activity of the First Principles, which persists inclusively even if all individuals or all species are destroyed<sup>15</sup>.

Finally, Lull also defines entities by their activity, by the action properly belonging to each substance. If we want to define man, we see in him the act of feeling, the act of sensitive life; but this is common to all animals. In man, the act of feeling is contracted in a more specific feeling, which at its base constitutes the ultimate difference relative to animals. The ultimate differences that define things are also actions. What is that of man? Lull defines him as the "animal that humanizes". Man is a being that humanizes itself, his surroundings, his community, his nation, and all the world<sup>16</sup>.

---

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Bérubé, Camille, [1964]. p. 157, nota (2): "Ad argumenta contra intellectionem singularium, quae fiunt super librum primum, patet quod nunc numquam intelligitur; unde perfectissima scientia nunc nobis possibilis est de specie specialissima, ibi status". From images we can extract concepts of individuality, which will always be universal concepts.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Lull, Ramon, Liber de modo naturali intelligendi, [1978], p. 189: Intellectus humanus per se habet naturam intelligendi, cum intelligere sit suus actus. Potentia autem visiva per se habet naturam videndi pari ratione. Et quia istae duae potentiae sunt coniunctae, oritur naturaliter communis actus, per quem intellectus attingit obiectum coloratum, mouendo potentiam visivam ad obiectum visibile. Et de hoc experientiam habemus; et contra hoc non est dare instantiam.

<sup>13</sup> In fact Aristotelian universality is a property that our mind attributes to the things it thinks. When thinking of them, it realizes that what is thought can be predicated upon others, and forms a relationship between what is thought and other things. This is Aristotelian universality. Though it may be founded in things, it is a logical property.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Lull, Ramon, [1998] ROL XXIII, 16, Lín. 13-19: "Verumtamen quia logici consideratio circa intentiones versatur secundas, quas perfecte cognoscere nequit, primis intentionibus ignoratis. Ideo in hoc nostro compendioso et novo opere, ponentes, deficientes et demonstrantes, in aliquibus passibus naturaliter et philosophice procedemus, ut primarum et secundarum intentionum notitia naturaliter et logice a scientibus hunc librum plenarie ac clarissime habeatur."

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Lull, Ramon, Liber de modo naturali intelligendi, [1978], p. 189: Facta hypothese quod omnia individua essent destructa, quaeritur: Vtrum species esset ens reale? Respondendum est, quod sic. Aliter non esset dare medium inter superiore et inferiora. Ipsa vero species sic esset in genere, sicut planta est in potentia in grano. Sed si quaeritur: Vtrum destructis omnibus speciebus genus sit ens reale? Dico, quod sic. Aliter praedicta, inconuenientia, quae de specie sequuntur, etiam sequerentur de genere. Et si quaeratur: Vbi est sustentatum genus ipsum? Dico, quod in principis primis, quae sunt decem et octo, ut patet in Arte generali. Quae sunt: Bonitas, magnitudo, duratio, potestas etc. secundum quod patet ibidem. Quae principia appetentur, ut genus esset actu.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Lull, Ramon, [1985], Logica nova, p. 31: "Homo est animal homificans. Et ista definitio est magis specifica, et magis convertitur cum definito, quam ista: Homo est animal rationale et mortale; quia de genere rationalitatis est angelus, et de genere mortalitatis est leo et equus, etc. Hoc quidem de Deo dici potest, et de ceteris entibus. Sicut Deus est ens deitans, et sua aeternitas aeternans, sua infinitas infinitans; ignis est igniens, leo leonans, planta plantificans, faber homo fabricans. Et ideo definitio magis propria est, cum sit maioris proprietatis immediate subiecti"

This points us to the Lullian path that will lead us to the practice of interculturality, that will lead us to an interculturality which shall correspond to the true definition of man.

## The unity of man

First, however, we must look at why this activity which defines man as an animal homificans is not an accidental activity, but constitutes man both substantially and intrinsically.

Lull explains that the act of being a man is a superior activity that unifies and maintains unified the common form of man and the common matter of man<sup>17</sup>. It is an activity without which inferior acts of the human entity could not exist. The act of being a man makes this inferior activity possible and elevates it to superior harmony and unity. For Lull, in fact, the act constitutes the entity; and, therefore, human action constitutes the particular man.

He would then be in favor of having the powers of the soul be part of its substance; these powers are not accidental<sup>18</sup>; and he believes this because he distinguishes in all entities two types of activities, a primitive or substantial activity and a secondary or accidental activity<sup>19</sup>. The first does not go from potential to actual, but is permanent and common to it<sup>20</sup>, and is converted into the substance of the subject that acts. The second does not. Therefore, when man realizes this activity of his substance – he also calls it “proper” -, which is never interrupted and takes place, as Lull says, “during all the time a man is a man”, then man grows in his being. This is a very important theory of Lullian thought, that also explains, as we will see in what follows, that man’s access to maturity is something linked to the good exercise of his activity.

Lull distinguishes in every substance between proper acts and those appropriated. The first, he explains, have their objects in the interior (de dins) while the objects of the appropriated acts are exterior; but, he explains that always “exterior

---

<sup>17</sup> Cf. LLULL, RAMON, [1950], *Llibre d'home*, p. 28: “E açò mateix dels actus de l' anima e del cors, qui sajusten, e de lur conjunyiment ajustament resulta e hix home qui passa e està en terç nombre, e és lo tot simple en nombre de home, segons as diffinició, e sés parts són la sua forma comuna e matèria comuna e l actu comú que dit havem. E en així home està en lo som.” No hem de confondre pas aquest forma comuna de l' home amb l'ànima, ni la seva matèria comuna amb el cos. (Per a una explicació més ampliada de l' ésser de l' ens humà, cf. JAULENT, Esteve, [2004], Cap. Antropologia lul·liana.

<sup>18</sup> This was a famous question discussed in the Middle Ages: whether the powers of the soul are part of its substance or are only accidental powers. “‘Diabolica disputatio’ la denominava Le Myésier”, cf. HILLGART, J. N., [1998], p. 266.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. LLULL, RAMON, [1951], p. 51: “Si acció e forma se convertexen en lo subyet en que son. E responem d[i]visén, so es que es acció primitiva e acció secundaria. Primitiva es substancial o substantiva qui ab si matexa e ab la sua propria materia constitueix substancia general, constituída de forma e de materia substancial. E aytal acció es dita esser convertida ab la sua forma. Enperó la acció secundaria que es actus de la primera forma, en genre de accident posada, ab forma accidental se convertex, axí con calor que.s convertex ab la sua acció, so es ab la sua activitat.”

<sup>20</sup> Cf. LLULL, RAMON, [1950], *Llibre de Home*, p. 35: “Si en la memòria no era coninu membrar, e enteniment entendre, e en la volentat voler, les formes e les matèries sperituales de la ànima que dites havem en lo capítol “Com és hom”, serien ocioses e no haurien ab què s poguesen ajustar, e car les formes no haurien actió ni les matèries passió sens radicals membrar, entendre e voler, l ànima no hauria ab 1què enformàs los cors, ni ab què li donàs ésser ni vida, e ab ell no s poria ajustar ni conjunir. Cové, donchs, que ls radicals membrar, entendre e voler sien en continu actu en aquell temps en què home és home.” Cf. Id, p. 28, nota 4].

objects reside together in the interior objects”<sup>21</sup>. For example, external intellectual activity – which he also says is “appropriated” – that is, to know, want and remember the other subjects which are not he himself, is realized under the protection of the primitive activity (dedins). That is, the proper activity is fed by the appropriated activity (externa). This explains two things: that the activity of every entity makes its own entity, and that we can define an entity by its activity.

In other words, all human activity, if well oriented, can become a builder of man. Also, the unity of the soul makes the act of knowing not an isolated act of the mind but one in which the will and memory also participate. Llull joins these three activities in such a manner that according to him to know something properly requires loving it and remembering what we know, otherwise we will never know it well.

For Llull, then the activity that continues to perfect the human soul is remembering, knowing and loving. What? Oneself and the external entities; but the interior activity always uses the external, and without the latter the internal activity would not grow.

These explanations can be applied both to theoretical cognitive activities and to practical activities, that is, those destined to a constructive external action, be it social or physical. If one's own proper activity is fed by the appropriated activity and external objects are kept with the internal ones, it is obvious that in the external world one obtains simultaneously a knowledge of oneself.

For instance, when we learn the truth of an entity, we become aware at the same time that we are knowing this entity, that is, knowing something we are doing. Now, when we learn about human behavior, we learn that we have good and bad habits. When we learn of a robbery, explains Llull, if we find it to be delightful and to our liking, we find that we are desiring incorrectly something tangible and imaginable which provides pleasure, but which in itself is neither intelligible nor lovable. Hence, our knowledge, in this case, is deprived of its fullness because of a bad habit. It is in this manner that we improve from knowledge of habits, both good and bad<sup>22</sup>.

Llull thinks that when we do evil, we are aware of what we are doing. I believe this is very important and gives us a guide to the practice of good interculturality.

The unity of man, according to Llull, is then complete. It is the result of the connection of a multitude of acts from all potentials, sustained by the act of being man.

However, only when this activity of the soul and body is realized according to the natural finality of each potential, that is to say, when the mind knows the truth, the will knows what is good and memory remembers the good it loves and the evil it rejects, or, in other words, when actions are appropriately human or, according to the definition of man, when we are human, only then will we get to know correctly our environment and be able to engage into the gears of the world once again, achieving as a result, and only in this case, growth in our own being.

---

<sup>21</sup> Cf. Llull, Ramon, [1950], *Llibre d'ànima racional*, p. 206. “Ànima ha los obgects de fores en los obgects de dins.”

<sup>22</sup> Cf. LLULL, RAMON, [1978], o. 204: “Homo moralis uidit suspendi latronem. Deinde considerat latrocinium et per consequens culpam. Tunc ascendit et considerat, quid est causa culpae, et determinat, quod talis causa est habitus priuatiuus intellectus, uoluntatis, et memoriae, qui obiectant indebite aliquod bonum delectabile, sensibile et imaginabile contra bonum intelligibile et amabile. Et tunc intellectus obiectat culpam et per consequens uindictam. Et tunc transit er obiectat iniuriam. Dum sic intellectus obiectat iniuriam, ascendit ad obiectandum iustitiam. Et cognoscit, quod iustitia est habitus bonus, cum quo agitur recte et iuste et bene, quoniam bonum est punire latronum, ut quilibet possideat in pace hoc, quod suum est.”

## Only a humanized man can humanize

Conclusion: only a humanized man, one who is truly so, can humanize.

Man will experience unity with everything that surrounds him only when he knows and loves the world just as it has been created. Then the joining of all the human acts is truly realized, all of which are supported by divine action. When man achieves this, using his free will, then he experiences the world correctly, and proceeds to incorporate it. Only then is he humanized and as such will he be able to humanize all that surrounds him.

Only the man who lives in peace can bring peace to institutions, to social action and to relations between people through his social, scientific, artistic, technical and esthetic productions.

## Good interculturality

To bring about good interculturality we already have a couple of well defined conditions. First, the definition of man: an animal that humanizes. Second, a use of freedom that respects the purposes of human abilities and the purpose of man as a whole.

If the individual man is in order and at peace, he will be able to realize a social action destined to find rather the public and general welfare than his own private and special welfare<sup>23</sup>. The common good is greater and more necessary than the particular one. Laws of course, when obeyed by the people, are what organize the common good.

## The law

Llull was the first to use the expression "the Principle of Law" referring to fundamental law. It is a very novel concept, as he makes the Principle of Law lead to the Natural Law. His theory of Natural Law also derives from the observation of man, who is witness to a natural order of things that if well understood and obeyed – with the help of his spiritual faculties -, will lead him to, by loving what is good and avoiding what is evil, the end for which he was created. He understands Natural Law to be "to love God, live honestly, and give to everyone what is theirs", conferring a greater importance to the principle of "loving God"<sup>24</sup>. This Natural Law, according to Llull, surpasses all other ordinances.

(The purpose of this Communication is not to summarize all of the social and political theories of Llull – others attending this congress will do this in the course of the development of the three segments of the Congress -, but to present only the link that unifies Lullian's theory of knowledge with the original notions of good interculturality. For this reason, after explaining how the perspective of action penetrates all of the theory of knowledge of Lullian's Art, we have seen the definition of man and his purpose, and we

---

<sup>23</sup> Cf. LLULL, Ramon, [2000], p. 359: "Fructus arboris imperialis est pax gentium, ut in pace esse possint, Deu metiam recolere, intelligere et amare, honorare et ei servire, quoniam gentes, quae sunt in guerra et inuicem in laboribus, non sunt in dispositione, quod Deum multum possint amare, honorare et seruire, nec sibi ipsis nec etiam aliis caritatem habere." I p. 360: " Idcirco fructus principis, qui talibus qui talibus fructus habet respondere, est infirmus quando se inclinat ad specialia contra generalia et publica, sicut princeps malus, qui plus diligit suam utilitatem quam utilitatem sui populi; quoniam propter infirmitatem fructus principis sunt fructus populi infirmi."

<sup>24</sup> Cf. PIÑA Homs, Roman, [1984], p. 63-64.



are discovering how activity is also what explains the laws, the customs and the values that man may acquire during “the period of time he is man”<sup>25.</sup>)

In fact, the Principles of reality of Art, according to Llull, provide access to the Logos of the substance of necessary and eternal Truth, and all the other contingent, created truths. Also they provide access to those that deal in the sphere of public or social life: the Principles of Art are forms of justice, and without them perfect justice cannot exist. The Law will therefore be true if it is based on them.

## Customs

We have already seen how considering capital punishment as applied to a thief, Llull elevates his discourse to the knowledge of habits or ways of acting. Then, when he asks himself what habits are, he says they are “resemblances of the Innate Principles that make up the universe” and “they make the mind understand correctly, they make the will love correctly and they make memory remember correctly, so that they tend towards the purpose for which they exist, and can rightly regulate the inferior powers”<sup>26.</sup> We can say the same about customs.

Customs are not, according to Llull, ways of acting established over long periods of time or by repetition of similar acts; but are laws only because of their rationality<sup>27.</sup> With this assertion he surpasses Aristotle and all of the High Middle Ages which legitimized the Law according to its antiquity. For Llull, customs are also a source of the Law, as are other laws and above all, the Principles of Law, which, as we have seen, is identified with the Natural Law. Bad laws, no matter how old, that is, laws that oppose justice and freedom to do good and avoid evil, should be fought. Those people that adopt them act against themselves<sup>28.</sup>

## Freedom

I would like to dedicate a few lines to the subject of the freedom to do good and avoid evil, because we can derive important conclusions on interculturality from it

Llull says that freedom is an intellectual form given to man in order that he may freely do good and avoid evil. This is so because good is something so noble that its nobility demands it be done freely and without coercion; just as vice and sin are so bad and contemptible that we should hate them without compulsion. That is why God has made us free.<sup>29</sup>

To make those that are in error enter the path of truth is a great good, probably the most necessary to achieve human maturity. But this, no matter how great the good,

---

<sup>25</sup> See note 15.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. Llull, Ramon, *Liber de modo naturali intelligendi*, p. 204: “Dum sic considerat intellectus, ascendit et quaerit: De quo est habitus iustitiae? E considerat, quod est de similitudinibus principiorum innatorum, ex quibus uniuersum est constitutum, ut puta bonitas, magnitudo, duratio, potestas etc. collectis ab istis principiis per intellectum, uoluntatem et memoriam, ut intellectus habeat iustum intelligere et uoluntas amare et memoria recordare, ut tendant ad finem, ad quem sunt, et iuste regulare potentias inferiores possint.”

<sup>27</sup> Llull, Ramon, [1986], p. 182.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. Llull, Ramon, [2000], p.349: “...quia ille populus facit contra semetipsum, qui uult quod in ciuitate sint aliquae antiquae consuetudines, quae sunt contra iustitiam et libertatem bene faciendi et malum uitandi.

<sup>29</sup> “Cf. LLULL, Ramon, [2000], p. 348: “Libertas est forma intellectualis data homini, ut libere bonum faciat et libere malum uitet. Quoniam bonum est ita nobile, quod de eius nobilitate est quod libere fiat et non coacte. Et uitium et peccatum tantum est malum et uile, quod sibi non conuenit quod coacte sit deamatum. Et ideo est data libertas uoluntati hominum ad faciendum bonum et ad uitandum malum.”

cannot be obtained by coercion, or through violence. Each accesses truth freely when made aware of his error.<sup>30</sup>

### **The inter-religious dialogue**

This subject has the most important application to interculturality when applied to religious conversion, that is, changing one's religion for another. Because religion is one of the principle elements of cultures, the one that most causes unity among people, we must examine the role of inter-religious dialogue in interculturality. And above all we must examine it from the perspective of Lullian philosophy.

I would like to recall here a small work written by Lull in 1309 in which he commented on the harmony that should exist between faith and reason. He says that "one should not want to renounce one's faith in favor of another in general, but it is possible to renounce a faith to improve understanding"<sup>31</sup>. That is, we should not abandon the faith that we live unless we are convinced of the truth of another faith. Lull was so convinced of this position that when he prayed in synagogues and mosques he started the dialogue saying that if they could convince him of the truth of Islam or Judaism he would be pleased to convert to these religions. His words were not just a rhetorical device or a tactic to persuade, but had their origin exclusively in his adherence to the Logos.

We see here a good explanation of the purpose, according to Lull, of inter-religious dialogue: to consent to the possibility of changing religion.

To bring about this change what is fundamental, as before, is man's capacity to take note of his habits, a point Lull constantly asserts<sup>32</sup>; and his capacity to realize he is in error. At the start of Lull's career as a writer in 1274, he said to his son: "Many Jews and Moslems within the control of Christian lords do not have any knowledge of the Catholic faith: but Christians can force some of the children of infidels to learn their faith in order that they might know it, and through this knowledge realize their error; through this knowledge it is possible they may convert and others may also convert."<sup>33</sup>

We have here a summary of Lull's position on this problem: many Jews and Moslems, with no knowledge of Christian faith, were held captive in lands reconquered by Christians. Lull, confirming this fact, says one may compel others to listen to explanations of Christian doctrine in order for them to realize their error. That is, he only admits force for teaching, to compel dialogue, not to conquer the mind by violence. He says it clearly: having made one conscious of his error, it is possible they may convert, and even for them to convert others.

Note the expression he uses: "it is possible they may convert".

In summary: it is false to say that Lull had opted to convert Jews and Moslems by force to Christianity at the end of his life. What he wanted was that they should convert freely.

But here we are touching on another very important subject of Lull: his respect for the conscience of other people.

### **The respect for the conscience of others**

---

<sup>30</sup> Lull dedicates all of the XXX Distinction of *Llibre de Contemplació* to the conscience. They are seven chapters that demonstrate that we have a conscience of our faults committed by the corporal and spiritual senses, of the faults committed by the three virtues of the soul, when we speak, when we remain silent, when we give and when we withdraw, etc.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. Lull, Ramon, [1721], vol. 4, XII, p. 2: "quia nolunt dimittere credere pro credere, sed credere pro intelligere".

<sup>32</sup> See note 26.

<sup>33</sup> Cf. LLULL, Ramon, [1274], p. 154.

In perfect continuity with what he had been teaching his son, Lull writes in 1292 his *Tractatus de modo convertendi infideles* providing us with evidence of his way of thinking. "We say the same about Moslem captives among Christians. Let the order be made that our faith be taught to those that are best prepared and let them be made to see those of our arguments that destroy their sectarianism. If they should not want to be convinced, let the discussion continue with them some time further, and, afterwards, let them be given permission to return freely to their country, paying graciously their expenses. They will explain to other Moslems what our faith is about, the proofs and the manner of our beliefs; this will spread doubts among them and will prepare them for conversion."<sup>34</sup>

As we can see, Lull even accepting that force placed some of the Moslems in captivity, does not want to impose upon them in any way the Christian faith by force, because truth, as he always says, can only impose itself by its own force. The only method he accepts to is persuasion. In the event they are not convinced, he recommends they be allowed to return to their countries paying for the expense of their return.

I consider this to be the best display of respect toward the conscience of others. Today one understands this respect to be the foundation of religious freedom. We are free to change religions if we come to the conclusion that we were wrong, but we must arrive to this conclusion by our own effort, never by outside violence. Lull respects the conscience of other religious groups, because he knows that the only way to present a faith to someone who does not have it is by rational arguments, because faith is a gift of God. If God gives this gift, then adherence can be made by a free act in the temple of the person's conscience.

## **The people**

Lull is aware that the historic role of the Empire was coming to an end, and he proposed that the unity of Christianity be saved in the context of a new society of nations<sup>35</sup>. But he also sees the necessity of a power that guarantees peace. The Pope would have such a power of supreme arbitration in this new society of nations, but he would have to remain on the sidelines in matters concerning the structure of civil power.

The arbitration of the Pope would be realized in the following way. He writes in *Blanquerna* that "once a year, the Pope would gather all powers in a certain location, and according to the rules of a legal hearing, friendship would be discussed and redresses made among them."<sup>36</sup> "All powers" means all supreme authorities of all nations, without religious distinction. In this he differentiates himself completely from Pierre Dubois, who only wanted the gathering to consist of Christian ecclesiastical authorities. With this formula Lull does not want to substitute papal for imperial power, but to arrive at a universal consensus with a minimal structure.

He admits that every nation may have its own customs and that it would be the best if everyone could know them all in order to do the best choice. In *Doctrina Pueril* he recommends to his son: "You would be a smarter merchant, my son, if you were to travel to different countries and choose the best customs you find"<sup>37</sup>. He recognizes therefore that every country has good customs that should be made known to all in

---

<sup>35</sup> Cf. Piña Homs, Roman, [1984], p. 71.

<sup>36</sup> Cf. Lull, Ramon, [1957], p. 256.

<sup>37</sup> Cf. Lull, Ramon, [1986], p. 182.

order to facilitate choosing of the best ones. "Because all men are free to select the best customs," he advises his son<sup>38</sup>.

When we freely change one customs for another better one, we do good, but also we earn the merit of applying well our freedom, in such a way that the good that we attain is greater than the good that the newly acquired custom provides<sup>39</sup>.

This is the Lullian philosophy. Without a doubt it expresses a culture. With this interchange of customs, Lull wants to tell us that philosophical traditions of diverse cultures are complementary expressions of the human mind and express attitudes and ways of thinking that can be interchanged. We are therefore capable of molding and transforming what we receive from the exterior, and if the choices were well made they could persist until our time. In this manner some cultures would help others.

Because of this, cultures should be taken into account in any dialogue at a world level.

## Values

Lull was the first to speak of values.

Entities have different values depending on the place and time they are considered. He explains this in Art when he speaks of the third and fourth species of Rule C. What is a thing in another thing? And, above all, what things are in another?

When we relate one thing to another and when the second is a person, the thing manifests a certain value for the one who thinks or wishes it. How much is a glass of water worth to a prince lost in a wood and who is dying of thirst? He might give all of his lands, all of his inheritance, for this glass of water. Well then, when we relate all things, all actions that man realizes, to Christ, the person who accomplishes in the most perfect manner the humanization of the universe, we obtain its true value.

Persons do not always behave in this manner and for this reason they build an imperfect scale of values, which despite not coinciding with the ontological, natural, ordered reality scale<sup>40</sup>, it is the one that reveals its current arrangement: what appears as good, and what appears as evil. But, since Lull's Art has the purpose of providing us with an access to truth, it should also be able to show us the truth and error of our arguments, and for this reason Lull had no other recourse than to introduce in his mechanism the vices and virtues of the artist.

In fact, Art allows the user to identify the moral quality of his intellectual adherences. That is, it has within its grasp the possibility of comparing the truth of a proposition that follows from its actual moral laws, with the truth demanded by necessary reasons and that a set of the Most Universal Principals show. Thus, universal truths obtained from the principles and the rules of Art are always ontological truths which cannot oppose the order of the universe.

---

<sup>38</sup> Cf. Lull, Ramon, [1986], p. 181.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. Lull, Ramon, [2000], p. 348: "Et quoniam homo libertatem habet ad faciendum bonum et euitandum malum, si bonum faciat et malum euitet, habet meritum, ratione cuius maius bonum assequitur, quam bonum quod fecit. Et si faciat malum et euitet bonum, habet culpam, ratione cuius consequitur maius malum et perdit maius bonum, quam bonum quod facere noluit."

<sup>40</sup> Only the ordering of values that the virtuous person creates coincides with the ontological and natural ordering of the universe, according to Aristotle and Lull. The latter had experimented this in his own flesh. On this matter, cf. El «*Ars Generalis última*» de Ramon Lull: Presupuestos metafísicos y éticos, JAULENT, Esteve, Research presented at the XII Congr s Internacional de Filosof a Medieval, organized by SIEPM - Soci t  Internationale pour l' tude de la Philosophie M di vale, at Palermos, September 17 to 22, 2007. It is being published.

Llull's Art is, then, a good instrument to build interculturality because it provides us with the true quality of the values that are highly regarded in each culture.

### **The role of the Church and State**

Finally, we will end this work with a few words on the role of the Church and State in the temporal ordering of society.

Llull recognizes that all power has not only God as its origin, but also that all choice comes from the people. We have already seen that he would like the Pope to stay on the sidelines when dealing with questions that affect the structure of civil power. However, he concedes to the Pope a moral force so great as to allow him to curb the injustices of kings. He says in *Blanquerna*: "Another establishment ordered was the apostolic, the cardinals, which was very much needed, and which is as follows: that everywhere proxies be provided that report by letter or messenger the state of the lands indicating that there was either no change or unusual happenings or that there was something that required improvement, and that together they should decide what best be done to improve those lands."<sup>41</sup> That is, the Pope has to know all that is happening in the world, what is going well and what isn't, so he may try to improve it.

But trying to improve things does not necessarily mean that one has the right to intervene in directly ordering civil authorities. The way he suggests to do this, as explained above, is to gather together the authorities, both civil and religious, once a year, without making any distinctions between the religions, to discuss how to come to an agreement on peace and harmony.

When Llull discusses "order" he refers always to the result of applying the Principles of Art. In fact he believes that if everyone were to live correctly his Christianity, the people as well as the princes, the laws as well as the institutions, would follow the natural order that God wants and we would have more peace. The world would be in order. But this does not mean that a theocratic power would order civil society.

Even though he criticizes the bad customs of the men of the Church of his time, and warns them of their responsibility, and even reminds them that "as the world is in such disaccord and disorder, it is a fearful matter to be an apostle, and one should feel guilty if he does not make use of his power to help put order into the world, following God's will to have given to apostles so much power to order the world"<sup>42</sup>. Thus, does not follow that the clergy should fashion the laws that organize society.

Llull has always thought this. At the beginning of his career, around 1274, we have already seen he was writing to his son, in *Doctrina pueril*,<sup>43</sup> that "Christians have the power that some of the children of infidels be forced to be taught, so that they may learn, and through learning realize they are in error, and through this realization it may be possible that they convert and convert others". And he continues: "Where a prelate or a prince who does not desire to do this so that Jews and Moslems do not flee to other lands, he shows he loves the things of the world more than the honor of God or the salvation of his fellow man"<sup>44</sup>. That is, he recriminates those princes and prelates who do not try to convert infidels because they are afraid that once converted they will be free to return to their country. Let us be reminded here that both Jews and Moslems were in

---

<sup>41</sup> Cf. Llull, Ramon [1957], *Livre d'Evast e Blanquerna*, lib. IV, cap. LXXIX. Ed. Barcelona 1947, vol.II, p.

<sup>42</sup> Cf. Llull, Ramon [1957], *Livre d'Evast e Blanquerna*, lib. IV, cap. LXXVIII, p. 135.

<sup>43</sup> See note n. 33.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. LLULL, Ramon, [1986], p. 154-5.

many occasions very useful to Christians. The desire Llull had to facilitate the possibility of conversion to others makes him suggest procedures that are contrary to present laws regulating the treatment of prisoners.

We have seen this same zeal, nearly twenty years later, when we were considering the subject of respect for the conscience of others. In *Tractatus de modo convertendi infideles* he suggests that prisoners who do not wish to convert should be set free. Llull not only criticized the excesses and vices of the ecclesiastic and civil authorities, but also, we repeat, he continued suggesting procedures that were contrary to civil, ecclesiastic and military orders of his time. Only when his “necessary reasons”, the result of the Principles of his Art, are instilled in all persons and at all levels of society, will peaceful coexistence be achieved.

Esteve Jaulent  
Instituto Brasileiro de Filosofia e Ciência  
“Raimundo Lúlio” (Ramon Llull)

Translate from  
catalan by Pere Garriga  
Casal dels Catalans de California  
Reviewed by Kathleen Mcnerney  
West Virginia University

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aristóteles, *Metafísica*, Giovanni Reale, Vol. II, Texto grego com tradução ao lado. Translate by Marcelo Perine. Edições Loyola, São Paulo, 2002.
- Bérubé, Camille, *La connaissance de l'individuel au Moyen Age*, Presses Universitaires de France, 1964.
- Colomer i Pous, Eusebi, *El pensament als països catalans durant l'edat mitjana i el renaixement*, Institut d'Estudis Catalans, Publicacions de l'Abadia de Montserrat, 1997.
- Diversos, *Què és l'home? Reflexions antropològiques a la Corona d'Aragó durant l'Edat Mitjana*, Prohom Edicions, Barcelona, 2004.
- Garay, Jesús de, *Los sentidos de la forma en Aristóteles*, EUNSA, Pamplona, 1987.
- Hillgart, J. N., *Ramon Llull i el naixement del lul.lisme*, Curial Edicions Catalanes, Publicacions de l'Abadia de Montserrat, 1998.
- Jaulent, Esteve, *Antropologia lul.liana, in Què és l'home?*, Reflexions antropològiques a la Corona d'Aragó durant l'Edat Mitjana, (coord. Josep Corcó, Alexander Fidora, Josep Olives Puig, Jordi Pardo Pastor), Prohom Edicions, Barcelona, 2004.
- \_\_\_\_\_ *El «Ars Generalis última» de Ramon Llull: Presupuestos metafísicos y éticos*, Paper presented in the XII Internacional Conference of Medieval Philosophy, organized by SIEPM - Société Internationale pour l'Étude de la Philosophie Médiévale, Palermo, 17-22 de september 2007. About to be published.
- Llinarés, Armand, *Ramon Llull*, Edicions 62, Barcelona, 1987.
- Llull, Ramon, *Liber de convenientia fidei et intellectus in obiecto*, in Raymundi Lulli Opera omnia, [quoted MOG] (publisher) I. Salzinger, 8 volumes (Mainz 1721-42).
- \_\_\_\_\_ *Libre d'ànima racional*, Obres de Ramon Llull, vol. XXI, Palma 1950.
- \_\_\_\_\_ *Libre de Home*, ORL XXI, Obres de Ramon Llull, vol. XXI, Palma 1950.
- \_\_\_\_\_ *Tractatus de modo convertendi infideles*. Transcription of the manuscript of the XIV century, et lat. 3174, located at the Library of Philippe de Bethune, edited by r Jaqueline Rambaud-Buhot al fasc. III de les Opera Latina Beati Magister Raimundi Lulli, de la Maioricensis Schola Lullisticae, Mallorca, 1954. Translated into French by Ramon Sugranyes de Franch in his book *Raymond Lulle, docteur des missions*.
- \_\_\_\_\_ *De conversione subiecti et praedicati et medii*, ROL vol.VI, (Catàleg n. 163), Brepols, Turnholt, 1978.
- \_\_\_\_\_ *Liber de modo natvrali intelligendi*, ROL vol. VI, (Catàleg n. 161), Brepols, Turnholt, 1978.
- \_\_\_\_\_ *Introductoria artis demonstrativae*, MOG iii, II, i (55).
- \_\_\_\_\_ *Die neue Logik, Logica Nova*, Felix Meiner Verlag, Hamburg, 1985.
- \_\_\_\_\_ *Doctrina Pueril*, Obres de Ramon Llull, vol. I, Edició facsímil, Miquel Font Editor, Palma de Mallorca, 1986.
- \_\_\_\_\_ *Lógica nova*, NEORL IV, Patronat Ramon Llull, Palma, 1998.
- \_\_\_\_\_ *De arbore scientiae*, ROL vol. XXIV, (Catàleg n. 65), Brepols, Turnholt, 2000.
- \_\_\_\_\_ *Libro de los correlativos*, Editorial Trotta, 2008. Traducción, introducción y notas de José G. Higuera Rubio. Prefacio de Esteve Jaulent.
- Obrador i Benassar, M., *Estudi de les doctrines Sociològiques de Ramon Llull. Apuntacions y fragments extrèts dels més antichs*. Amengual y Muntaner Impresores, Palma de Mallorca, 1905.
- Piña Homs, Roman, *Alfonso el Sabio y Ramon Llull, su concepción de la justicia y del orden social*. Universidad de Palma de Mallorca, 1984.

