

# UNIONE ACCADEMICA NAZIONALE

Subsidia al  
«Corpus Philosophorum Medii Aevi»

Serie fondata da

GIUSEPPE BILLANOVICH, EUGENIO GARIN, GIAN CARLO GARFAGNINI,  
TULLIO GREGORY, CLAUDIO LEONARDI, ALFONSO MAIERÙ, VITTORIO PERI,  
SOFIA VANNI ROVIGHI, CESARE VASOLI

XIX

a cura della Commissione dell'Unione Accademica Nazionale  
per il «Corpus Philosophorum Medii Aevi»:

LORIS STURLESE (Presidente), STEFANO CAROTI,  
GIAN CARLO GARFAGNINI (Segretario), ENRICO MENESTÒ,  
PASQUALE PORRO, PIETRO B. ROSSI

CHARLES H. LOHR

## THE ARISTOTELIAN TRADITION (1200-1650): TRANSLATIONS, THEMES AND EDITIONS

edited by Christoph Lüthy and Andrea Aldo Robiglio

I

FROM ARISTOTLE VIA LLULL TO THE RENAISSANCE

SELECTED ESSAYS

edited by Andrea Aldo Robiglio

Nella stessa serie

C. H. LOHR, *Latin Aristotle Commentaries, I.1: Medieval Authors, A-L*

C. H. LOHR, *Latin Aristotle Commentaries, I.2: Medieval Authors, M-Z*

C. H. LOHR, *Latin Aristotle Commentaries, II: Renaissance Authors*

C. H. LOHR, *Latin Aristotle Commentaries, III: Index initiorum – index finium*

C. H. LOHR, *Latin Aristotle Commentaries, V: Bibliography of Secondary Literature*

CHARLES H. LOHR

THE ARISTOTELIAN  
TRADITION (1200-1650):  
TRANSLATIONS, THEMES  
AND EDITIONS

edited by  
Christoph Lüthy and Andrea Aldo Robiglio

I

FROM ARISTOTLE VIA LLULL  
TO THE RENAISSANCE

SELECTED ESSAYS

edited by  
Andrea Aldo Robiglio



FIRENZE  
SISMEL · EDIZIONI DEL GALLUZZO  
MMXXIII

SISMEL · EDIZIONI DEL GALLUZZO  
Via Montebello 7, 50123 Firenze  
tel. +39.055.237.45.37 fax +39.055.239.92.93  
galluzzo@sismel.it · order@sismel.it  
www.sismel.it · www.mirabileweb.it



Due volumi  
ISBN 978-88-9290-230-5  
© 2023 - SISMEL · Edizioni del Galluzzo

## INTRODUCTION

The two volumes of this publication are an homage to Charles H. Lohr, S.J. (1925-2015), the eminent scholar of medieval and Renaissance Aristotelianism, of Ramon Lull, and of the evolution of metaphysics.

This homage is, at the same time, also the delivery on two promises that were made several years ago and on different occasions by the two editors of this publication.

Charles Lohr was not a scholar who wrote monographs. In the same way in which his bibliographical studies appeared in a range of different journals, so his best scholarly essays are spread over a number of different venues – encyclopedias, journals, introductions to reprints and translations – and were moreover published in different languages. In 2008, Andrea Robiglio therefore asked Charles Lohr to draw up a list of what he considered his best texts, with an eye to publishing them as a collection. Lohr accepted this invitation gracefully. How and why he chose precisely the five articles that are included in the present volume and which are here partly translated for the first time into English, is narrated by Robiglio in his preface to part I of this homage. Even if the promise to republish these essays could not be fulfilled during Lohr's lifetime, it is our hope that it will introduce new generations to Lohr's scholarship and remind his old friends of his academic achievements.

The second promise is related to an ever expanding database on which Charles Lohr worked for more than two decades, ever since the death of his friend Charles B. Schmitt in 1986, from whom he took over. Schmitt's ambition, which Lohr now adopted, was to draw up a complete list of all Latin Renaissance editions of Aristotle's works from the invention of printing up to 1650. When his forces began to fail him, Lohr handed over the dataset and thousands of annotations to Christoph Lüthy with the request that he complete this repertory and publish it. As Lüthy explains in his introduction to part II of this homage, this wish was anything but

## INTRODUCTION

easy to fulfill, and in fact, it was probably an impossible mission for a variety of reasons that are explained there. Still, not only is a promise a promise, but there are excellent scholarly reasons for publishing this repertory despite its shortcomings.

But the two volumes, *benevole lector*, which you hold in your hands contains more than merely the delivery on this double promise. After all, an homage is no homage if it does not also include an *éloge*. This is why this book opens with three appraisals of Lohr, by his former colleagues and friends Paul Richard Blum, Pietro B. Rossi & Luca Bianchi, as well as Fernando Domínguez Reboiras.

This work, then, opens with a triple appraisal of Charles Lohr; then presents what Lohr himself considered his best five articles (vol. 1), and ends with Lohr's repertory of Latin Renaissance editions of Aristotle, which in the past years has been ordered, added to, and pruned by Christoph Lüthy and Davide Cellamare (vol. 2).

This homage hopes to pay tribute to the memory of Charles Lohr, render his work more accessible, and bring to light, alas only posthumously, the vast database on which he had been working in the last years of his life. Lohr would have been delighted to know that this testimonial of friendship and appreciation was published by SISMELE - Edizioni del Galuzzo, which in the period 2005 to 2015 published a number of his volumes on *Latin Aristotle Commentaries*.

Nijmegen and Leuven, 10 May 2022

Christoph Lüthy and Andrea Aldo Robiglio

Fernando Domínguez Reboiras

CHARLES H. LOHR AND RAMON LULL

Charles Lohr's biography documents that he enjoyed a solid classical education at Fordham College, New York, and Woodstock College in Washington D.C., both Jesuit schools<sup>1</sup>. He then worked full time in his father's business<sup>2</sup>, but gradually lost interest in the world of finance and entered the Jesuit novitiate<sup>3</sup>.

When Charles Lohr began his scholarly career, he was over thirty-five years old. After obtaining his licentiate in theology (Fordham University) in 1962, he began, as was common in the order, to teach in secondary schools. For several years he taught language (Latin, Greek, and English) in Jesuit schools, a task that would carry over to Europe, in St. Andrä im Lavanttal (Austria), where he had his first contacts with the German-speaking world. That he had the intention to devote himself to university teaching and research was clear, but he was not so clear about his field of scientific investigation. His early work reveals an interest in Greek and the study of the New Testament<sup>4</sup>. Nonetheless, since that time, as he himself

---

<sup>1</sup> "I still like Virgil and Horace and other classical authors a lot"; see *Cees Leijenhorst Interviews Charles Lohr – A Subtle Revision of the History of Philosophy*, «Intellectual News. Review of the International Society for Intellectual History», 13, Winter 2003, pp. 15-8. (hereafter: *Interview*). In addition to this autobiographical document, there is an *Entrevista de Amador Vega a Charles Lohr, director del Raimundus Lulius* [sic!] *Institut*, entitled *Ramon Llull en la historia de la cultura europea*, «La Vanguardia/Cultura», February 24, 1987 (hereafter: *Entrevista*), where one can also find autobiographical descriptions.

<sup>2</sup> "A New York City insurance broker whose office was located only two blocks away from Wall Street. I liked the job, and I still read the financial pages of the newspapers" (*Interview*, p. 15).

<sup>3</sup> "The Jesuits had liberated me from the world of business and finance and put me on the path of learning, which I had grown to appreciate in college" (*Interview*, p. 15).

<sup>4</sup> Cfr. C. H. Lohr, *Oral Techniques in the Gospel of Matthew*, «Catholic Biblical Quarterly», 23, 1961, pp. 403-35.

has explained, he also devoted himself to the study of medieval sources, and more specifically the sources of Latin Aristotelianism, which became the key and fundamental subject of his scientific contribution. This interest was strengthened as a consequence of his profound friendship with a young professor, Charles B. Schmitt (1933-1986), who made decisive contributions to this field. Lohr had a deep and constant working relationship with Schmitt until the premature death of this renowned researcher in the history of science<sup>5</sup>.

Charles Lohr, however, also devoted part of his time and work to Ramon Lull (Lat. *Raimundus Lullus*, 1232-1316), a Spanish philosopher, who defended the union of science and religion and the rational demonstrability of Christian theological dogmas by means of a 'new logic' exposed through a 'Great Art' (*ars magna* or *ars combinatoria*). Lull fought tirelessly for the conversion of the Muslims, whose culture and philosophy he had previously studied and, in a way, admired. The ultimate intention of his missionary activities was the idea of a peace between religions that greatly influenced later philosophers such as Nicholas of Cusa (1401-1464), Giovanni Pico della Mirandola (1463-1494), Giordano Bruno (1548-1600), Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz (1646-1716) and others. Ramon Lull's influence in the following centuries and the enthusiasm of his numerous followers was not only based on his extensive original work (at least 250 works) but also on a series of alchemical treatises that were attributed to him over the centuries. This double facet of Charles H. Lohr's scholarly work – Aristotelianism and Lullism – is evident throughout his extensive bibliography as well as in the tribute volume published in 1995 on the occasion of his 70<sup>th</sup> birthday<sup>6</sup>.

---

<sup>5</sup> "Charles Schmitt was professor at Fordham, but we did not meet at the time [...]. But Charles was always dissatisfied with things and wanted to do more, [...] he went to Leeds in England and from there to the Warburg Institute in London. I knew of him and when I came to Freiburg I decided to visit him. We became very close friends" (*Interview*, p. 16). Charles Schmitt frequently came to Freiburg. Those of us who worked in those years at the Raimundus-Lullus-Institut can document the numerous, intense and endless disputes between the two of them.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. F. Domínguez, R. Imbach, Th. Pindl, and P. Walter, eds., *Aristotelica et lulliana magistro doctissimo Charles H. Lohr septuagesimum annum feliciter agenti dedicata*, The Hague, Steenbrugge, 1995 (*Instrumenta Patristica et Mediaevalia*, 26).

1. "I LEARNED A LOT FROM STEGMÜLLER"

It is important to note that the personality who at least initially influenced Charles Lohr's scholarly work in the most significant and decisive way was Professor Friedrich Stegmüller, an important figure in medieval studies and the founder and director of the *Raimundus-Lullus-Institut* at the University of Freiburg in Breisgau, the scientific institution where Charles Lohr worked for more than forty years and carried out most of his academic research.

Since 1971 Charles Lohr held an office at the Raimundus-Lullus-Institut, which was his home address and scientific reference for decades. There he was also *Geschäftsführender Direktor*, i.e., a substitute for the officially appointed director Prof. Dr. Helmut Riedlinger, who delegated all administrative duties to him from 1980 to 1990. After his retirement in 1990, Prof. Dr. Peter Walter succeeded him as director, but Lohr continued to work there until 2009. From 1975 until his death in 2015 he was a member of the editorial committee of the *Raimundi Lulli Opera latina*, the primary product of that Institute, whose official task, as shown by its administrative designation in the Faculty of Theology ("Arbeitsbereich Quellenkunde der Theologie des Mittelalters"), is the study of the sources of medieval theology. Until 1990 Charles Lohr supervised the Lull edition and was responsible for volume XI<sup>7</sup> and a first volume of the supplementary series<sup>8</sup>.

Although Charles Lohr did not come to Europe, and specifically to Freiburg, to study and devote himself to Ramon Lull<sup>9</sup>, his admiration and

---

<sup>7</sup> Raimundus Lullus, *Opera latina*, XI, *Opera latina in Monte Pessulano annis MCCCVIII-MCCCIX composita*, Turnhout, Brepols, 1983 (Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Mediaevalis 37). "The books that Lull wrote in Montpellier before the penultimate trip to Paris. He had prepared himself to dispute with the scholastics, but he also found himself in opposition against the Averroists, who thought that theological and philosophical truths could be in opposition. Lull was in the middle of this dispute" (*Entrevista*).

<sup>8</sup> Raimundus Lullus, *Opera Latina*, Supplementum Lullianum I, *Breviculum seu Electorium parvum Thomae Migerii*, ed. C. H. Lohr; Th. Pindl-Büchel, W. Büchel, Turnhout, Brepols, 1990 (Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio mediaevalis 77). In addition to this critical edition of the *Breviculum* by Thomas Le Myésier, the compiled work of this disciple of Lull was not only one of Lohr's favorite themes, as his bibliography documents, but also the favorite theme of numerous lectures in which he explained (with the aid of slide projections) the miniatures contained in the manuscript of that work.

<sup>9</sup> "When I came to Freiburg I had heard of the name Lull, but I did not know much about him.



enthusiasm for the work of its founder and first director, Prof. Dr. Friedrich Stegmüller, made him follow in the footsteps of his master in his two research areas: as a researcher of the manuscript sources of the Middle Ages and as an enthusiastic promoter of Lullian studies and editor of the Latin works of Ramon Lull. Looking back at the age of 78 years, Charles Lohr put it this way:

In the United States I had already become familiar with the work of Friedrich Stegmüller. He had made bibliographies of medieval Bible commentaries and of the commentaries on Peter Lombard's *Sentences*. I wanted to do the same for Medieval Latin Aristotle commentaries and felt that he could help me. Now, the Introduction to his *Repertorium Sententiarum*, written in Latin, gives the place of publication as 'Herbipolis'. At the time I was in Washington and I had hard time finding out which city was meant, but I finally discovered it was Würzburg, in Germany. So in 1961 I got off the plane in Frankfurt and took a train to Würzburg, where the secretary of the Theological Faculty informed me that Stegmüller had been at Freiburg for the last twenty years. So, off I went to Freiburg, which I have never left [...]. I learned a lot from Stegmüller<sup>10</sup>.

It may therefore not be superfluous to offer here a brief biographical sketch of Charles Lohr's admired teacher. Friedrich Stegmüller (1902-1981), an orphan from an early age, was educated in boarding schools, where he soon stood out for his extraordinary intellectual gifts. In Freiburg he studied theology and, at a very young age, focused his interest on researching the sources of the theology of the Middle Ages. In 1928 he went to Munich, where he wrote his doctoral thesis with Martin Grabmann (1875-1949), the great expert of the development of the scholastic method and pioneer researcher of the sources of medieval philosophy. One year later, at the age of 27 – an exceptionally fast case for a German scientific career – he obtained his university teaching qualification. From 1936 to 1949 he was Professor of Dogmatic Theology at the University of Würzburg. In 1949 he rejoined the University of Freiburg, where he

---

I had to laugh at the name 'Lullists', at the fact that there were people who were called that way" (*Interview*, p. 15). "I arrived in Freiburg in 1961 to do my doctoral thesis. At that time I knew very little about Lull; I had heard the name, but nothing more" (*Entrevista*).

<sup>10</sup> *Interview*, p. 15.

taught dogmatic theology until his retirement in 1968. Alongside his teaching, Stegmüller continued his constant research activity. He had since the 1920s traveled all over Europe, searching in libraries and archives for forgotten or unknown philosophical and theological texts. His tireless search led him to unearth a large number of works that are today the common domain of the medievalist and the basis of numerous monographs. He presented his findings in articles in specialized journals with a sober and concise brevity<sup>11</sup>.

His research called for an orderly, exhaustive, and systematic classification of the medieval manuscript legacy preserved in libraries and archives. In 1927, Stegmüller began to collect the *initia* of the commentaries to the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard scattered in the numerous libraries of Europe. In 1937 he published an extensive index of incipits in the journal *Römische Quartalschrift*<sup>12</sup>. His intention was, like that of other authors pursuing similar work, to make the identification of anonymous commentaries easier. Stegmüller regarded his inventory as preliminary to a history of the problems dealt with in these commentaries, and therefore was not satisfied with the earlier publication and decided to publish these materials in a completely new arrangement, considerably expanded to include new findings. Thus, ten years later, the *Repertorium commentariorum in sententias Petri Lombardi* (1947) was published in Würzburg in two thick volumes. The first offers, in alphabetical order, a list of authors with a brief curriculum vitae, a list of secondary literature, a list of works with the corresponding incipits, as well as reports on manuscripts and editions. The second volume contains various indexes.

Friedrich Stegmüller, in compiling this inventory, came to recognize that it is not the commentaries on the *Sentences* and *Summae* that constituted the high point of medieval theological speculation, but rather the commentaries on the Bible. Therefore, in 1937, he conceived of the plan to devise an inventory of biblical commentaries, and already in 1949 the

---

<sup>11</sup> See A. Madre, H. Riedlinger, eds., *Bibliographie Friedrich Stegmüller zum 70. Geburtstag am 8. Dezember 1972 überreicht von der Theologischen Fakultät der Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg im Breisgau*, s.l. [1972]. 130 titles (including both monographs and articles) are listed there.

<sup>12</sup> Cfr. F. Stegmüller, *Repertorium initiorum plurimorum in Sententias Petri Lombardi Commentariorum*, «Römische Quartalschrift für christliche Altertumskunde und Kirchengeschichte», 45, 1937, pp. 85-360.

first volume of the *Repertorium Biblicum Medii Aevi* appeared in Madrid, with volume XI in 1980 completing this effort. This *Repertorium*, which Stegmüller considered to be his life's work, comprises 11,854 titles. This means that between the years 300 and 1500, at least 24,000 Latin commentaries on the Bible were written, which have been transmitted in more than 100,000 manuscripts and in several thousand editions, which are rigorously numbered and arranged in Stegmüller's *Repertorium*.

Stegmüller achieved a systematic cataloguing of the two basic sources of medieval theology, thereby creating a complete index of these models of scientific production. Researchers now had at their disposal an invaluable and indispensable guide which, under normal conditions, would have taken years and countless collaborators to produce, while Stegmüller had been able to achieve this work single-handedly thanks to his incredible work capacity. Both directories contain an enormous amount of information in a concise and clearly arranged format. Their author was aware of the inaccuracies that are inevitable in this kind of undertaking. But he did not wait for a group of specialists to come up with something more perfect in some utopian future. Instead, he laid a foundation on which others could build.

With his original and exemplary methodology, Stegmüller arranged the fundamental data of the author and manuscript sources, providing the necessary indications for their identification and use. He not only offers the researcher a series of unknown textual references, but also laid the foundation for further studies such as the history of biblical exegesis, the history of teaching, and the development of philosophical concepts and systems. Stegmüller's repertoires have become indispensable for the archivist of medieval texts as well as for anyone who wants to get to the core of any scientific and cultural manifestation of the Middle Ages. Thanks to Stegmüller, research into the manuscript sources of the Middle Ages has taken a decisive new direction: no longer do only a few famous authors and names or a couple of more or less well-known texts count, but rather it is the motley constellation of authors and schools. Subsequent generations of scholars have, little by little and thanks to this foundational work, been systematically editing these texts, which are hidden away in libraries and archives. One of the fruits of this work of identification and clarification of sources is the publication of secure editions of medieval authors.

Charles Lohr realized that Stegmüller's repertoires put research into the Middle Ages on a completely new footing. His enthusiasm for this work was reflected in his plan to follow Stegmüller's lead in producing a catalogue of commentaries on Aristotle. The basis of this work is the conviction that the scholastics were first and foremost exegetes and commentators. They wanted to interpret the texts that in their opinion already contained the truth, in particular the Bible, the writings of the Church Fathers as systematically collected by Peter Lombard in his *Sentences*, but also the works of Aristotle and other classics of antiquity. This vision of scholasticism allows us to consider many authors and works in a new light, while at the same time forcing a revision of the traditional history, broadening the horizon and opening up new sources and possibilities for the study of the medieval intellectual legacy.

For Friedrich Stegmüller, research into the history of scholastic theology was the task of his life: "A history of ideas without a literary history, a history of problems without knowledge of the sources, leads only to constructions, and, at best, to conjectures"<sup>13</sup>. Charles Lohr adopted this vision.

Friedrich Stegmüller was also convinced that the neo-scholastic system, as then in force, could be renewed only by investigating its history and by going back to its sources. Despite an apparently conservative spirit, he agreed with the work of Marie-Dominique Chenu, *Une école de théologie. Le Saulchoir*, which had been published in 1939 and was placed in the index of forbidden books in 1942, explaining:

Christianity bases its reality on history, not on a metaphysics. Hence the first concern of the theologian must be to know history and to prepare himself for it. [...] Texts are to theology what experience is to the natural sciences [...]. Nothing worse could happen to Thomism than to be considered a kind of orthodoxy. Theological evolution [...] rather has its origin in contact with the sources<sup>14</sup>.

When the Pontifical University of Salamanca awarded him an honorary doctorate (15 April 1966), the value of his work was stated concisely on

---

<sup>13</sup> In the published part of Stegmüller's doctoral dissertation: *Die Lehre vom allgemeinen Heilswillen in der Scholastik bis Thomas von Aquin* [Teildruck der Dissertation], Rome 1929.

<sup>14</sup> F. Stegmüller, [Review of Chenu, *Une école de théologie*] «Theologische Revue», 38, 1939, pp. 48-51.

the diploma as follows: “Nulli antea tritas theologicae historiae vias indefesso labore munivit” (“with his tireless activity he opened new paths to the history of theology that no one had trodden before him”)<sup>15</sup>. Indeed, Stegmüller sought in his investigations of the history of medieval science new paths and new insights. He was always averse to what was mere repetition. But, apart from the successes he achieved, he also recognized and experienced the limits of his possibilities.

It is evident, then, that it was Stegmüller’s enormous achievement – notably his repertoires of medieval commentaries on the *Sentences* and the Bible – that fundamentally attracted Charles Lohr’s interest, who set out to continue that work by projecting a repertoire of medieval commentaries on Aristotle. Lohr was so enthusiastic about Friedrich Stegmüller’s historiographical work<sup>16</sup> that he conceived of his own *magnum opus*, the repertoires of commentators on Aristotle, as a continuation of the works of Stegmüller and his disciples<sup>17</sup>. Lohr always wanted to make it clear how Stegmüller had shown him the way to follow in the study of the sources of the Middle Ages.

## 2. THE RAIMUNDUS-LULLUS-INSTITUT

In addition to his catalogues, from 1955 onwards, Friedrich Stegmüller also worked on another major project: the edition of the Latin works of Ramon Lull. Stegmüller recognized the special importance of the Spanish

---

<sup>15</sup> Cfr. *Universidad Pontificia de Salamanca. Sus primeros veinticuatro años (1940-1965)*, Salamanca, Calatrava, 1966, pp. 118-26.

<sup>16</sup> “Stegmüller had devoted himself to the history of medieval theology and philosophy. He made an inventory of all the commentaries on the Bible in the Middle Ages. This is precisely what I had done with Aristotle. You will understand what it meant to me to be close to such a man. I just thought: *with him I can learn something*” (*Entrevista*). See above all: C. H. Lohr, *Friedrich Stegmüller: In memoriam*, «Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kulturgeschichte Spaniens», 31, 1984, pp. 371-4.

<sup>17</sup> Charles Lohr also undertook the publication of two extensive and dense volumes of indexes of the *Repertorium sermonum* published in 9 volumes by Stegmüller’s disciple, Johannes Baptist Schneyer, after the latter’s death and on the basis of Schneyer’s *Nachlass*: J. B. Schneyer (†), *Repertorium der lateinischen sermones des Mittelalters für die Zeit von 1150-1350*, Index der Textanfänge. Bearbeitet von C. Lohr u. a., vol. 11-11, Münster, Aschendorff, 1989-1990 (Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie und Theologie des Mittelalters).

theologian, stemming already from the fact that he could not be classified within any school or tendency in his long list of repertoires. His constant search into the medieval literary legacy documented the impressive number of manuscript testimonies to the extensive Lullian corpus, which however lay outside of all available schematic classifications.

In order to ensure the publication of Lull's Latin works in some fifty volumes, Stegmüller in 1957 secured the foundation of the Raimundus-Lullus-Institut at the University of Freiburg. In order to carry out this enterprise he attracted and trained collaborators from all over the world: the first collaborators of the Institute came from Japan, the two Americas, and numerous European nations. In 1959 the first volume appeared, containing some of Ramon Lull's late writings, which until then had been entirely unknown. The first five volumes were published by the *Maioricensis Schola Lullistica* de Mallorca with the support of the Fundación Juan March. From volume VI onwards, the edition of the Latin works of Raymond Lull forms part of the *Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio mediaevalis* series. The important and decisive change of publisher took place when Charles Lohr was a member of the editorial team at the Raimundus-Lullus-Institut.

In Freiburg, Charles Lohr had written his doctoral dissertation<sup>18</sup> on a work by Raymond Lullus, which, although prepared and revised under the mentorship of Friedrich Stegmüller, was not presented to the Faculty of Theology but instead to the Faculty of Philosophy, on November 30, 1967. The thesis was supervised by Bernhard Lakebrink, then professor of philosophy at both faculties<sup>19</sup>. Shortly thereafter, in the last days of the same year, just before his retirement scheduled for the following year, Stegmüller suffered a stroke that put an end to his teaching activity, but not to his research activity, which he continued to carry on until his death in 1981.

---

<sup>18</sup> Cf. C. H. Lohr, *Raimundus Lullus' 'Compendium logicae Algazelis': Quellen, Lehre und Stellung in der Geschichte der Logik*, Diss., Freiburg i. Br., 1967.

<sup>19</sup> Charles Lohr always affirmed that Stegmüller had been the director of his thesis and the one who had proposed the topic of it: "My thesis director was Friedrich Stegmüller, one of the greatest Hispanists that there has been in Germany [...]. He proposed to me to work on Lull [...] he told me 'take a vacation from Aristotle and, if you want to get your doctorate, do it on Lull'" (*Entrevista*).

In April 1971, after an intermezzo as Assistant and then Associate Professor at Fordham University, where he taught theology and history of philosophy, Charles Lohr returned to Freiburg with a Guggenheim Fellowship, already intending to pursue his academic career there. In 1972, he received the *Habilitation* and was appointed professor of history of theology, a subject he taught as a lecturer from 1974 and as an extraordinary professor from 1976 until his retirement in 1990. Twice (1976-1978 and 1989-1990) he also served as dean of the Faculty of Theology. From 1971 to 2009, the Raimundus-Lullus-Institut was his center of operations. He worked there regularly until noon. In the afternoons of most weekdays and on many weekends he cycled, which was his favorite sport, and also sporadically went mountain climbing or cross-country skiing.

Charles Lohr kept in touch with his *alma mater*, Fordham University. In the journal *Traditio* of that university, he regularly published his own inventories, listed by authors in alphabetical order, as well as other articles and other research that resulted from his many visits to European libraries. Charles was a member of the editorial board of *Traditio* which, in time, he ended up directing. At least once a year he would travel to New York for a meeting of the editorial board. The journal was printed in Belgium, and he himself supervised the proofs.

For Lohr, the working conditions at the Raimundus-Lullus-Institut were ideal for his project of developing a catalogue of commentaries on Aristotle. The interlibrary loan service was an effective and indispensable aid. Through that service, Charles received literally hundreds of books and xerox copies each month. He was particularly interested in creating an on-site library where the researcher of the sources of the Middle Ages could have the necessary material for that purpose. All the books he acquired became part of the Library of the Institute, which is still today an important reference for the study of the sources of the Middle Ages: it offers direct consultation of an excellent selection of sources without the need for loans<sup>20</sup>.

During the first years of his stay, Charles Lohr had the opportunity to contact the numerous collaborators of the edition of the *Raimundi Lulli*

---

<sup>20</sup> Cf. C. H. Lohr, *Bibliothek des Raimundus-Lullus-Institut der Universität*, in W. Kehr, ed., *Handbuch der historischen Buchbestände in Deutschland. Baden-Württemberg und Saarland*, Band 7, A-H, Hildesheim, Olms-Weidmann, 1994, pp. 170-1.

*Opera Latina*. Among them were Louis Sala-Molins<sup>21</sup>, who was finishing his doctoral thesis there and his edition of a volume for the series, but especially relevant were the long discussions he was able to have with Prof. Jordi Gayà, who between 1972 and 1975 composed his brilliant doctoral thesis, a work that marks a milestone in Lullian studies<sup>22</sup>. Jordi Gayà is, without a doubt, one of the most recognized experts of Lull's work and perhaps one of the few Lullists who has read and knows the entirety of his immense oeuvre. Because of his profound expertise, he was an important and constant reference for Lohr's own investigations into Lull, which soon complemented his initial, almost exclusive interest in Latin Aristotelianism. It was undoubtedly the presence of so many Lull scholars who passed through the Institute on short or long stays (Erhard Wolfram Platzeck, Robert Pring-Mill, Eusebio Colomer, Miguel Batllori, Anthony Bonner, Michela Pereira, Lola Badia, and many others) that activated Charles Lohr's interest in the Mallorcan philosopher and significantly influenced his later writings. His long and constant presence in the "capital of the Lullian world" (Miguel Batllori) was decisive for the development of his own work on Lull<sup>23</sup>.

### 3. CHARLES LOHR'S LULLIAN STUDIES

As already indicated, Charles Lohr's first contribution to the study of the Lullian legacy was his doctoral thesis, that is, the critical edition of the first work of the Lullian catalog<sup>24</sup>, a short work which was perhaps a

---

<sup>21</sup> Cfr. L. Sala-Molins, *La philosophie de l'amour chez Raimond Lulle*, Préface de Vladimir Jankélévitch, Paris-The Hague, Mouton & Co., 1974.

<sup>22</sup> Cfr. J. Gayà, *La teoría luliana de los correlativos*, Palma de Mallorca, [El autor], 1979.

<sup>23</sup> In his *Entrevista* (1987), Lohr indicates other researchers and institutions that collaborated in the Institute's mission: "We maintain close contact with: the Warburg Institute of the University of London, where Frances Yates, the great historian of Renaissance culture, was busy with Lullian investigations; Jocelyn Hillgarth of the Pontifical Institute for Medieval Studies in Toronto; in France, where Lull left some disciples, Marie-Thérèse d'Alverny, from the National Library, researches medieval Arabic sources. Because of the great impact of Lull's writings on alchemy, astrology, etc., of the Italian Renaissance, we worked together with Claudio Leonardi from the University of Florence and Eugenio Garin from the National Institute of the Renaissance in this same city. Professor Ruedi Imbach has developed the history of Lullism in Germany, from the University of Fribourg in Switzerland".

<sup>24</sup> See n. 18 above. This is what Lohr declares: "[My first work was] the influence of Arabic logic, the logic of the great Muslim theologian Algazel in the work of Lull" (*Entrevista*).



school exercise booklet originally written in Arabic and used by Lull when he was engaged in intense autodidactic studies whose objective was to exercise himself in dialectical dispute and argumentation. It is, at the same time, a testimony to his knowledge of Arabic philosophy. Although the title might suggest otherwise, this is not a translation of the chapters devoted to questions of logic from the *Maqāṣid al-falāsifah* (*Aims of the Philosophers*) by al-Ghazālī (1058-1111), which could have been supplemented by extracts on the metaphysical questions taken from the *Tahāfut al-falāsifah* (*The Incoherence of the Philosophers*). It is probably instead a translation of an Arabic *compendium* that circulated under the name of al-Ghazālī. The brief Lullian selection is interesting as it hints at the later development of the logical framework of his *Art*. The material Lull gathers and the topics that he introduces here on his own account indicate the motives underlying his system. Of particular relevance in this regard is the section *Additiones de theologia et philosophia*, in which Lull refers to a peculiarity of Islamic apologetics that used arguments borrowed from logic for the solution of theological questions. A decisive determinant of his own theology was fundamentally conceived in order to demonstrate the rationality of faith.

Lohr's first foray into Lullian studies anticipates the general pattern of an important part of his writings on Ramon Lull: the logical structure of his system and its relation to contemporary Arabic thought.

### 3.1. *The Logica nova and Ramon Lull's relationship with the Arab milieu*

Before finishing his doctoral thesis, Lohr had already published a critical edition of the *Logica Algazelis*<sup>25</sup> and an introduction to a facsimile edition of the same text<sup>26</sup>. The first two articles on Lullian topics deal with the identification of two works of anti-Muslim controversy that had been cited as Lullian<sup>27</sup> and the exclusion of two works on logic that had been included

---

<sup>25</sup> Cfr. C. H. Lohr, *Logica Algazelis: Introduction and Critical Text*, «Traditio», 21 1965, pp. 223-90.

<sup>26</sup> Cfr. C. H. Lohr, *Einführung to Logica et Philosophia Algazelis Arabis* (unchanged reprint of the edition Venice 1506), Frankfurt a. M., Minerva, 1968.

<sup>27</sup> Cfr. C. H. Lohr, ed., *Ramon Lull, Liber Alquindi and Liber Telif*, «Estudios Lulianos», 12, 1968, pp. 145-60.

in previous Lullian catalogs<sup>28</sup>. Later he would publish a bilingual edition (Latin-German) of the *Logica nova* (op. 101)<sup>29</sup>, but already in 1971 he prefaced a facsimile reprint of the same work and several works on logic<sup>30</sup>. On the originality and special relevance of Lullian logic, Lohr published, up to the end of his life, a series of articles that aimed to clarify above all the connection of his logical discourse with postulates of Muslim philosophy<sup>31</sup>.

On Lullian logic – one of his favorite subjects – Lohr never tired of pointing out that:

The logic of the *Logica nova* is new because it is meant to be a logic of pure knowing, a logic whose first intention is to consider the intellectual things which are the proper object of the intellect. It is only in a second intention that the new logic must consider the appropriated objects of the intellect, the ideas which the intellect abstracts from sensible things. A new logic must be a 'philosophical logic' providing a 'natural' knowledge not only of second, but also of first intentions. Here Lull adopts the distinction between first and second intentions, not as it was current in Latin logic, but as he had found it in Arabic works<sup>32</sup>.

---

<sup>28</sup> Cfr. C. H. Lohr, *Ramon Llull, 'Logica brevis'*, «Franciscan Studies», 32, 1972, pp. 144-53, and «Estudios Lulianos», 16, 1972, pp. 1-10.

<sup>29</sup> Cfr. Raimundus Lullus, *Die neue Logik/ Logica nova*, Lateinisch und deutsch [ed. C. H. Lohr; transl. V. Höhle and W. Büchel, with an introduction by V. Höhle], Hamburg, Meiner, 1985 (Philosophische Bibliothek 379).

<sup>30</sup> Cfr. C. H. Lohr, *Introduction to Raimundus Lullus, Logica nova, Logicialia parva, De quinque praedicabilibus et decem praedicamentis* [Palma de Mallorca 1744], Frankfurt a. M., Minerva, 1971.

<sup>31</sup> Among the most relevant, one may mention: C. H. Lohr, *Arabische Einflüsse in der Logik Lulls*, in: *Raymond Lulle. Christianisme, Judaïsme, Islam: Les Actes du Colloque sur R. Lulle, Université de Fribourg 1984*, Fribourg, Éditions Universitaires Fribourg, 1986, pp. 71-91; Id., *Les fondements de la logique nouvelle de Raymond Lulle*, «Cahiers de Fanjeaux» [Toulouse], 22, 1987, pp. 233-48; Id., *Islamic Influences in Lull's Logic*, in M. Salleras, ed., *El debat intercultural als segles XIII i XIV: Actes de les I jornades de Filosofia Catalana, Girona 25-27 d'abril de 1988*, Universitat de Girona, Girona-Barcelona 1989, pp. 147-57; Id., *La nova lògica de Ramon Llull*, in *Ramon Llull, dues lectures*, Barcelona, Barcanova, 1990, pp. 13-35; Id., *Ramon Lull's Theory of Scientific Demonstration*, in K. Jacobi, ed., *Argumentationstheorie: Scholastische Forschungen zu den logischen und semantischen Regeln korrekten Folgerns*, Leiden, Brill, 1993 (Studien und Texte zur Geistesgeschichte des Mittelalters 38), pp. 729-45; Id., *Ramon Lull's Theory of the Quantification of Qualities*, in F. Domínguez, J. de Salas, eds., *Constantes y fragmentos del pensamiento luliano: Actas del Simposio sobre Ramon Llull en Trujillo, 17-20 septiembre 1994*, Tübingen, Niemeyer, 1996, pp. 9-17; Id., *Ramon Lull's New Theory of the Logical Categories*, in J. M. Soto Rábanos, ed., *Pensamiento medieval Hispano. Homenaje a Horacio Santiago Otero*, Madrid, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1998, pp. 1203-14.

<sup>32</sup> C. Lohr, *Ramon Lull's Theory of Scientific Demonstration*, p. 742.

Already in the early and brief introduction to the facsimile edition of this work, Lohr states that “the ideas developed in the *Logica nova* powerfully influenced the development of philosophy, especially in the Renaissance”<sup>33</sup>.

At the investiture session as *Magister* of the *Maioricensis Schola Lullistica* (January 27, 1972), he delivered a lecture<sup>34</sup> in which he claimed that Lull was the first to use the term ‘positive theology’, a term that was later to have a decisive importance in post-Tridentine theology, by which Lull intended to adapt in his discourse “a common Muslim conception of the theological task”, now with the purpose of attracting Muslims to Christianity whereby Lull adapted his language to the theological discourse of Islam. Thus Lull presented a theological discourse different from that of Christian milieu. This key idea for understanding the Lullian language was developed by Lohr in another oft-cited article, which was translated into several languages<sup>35</sup>, and in other successive contributions, all of which culminated in a vision of the development of the history of ideas that demanded the recognition of the decisive influence of Ramon Lull as a frontier thinker in the Mediterranean area on the margins of the intellectual centers of Christianity<sup>36</sup>.

Recognizing Islamic sources in the Lullian writings was a constant obsession for Lohr<sup>37</sup>. In my opinion and in the opinion of many Arabists,

---

<sup>33</sup> Lullus, *Die neue Logik/ Logica nova*, p. LXXXV: “Die in der *Logica nova* entwickelten Ideen beeinflussten die Entwicklung der Philosophie, besonders in der Renaissance, beträchtlich”.

<sup>34</sup> C. H. Lohr, *Ramon Lull y la teología positiva*, «Estudios Lulianos», 17, 1973, pp. 114-23.

<sup>35</sup> Cfr. C. H. Lohr, *Christianus arabicus, cuius nomen Raimundus Lullus*, «Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie», 31, 1984, pp. 57-88.

<sup>36</sup> See, *inter alia*, C. H. Lohr, *Ramon Lull und der Dialog zwischen den Religionen*, in Ramon Lull, *Buch vom Heiden und den drei Weisen*, Freiburg i. Br., Herder, 1986, pp. 20-5; Id., ‘Introduction’ à la *Vita coetanea de Raymond Lulle*, in R. Imbach, M.-H. Méléard, eds., *Philosophes médiévaux: Anthologie de textes philosophiques (XIIIe et XIVe siècles)*, Paris, Union générale d’éditions, 1986, pp. 209-22; Id., *Raymond Lulle: doctrine et spiritualité*, in *Dictionnaire de spiritualité ascétique et mystique*, vol. 13, Paris, Beauchesne, 1988, pp. 179-87; Id., *Ramon Lull and Thirteenth-Century Religious Dialogue*, in H. Santiago-Otero, ed., *Diálogo filosófico-religioso entre Cristianismo, Judaísmo e Islamismo durante la Edad Media en la península Iberica: Actes du colloque international de San Lorenzo de El Escorial 23-26 juin 1991*, Turnhout, Brepols, 1994, 117-29; Id., *Raimundus Lullus und die Scholastik*, «Recherches de Théologie et Philosophie médiévales», 73, 2006, pp. 335-47; Id., *The Islamic ‘Beautiful Names of God’ and the Lullian Art*, in H. J. Hames, ed., *Jews, Muslims and Christians in and around the Crown of Aragon*, Leiden, Brill, 2004 (The Medieval Mediterranean 52), pp. 197-205.

<sup>37</sup> In the 1987 *Entrevista*, Lohr contends: “I have been interested in the Islamic sources of the Lullian thought and in this line I discovered a possible reference: the logic of the Murcian Sufi

what Lohr took to be reliable references can however not always be accepted as such. The identification of the sources of the Lullian thought, not only the Islamic ones, often depends more on conjectures than on certainties.

3.2. *In the history of science: "Ramon Lull: a man born long before his time"*

Charles Lohr's contributions regarding the history of Aristotelianism throughout Europe were not limited to his catalogues. He firmly believed that "the history of philosophy after the fourteenth century was not that of a decadence, but the beginning of a new era" (*Entrevista*). Relying on the abundant material gathered in the immense corpus of commentaries, Charles Lohr wanted to provide, and succeeded in contributing, important reflections on the history of science, revising traditional historiography. Some titles of his dense bibliography already show how he tried to take the step from literary history to the history of ideas. It is striking how these reflections are influenced and in a certain way determined by his dedication to Lullian studies.

One of Charles Lohr's most important – if not the most important – contribution to the development of the history of ideas was his long and dense chapter "Metaphysics" in *The Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy*, which is also reprinted in the present volume<sup>38</sup>. It brings together his knowledge of the Aristotelian tradition with his growing familiarity with the ideas that he saw as key to the *corpus lullianum*, and was gaining traction in the Christian West by way of Nicholas of Cusa and other Renaissance authors. For Lohr the concept of metaphysical science, which for Aristotle had been 'first philosophy', was to be identified with 'divine science':

---

Ibn Sabin, who corresponded with Frederick II of Sicily. Lull was self-taught and this has many drawbacks, but also many advantages. It was very original, incredibly original. At the same time it must be taken into account that he was the only one who, among the authors of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, could read Avicenna, Averroes, and Algazel directly, while the scholastics knew them only through Latin translations. For this reason, among others, the investigation of Lullian sources becomes so complex".

<sup>38</sup> See C. H. Lohr, *Metaphysics*, in C. B. Schmitt, Q. Skinner, E. Kessler, and J. Kraye, eds., *The Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1988, pp. 535-638; see also *infra*, in this volume, pp. 95-209.

He <Aristotle> distinguishes three types of speculative science, physics, mathematics and 'divine science', so that one must ask how he understood the relationship between the general science of being, first philosophy and divine science [...] In the course of history it was Aristotle's conception of metaphysics as divine science that gave rise to the most difficulties. The encounter of his idea of God as first substance with divergent religious traditions often forced later thinkers to modify the conception of metaphysics as the science of being<sup>39</sup>.

For Lohr it was clear that the Christian notion of a God active in himself as one and triune and acting in the world as incarnate man demanded a new definition of metaphysics. These fundamental articles of faith that were considered to be more certain than all knowledge provided necessarily a new vision of reality that was distinct from all metaphysical disquisition. This new conception of reality shows itself in various forms: in connection with a new vision of mathematical science, the idea of a supernatural control of reality, an insoluble conflict between the ideologies of Plato and Aristotle – problems that were all framed in a concrete idea of God the Creator. According to Lohr:

It was resisted by scholastic authors, who sought for apologetical reasons to maintain Aristotle's static notion of being. But as more and more new sciences [...] came to maturity, even thinkers in the Aristotelian tradition were forced to reopen the question of the definition of metaphysics and its relationship to the individual sciences. [...] each of these problems – the problem of God and the problem of the science of being – had its own history [...]<sup>40</sup>.

Especially in the Mediterranean basin, in the territories bordering on Islam, there was a confrontation between pagan science and the Christian tradition. In this context Lohr places Ramon Lull as

One of the most remarkable figures in this interchange [...]. Conscious of the fact that he stood at the frontier between the three great religions, he sought – as *arabicus christianus* – to use methods proper to the Arabic tradition to convince Moslems and Jews of the truth of Christianity<sup>41</sup>.

---

<sup>39</sup> Ibid., p. 537. See *infra*, pp. 95-6.

<sup>40</sup> Ibid., p. 538. See *infra*, p. 96.

<sup>41</sup> Ibid., p. 539. See *infra*, pp. 97-8.

Charles Lohr begins from the premise that “Ramon Lull was a man born long before his time”<sup>42</sup>. This implies that all the manifestations of a modern conception of science in the Renaissance can be seen through the reception of Lull’s revolutionary and innovative system of ideas. In several pages he shows how the diffusion of Lullian ideas in France and Italy offered “a fertile soil for the formation of a school whose device was that of universality and tolerance”<sup>43</sup>. This Lullian influence at the end of the fifteenth century led to the development in Padua and Venice of a new culture that was

diametrically opposed to the abstract conception of science which had been dominant among both scholastic theologians and the secular Aristotelians of the medieval arts faculties [...]. It was in this context that the Catalan Ramon Lull made his appearance in the Veneto<sup>44</sup>.

In this context Charles Lohr points to Padua as the place where “Nicholas of Cusa first became acquainted with Lull’s ideas” to develop a documented account of the importance of Ramon Lull in the thought of the German cardinal<sup>45</sup>. The original Lullian thesis of a distinction between necessary and contingent activity was “crucial for Nicholas’ idea of man. Bringing together the Lullian conception of Christ’s mediate place between the first cause and its effect and the Venetian vision of human dignity” he defined man by way of his relationship to God and the world<sup>46</sup>.

After an extensive reference to representatives of Florentine Platonism and the cabalism of Pico della Mirandola, he notes how the latter affirmed “the similarity of the cabalistic techniques to those of Lull’s Art” to conclude that:

The tradition of a dynamic understanding of reality which had been represented by Lull, Nicholas of Cusa and Ficino became associated with Renaissance magic and occultism. The idea of man’s creativity was paralleled by the notion of a magical control over nature and by the vision of a new technology.

---

<sup>42</sup> Ibid., p. 543. See *infra*, p. 102.

<sup>43</sup> Ibid., p. 545. See *infra*, p. 104.

<sup>44</sup> Ibid., pp. 545-7. See *infra*, pp. 105, 107.

<sup>45</sup> Ibid., p. 548. See *infra*, p. 107.

<sup>46</sup> Ibid., p. 552. See *infra*, p. 112.

These ideas led, in turn, to the demand for a new system of the sciences and the works of men like Cornelius Agrippa and Giordano Bruno<sup>47</sup>.

The long and dense pages of this contribution to the *Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy* are a summary of all that Charles Lohr had written before 1988 on Ramon Lull. Having followed the trajectory of his contributions in previous years, we may see how this unique contribution is the fruit of an increasingly intense study of Lull's literary legacy. It is also clear that one of the fundamental aspects of Charles Lohr's contributions to Lull's work and to Lullism is undoubtedly the documentation of his influence on the thought of Nicholas of Cusa.

Lohr rejected the linear and evolutionary structure of positivist historiography. By showing the importance of Lull in the thought of Nicholas of Cusa, he wanted to show how the Renaissance debt to Lullism and its relations with themes of the magical-hermetic tradition places the birth of modern science in a heterogeneous context and is the fruit of intellectual and social stimuli of different types and from different origins. By deepening aspects of this complex context he depicts – as did his friend, Charles B. Schmitt – the development of science in modernity as inseparably linked to the development of technology and its tools (*instrumenta*), of the practical knowledge of craftsmen and engineers and of all manifestations of knowledge, however esoteric they may seem to us today – an elementary symbiosis between the history of ideas and the sociology of science. Always faithful to his work on the sources, Lohr pointed to the need to extend and overcome disciplinary boundaries, giving importance to all sciences as well as to other disciplines considered today as occult or esoteric sciences. Renaissance thinkers returned to the ancient sources in their plural and varied structures.

At the foundation of everything we consider to be historical research is the pleasure of making connections between ideas and relating those ideas to actions and facts, but above all there is the pleasure of organizing and discovering gaps in what might be thought to be entirely deciphered. Not only the future but also the past is full of new and unpredictable things. Like the future, the past also flees from classifications and arro-

---

<sup>47</sup> Ibid., p. 584. See *infra*, pp. 148-9.

gant pretensions of wanting to see any given interpretation as definitive. In his historiographical work, Charles Lohr wanted to question all present certainties, always grounded upon the primary sources. Thus through his contribution, Lullism, normally considered in modern times to be a kind of strange superstition, becomes and will be henceforth an entity that merits consideration in the history of culture. Considerations of the history of science since the thirteenth century cannot ignore the gigantic Lullian enterprise that attempted to reconcile the “logical structure” with the “structure of reality” in a serious way<sup>48</sup>.

Without expressly saying so, Lohr always wanted to consider Lull a Renaissance man – and in any event, as a character and a figure best explained through his later reception. This is why he wanted to write, in a book dedicated to the philosophers of the Renaissance, an article in which Ramon Lull appears as the first manifestation of the later philosophical developments<sup>49</sup>.

### 3.3. *‘Script’ and foundation of all his Lullian discourse: Nicholas of Cusa’s reception of Lull*

Charles Lohr arrived at this view of Lull and Lullism as a paradigm of the development of modern thought, which – as indicated before – is the *Leitmotiv* of his entry on “Metaphysics” in the *Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy* after having drawn the reader’s attention to

---

<sup>48</sup> “Until today, the history of medieval philosophy and theology have been written by Catholic theologians and priests, who focused their attention on Paris and Oxford. But if we keep in mind the natural sciences and medicine of the Middle Ages, we can say that not only in those cities, but also in Catalonia, or at Montpellier for example, there were important centers of intellectual research. In this field, as a result of the contacts among Jews, Arabs and Catalan Christians, missions were established in Bugia and Tunisia. In Catalonia, the three great religions coexisted, and Lull’s work is a clear testimony to it. It is from this perspective, in my opinion, that philosophy and science in the Middle Ages should be understood” (*Entrevista*).

<sup>49</sup> Cfr. C. H. Lohr, *Ramon Lull. Aktivität Gottes und Hominisierung der Welt*, in P. R. Blum, ed., *Philosophen der Renaissance: eine Einführung*, Darmstadt, Primus Verlag, 1999, pp. 11-21. In the *Entrevista*, Lohr states: “Unfortunately, little is known throughout the world of the great importance that Lullism represented for the history of European culture. The meaning of his immense work is evident in the Renaissance; for example, Agrippa of Nettesheim, Paracelsus, Giordano Bruno, Athanasius Kircher and Leibniz among the most representative. We try to ensure that the name of Ramón Llull occupies the place it deserves in the history of thought; furthermore, I would say that the Renaissance cannot be understood without him”.



Nicholas of Cusa's affinity with, and dependence on, some fundamental ideas of Lullian thought. His first work on this subject begins with a sentence that sketches his larger project:

The enormous influence that the thought of Ramon Lull had in the time span from the Renaissance to the Enlightenment in extra-scholastic circles is a very forgotten aspect in the history of modern philosophy<sup>50</sup>.

Lohr was always at pains to demonstrate that Lullism was decisive in Cusanus' thought and in that of other contemporaries. The only certain fact about Nicholas of Cusa's relationship with the work of Ramon Lull is the autograph note at the beginning of his excerpts from the *Liber contemplationis* (cod. 83 of the Cusan Library, fol. 51r). Not only is the origin of the copied text indicated, but the exact date is given to mark the beginning of the copy, namely Monday after the first Sunday of the Passion, i.e., March 22, 1428. In addition to the extracts from the *Liber contemplationis* (op. 2), Eusebio Colomer has transcribed a series of extracts from twenty-six Lullian works from the same codex 83<sup>51</sup>, all allegedly written by Nicholas during his stay in Paris. Colomer had previously shown how seventeen of those twenty-six extracted works are found in codices that are either preserved today in Paris or were presumably in the library of the Carthusian monastery of Vauvert, which had a valuable collection of manuscripts donated by Lull himself. It was the impossibility of finding today in Paris a manuscript base for the whole series of extracts of Lullian works copied by Cusanus that motivated a documented study by Charles Lohr, who, after submitting the series of extracts to paleographic analysis both in their external characteristics and in their relationship with the known manuscript tradition, reached the conclusion that not all these

---

<sup>50</sup> "Der gewaltige Einfluß, den das Denken Ramón Lulls in der Zeitspanne zwischen Renaissance und Aufklärung in außerscholastischen Kreisen ausübte, ist ein oft vernachlässigter Aspekt der Geschichte der neuzeitlichen Philosophie", see C. H. Lohr, *Ramon Lull und Nikolaus von Kues: Zu einem Strukturvergleich ihres Denkens*, «Theologie und Philosophie», 56, 1981, pp. 218-31. The same ideas are found in another article dating back to the same time: C. H. Lohr, *Die Überlieferung der Werke Ramón Lulls*, «Freiburger Universitätsblätter», 78, 1982, pp. 13-28.

<sup>51</sup> Cf. E. Colomer, *Nikolaus von Kues und Raimund Lull: aus Handschriften der Kueser Bibliothek*, Berlin, de Gruyter, 1961 (Quellen und Forschungen zur Geschichte der Philosophie 11).

extracts were written in Paris<sup>52</sup>. By casting doubt on the exclusively Parisian origin of the Cusan sources, Lohr intended to draw attention to the Italian origin of Cusanus' interest in Lull and specifically to the Venetian and Paduan Lullism of the early fifteenth century.

Lohr never tired of stressing Cusanus' affinity with Lull and their ideological affinity:

Thus I have come to the conclusion that Ramon Lull is 'one of us', those of whom Cusanus speaks in book II of *De docta ignorantia*, where he describes the domain of infinite possibility – 'the best possible world' – where the absolute divine infinity is manifested<sup>53</sup>.

For Lohr, it is in Cusanus where the full importance and transcendence of Lullian thought for posterity is understood<sup>54</sup>.

#### 4. CHARLES LOHR'S DISCOURSE ON LULLIAN THOUGHT<sup>55</sup>

Charles Lohr's numerous contributions to the study of Lullian thought have a discursive line that we will try to summarize below. In numerous articles he formulates his vision of Lullian theology, cosmology, and

---

<sup>52</sup> Cfr. C. H. Lohr, *Die Exzerptensammlung des Nikolaus von Kues aus den Werken Ramon Lulls*, «Freiburger Zeitschrift für Philosophie und Theologie», 30, 1983, pp. 373-84. Accordingly, in his *Entrevista*, he says: "Nicolas de Cusa, a great German thinker, read Llull in Paris, but he had already discovered him, really, as a student in Padua and Venice. It is interesting to see how at the beginning of the Renaissance, in the time of Petrarch, some of Llull's works are translated into Italian".

<sup>53</sup> „So bin ich zu dem Schluss gekommen, daß Ramon Lull ‚einer von den Unsrigen‘ ist, von dem Cusanus im Buch II seines *De docta ignorantia* spricht, wo er den Bereich der unendlichen Möglichkeit – ‚die bestmögliche Welt‘ – beschreibt, in dem die absolute Unendlichkeit Gottes offenbart“; C. H. Lohr, *Chaos nach Ramon Lull und Nikolaus von Kues*, in E. Bidese, A. Fidora, P. Renner, eds., *Ramon Llull und Nikolaus von Kues: Eine Begegnung im Zeichen der Toleranz*, Turnhout, Brepols, 2005 (Instrumenta patristica et mediaevalia 46 /Subsidia Lulliana 2), pp. 125-38, at p. 136.

<sup>54</sup> See *inter alia*: Id., *Der Naturbegriff Ramon Lulls*, in W. Erzgräber, ed., *Kontinuität und Transformation der Antike im Mittelalter*, Sigmaringen, Thorbecke Verlag, 1989, pp. 159-68; Id., *Ramon Lull: Philosophische Anstöße zu einem Dialog der Religionen*, in Id. (ed.), *Anstöße zu einem Dialog der Religionen: Thomas von Aquin - Ramon Llull - Nikolaus von Kues*, Freiburg i. Br., Akad. der Erzdiözese Freiburg, 1997, pp. 31-49; Id., *Nicolaus Cusanus and Ramon Lull: A Comparison of Three Texts on Human Knowledge*, «Traditio», 59, 2004, pp. 229-315.

<sup>55</sup> This attempt at drawing a synthesis is fundamentally based on the articles already cited in previous notes to which we may especially add: C. H. Lohr, *Raimondo Lullo e Anselmo di Aosta*,

anthropology, repeating since 1985 the same ideas with few variations in their formulation, in various languages and in different contexts. As we have already indicated, the fundamental lines of this understanding, which we present below, were clearly framed and defined in his contribution to the *Cambridge History of Renaissance Philosophy*, which is a summary of all the aspects that follow.

#### 4.1. *A new science*

According to Lohr, a new conception of knowledge and reality appeared in the Latin world of the thirteenth century. This was the result of the meeting of three great cultures: Islam, Judaism, and Christianity. This cultural encounter found its material support in the traffic and active trade in the Mediterranean and is animated by a spirit characterized by a rare readiness to understand the other cultures. One of the most significant figures in this shift was Ramon Lull.

On the basis of an Arab model, Lull constructed the idea of a new science, an *Ars* that was to be the ideal instrument for achieving his missionary ideals. Assuming that this new science was intended for people of all religious denominations, it could not be limited to being a simple device of Christian theology but had to be formulated as a general science that would explain and include all the particular sciences of the time. Behind this general science one perceives a fundamental vision of a natural theology that offers the knowledge of the true God through a method of contemplation of the divine names. The Lullian method aims to rise from the finite perfections of the created world to the infinite perfections constitutive of God himself. Lull designates these divine perfections (*bonitas, magnitudo, duratio; potestas, sapientia, voluntas; virtus, veritas, gloria*) with the term *dignitates* or *principia*. It seems that the origin of the idea of *dignitates* is to be sought in an Islamic contemplation technique, which –

---

«Studi medievali», Ser. III, 29, 1988, pp. 1-17; Id., *Raimondo Lullo: l'azione e il pensiero*, in *Conciliarismo, stati nazionali, inizi dell'umanesimo: Atti del XXV Convegno storico internazionale*, Todi, 9-12 ottobre 1988, Spoleto, Centro Italiano di Studi sull'Alto Medioevo, 1990, pp. 235-43; Id., *Die Stufen der menschlichen Erkenntnis nach dem 'Karlsruher Breviculum' Ramon Lulls*, in M. Schmidt, F. Domínguez Reboiras, eds., *Von der Suche nach Gott: Helmut Riedlinger zum 75. Geburtstag*, Stuttgart-Bad Canstatt, Frommann-Holzboog, 1998, pp. 389-98.

with the help of images – strove to rise from the finite perfections of the created world to the infinite perfections that constitute God himself, and Lull believed that through the contemplation of the names of the divine perfections, common to all religions, unity between Muslims, Jews, Greek and Latin Christians could be achieved.

Behind the principle of *bonitas*, which we must consider as the first in the series of *dignitates* or *principia*, can be found the Neoplatonic formula according to which *bonum est diffusivum sui*, the good is self-diffusive. The second group of three names may have as its source the triad already present in the twelfth century, that of *potestas*, *sapientia*, *benignitas*. From the fact that Lull also introduces *magnitudo* into the series, it can be thought that he had found his starting point by rethinking the dynamic concept of *id quo maius cogitari nequit* which has its origin in Anselm of Canterbury.

#### 4.2. Theology: divine activity

To realize what Lull intended with these divine names, it is important to keep in mind that he was inspired by the writings of Arabic mystics. In the *Liber de centum nominibus Dei* (op. 38), Lull maintains that God has placed more energy and power in his names than can be supposed to exist in precious stones, plants, or animals. For this reason one can correctly understand his method of contemplation only by considering that the *dignitates* perform the function of active powers (*Liber de gentili et tribus sapientibus* [op. 11]; *Disputatio quinque hominum sapientium* [op. 58]). Lull insists that all the powers of created things must refer to the highest power of the creator.

Lull attempts to render universally comprehensible the two distinctively Christian dogmas under which the missionary efforts were grouped: namely, the doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation. In order to do so, he tried to analyze the affirmation according to which the power of the *dignitates* would be constantly active, to the point of concluding that we cannot qualify a thing as truly good if it does not produce something good. This thus affirms that activity must be a necessary attribute of any of the *dignitates*: the *vera bonitas* must produce good, the *vera magnitudo* must generate magnitude.

As a starting point for this scheme Lull took the dynamism that his Muslim interlocutors presumed to be involved in the cognitive process (constituted by the cognizing intellect, the known object, and the act of knowing) and in love (the lover, the beloved, and the act of loving), thus affirming that principles of action must be attributed to each of the divine perfections.

Lohr repeatedly claims that in doing this, Lull introduced an entirely new category into the history of theological reasoning. Lull speaks not only of principles of being but of principles of doing, of action. Thus every activity presupposes a principle, an objective, and a link between the two. He speaks, therefore, of three correlatives that are present in the activities of any of the *dignitates*, that is, of any divine principle. He has given these three correlatives strange Latin names, because they probably derive from Arabic verbal forms. In a sermon delivered in Tunis he explained this aspect of his doctrine thus:

Actus bonitatis dico bonifivativum, bonificabile et bonificare; actus etiam magnitudinis sunt magnificativum, magnificabile et magnificare; et sic de aliis suis dignitatibus.

This scheme is applied to a certain extent to all reality, in such a way that any action is explained with terminology involving *-tivum*, *-bile*, and *-are*, thus establishing that these three moments describe the ontological, intrinsic and substantial principles of any event and that together can validly constitute any action.

If these principles are intrinsic to any reality, it is evident that not only are being and doing one and the same thing, but also being and relation. This is why the divine unity must also be structured: at the core of the divine essence, the infinite *-tivum* necessarily produces an infinite *-bile*, which are equal and which both unite in the *concordantia* of an infinite *-are*.

Just as Lull tried to clarify the Christian dogma of the Trinity, always employing the dynamic principles of his great *art*, he also sought to render the idea of the Incarnation of Christ comprehensible. To this end, he resorted to the fundamental distinction of the theology of creation between necessary activity *ad intra* and contingent activity *ad extra*. Not only are the divine persons productive *ad intra*: God is also active in creation, that is, *ad extra*. The divine activity *ad intra* is necessary; the cre-

ation of the world is contingent and depends on the divine will. But from the moment God decided to be creator, He cannot realize the *concordantia* between the cause and its effects if it is not *in Filii incarnatione, per participationem scilicet unionis creatoris et creaturae in una persona Christi*<sup>56</sup>.

#### 4.3. *Cosmology: The activity of created things*

God's creative activity does not end when He has given being to the world. Lull sees the difference between necessary and contingent activity also in the realm of created things. The world, precisely because it is God's creature, is – like the creator himself – active in itself and aspires to its own perfection.

In order to explain how this distinction applies to created activity, Lull takes as an example the accidents of a subject. Fire must necessarily burn, but in the process acts contingently when heating water or earth. In itself fire is active in a proper mode but in water and earth it is active in an appropriate and accidental mode. When fire heats a body or when the form of white (*albedo*) whitens a body (*albificat*), they act contingently in this or that body, where they are present in a received manner.

Lull thus extends his idea of the dynamic character of the creative act to contingent reality: thus the *albedo* can attempt to multiply its fullness by whitening an increasing number of things. The creator has produced the world in such a way that it aspires to increase its perfection by numerical multiplication, in accordance with the dynamics of its activity. But although the world is full of individual energies in constant activity, this does not achieve the fulfillment of the perfection of the world. Lull understands the individuals, species, and genera that we know in the world as parts of a whole, as members of a unity that reflects the dynamic greatness of the creator. The individual aspires to full concordance with its species, the species with the genus, and the genus with the one composite source of matter and universal form. The species remains the limit against which the perfection of the individual runs up against, and the genus is the frontier of the species.

---

<sup>56</sup> Lohr illustrated this line of argument several times by reference to Lull's Tunis sermon, which is contained in the *Vita coetanea* (op. 189), ed. by H. Harada in Raimundus Lullus, *Opera latina* VIII, Brepols, Turnhout 1980, pp. 290-1. For Lohr, this sermon was key to all Lullian writing as well as a succinct synthesis of his entire line of argument.

The idea of the whole – of the universe – is lucidly developed in a key text, the *Liber chaos* (op. 36a), which is a part of op. 36, the *Lectura super figuras Artis demonstrativae* (the *Ars demonstrativa* is the second redaction of the *Ars magna*). The ‘chaos’ he studies in that book cannot be understood as *confusio*, in the sense of disorder or disturbance, nor as *materia informis* in the sense of the Augustinian theology of creation. Lull understands chaos as the full and total union in a single act of all created existents and of all existing determinations.

This chaos contains the *semina causalia* – the *forma universalis* and the *materia universalis*, the genera and the species, the *substantiae* and the *accidentia* – which permeate and comprise all things. From this chaos is born and comes all that is found in the sublunar realm. All the different possible and singular changes (*transmutationes*) are already present in the *semina causalia* of the first degree of chaos. All these possibilities do not touch the nature of chaos: they are only the eventual results of all that is present *in potentia*. In a second degree of chaos we find the first individuals of the singular species, while the third degree is constituted by the further multiplication of the first individuals.

Thus Lull brought together many themes of the philosophical tradition within the concept of chaos. These themes, however, acquire a different meaning in his thought as they had in the previous tradition. The Platonic idea of the soul of the world is connected to the Aristotelian doctrine of matter and form and is integrated into the doctrine of correlatives (*correlativa*). Chaos is made up of the four abstract essences of matter: *igneitas, aereitas, aqueitas, terreitas*. Any element is structured in its own matter (*ignificabile*), in its own form (*ignificativum*), and in its own act (*ignificare*).

Form and matter are realities, but they cannot be thought of separately from each other. Above all, all particular forms are united in a single universal form – the sum of all possible forms *-tiva* – and each particular matter in a single universal matter – which gathers all possible forms, *-bilis*. From this form and from this matter emerges that *unum ens, unum esse, unum suppositum* that Lull calls chaos.

From general form and general matter emerge particular realities composed of particular form and matter, by which particular forms and matter find their foundation in those universals. Lull places the second degree

of chaos as a medium between the *semina causalia* and the realizations that the first individuals find in the numerical multiplication of species.

These concrete realizations that emerge from the *semina causalia* do not simply aspire to their extrinsic and numerical multiplication, although they advance toward an intrinsic perfection. By nature all concrete things aspire to rejoin their abstract principle of which they are manifestations. In this sense Lull can affirm that the predicables and the relation between universal matter and form are real. The abstract is in the singular things as an ideal horizon by dint of the aspiration of the concrete towards an infinite that is always already present.

#### 4.4. *Anthropology: human activity, thought*

The dynamic conception of reality and the difference between contingent and necessary activity is equally decisive for the Lullian image of man. In the *Liber de natura*, Lull defines nature as the principle through which the concrete *entia* – e.g., a singular man – progressively approach the abstract entities – e.g., the human essence (*humanitas*).

Lull's definition of man in the *Logica nova* (op. 101) as *animal homificans* must also be interpreted in accordance with this idea. For Lull, man is man not only because he always seeks to come closer to his abstract essence as a rational animal, but also because he aspires to the full transformation of his genus.

Faithful to the conception within the scope of which he had placed Christ as absolute mediator – situated between cause and its effects – Lull defines man as mediator between God and the world. Man is a mediator because he unites the lowest levels of intellectual reality and the highest degree of the material world. In this way he comes to realize that harmony which is to bring all creation to unity and ultimate happiness.

The metaphysical distinction between activity *ad intra* and activity *ad extra* also represents the foundation of the Lullian vision of man, first of all because it allows us to understand the deep meaning of the nature of human knowledge.

Lull had affirmed that realities such as fire or whiteness have their *correlativa* of intrinsic, necessary, and proper action, just as their objects *ad extra* (earth, water, this or that thing) are contingent and appropriate. But man is also active in his thinking. In effect he produces *ad extra* tools,



inventions, and ideas. The forms he produces are a true creation of the human spirit, even if man's creative capacity is limited. Unlike God, man is not in a position to create true essences. He can only put them before himself and 'appropriate' them.

In the late and very important writing entitled *De potentia, obiecto et actu* (op. 68)<sup>57</sup>, Lull draws a number of precise consequences from this principle concerning human knowledge. The instruments and tools that the spirit creates are proper terms of the spirit; the proper object of its activity can only consist in an interior reality. Likewise the sensible realities to which the spirit is conditioned, are not the necessary objects of knowledge. In a manner very similar to how fire was treated – about which it was said that earth and water are not its immediate object, but fire itself and its capacity to burn – it is said here that the object of spirit is only spirit itself insofar as it is capable of knowing.

In order to find out what spirit really is, spirit itself must abstract itself from sensible perception and rational knowledge. Spirit must enter into itself. It must distance itself from the appropriate activity *ad extra* and immerse itself in its necessary activity, in its own intrinsic inner dynamism. The human being has the possibility to choose if it wants to be a prisoner of the world or wants to be free and realize the infinite intrinsic potentialities of its true nature.

Reflecting on itself, the human being becomes an object of self-knowledge. Since knowledge of an object presupposes that in this object, a disposition is present that makes it accessible to knowledge, man discovers himself as knowable. To clarify the process implicit in human knowing, Lull turns to his theory of the correlatives of action: in the cognitive process the cognizer (*intelligens*) is known (*intelligere*) as accessible to knowledge (*intelligibile*). This triadic structure does not mean that there is a breakdown of the human subject into three separate entities. Man recognizes himself as a cognizable object while referring this objectivity to himself.

At the same time man discovers his own finitude. His cognitive activity is above all limited by the fact that he is always obliged to have recourse to sensible images. In the face of the things that he can know and that the

---

<sup>57</sup> Concerning the importance that Lohr gave to this booklet, see especially: C. H. Lohr, *Nicolaus Cusanus and Ramon Lull*.

spirit can discover in the world – that is, in the face of the things that we have seen to be in constant becoming, aspiring to their own perfection – the spirit must have recourse to the static categories of discursive reason. Additionally, the knowledge of that which the spirit itself is producing is limited to the constraint that is constituted by the necessity of using materials that are foreign to the spirit.

But the reason why the human spirit discovers the need to confront the limitations of its nature lies above all in its desire for self-consciousness. Although it must free itself from external things in order to find itself, the very character of his spirit constrains it to leap *ad extra* before it can begin his journey *ad intra*.

Through reflection on himself man acquires a simplicity that leads him to reflect on the fact that alongside his own *-bile*, which remains ‘contracted’, there must be an absolute *-tivum* that is not only the original cause but also the end and fullness of all things.

Finally, God is not knowledge to man in the same way as the external things that are contingent objects of human knowledge. He is rather the complementary part of a cognitive process that is in the movement of two subjects, in which each experiences itself as knower and as known. In this sense God is understood – *intelligens*, *intelligibilis*, and *intelligere* – and the created intellect can unite with Him and achieve beatitude.

There is no possible parallel between the divine *-tivum* and the human *-bile*. God himself is the condition of the process between God and man. This is why transcendence is not hindered by the fact that it is part of the process of human knowing. The triadic structure intrinsic and necessary to the modality of knowing allows for union without identification.

In this union, however, man himself realizes all the possibilities of his being. The triadic structure of knowing makes of it a representation of God; in this confrontation with the exemplar, man attains that harmonious and dynamic stillness which is constitutive of knowledge.

The measure of man’s truth is the degree of intensity with which he reflects the divine model. The separation between the model and its image is clearly also present between God and man, to such an extent that only God Himself could overcome it, bringing human nature to its own fullness.

The image of man that Lull has constructed reaches its climax in Christ: the fulfillment of the perfections of the universe demanded the union of

the creator with his creature. Christ is the dynamic *-are* that unites the *-tivum* of the creator with the *-bile* of the universe, because in him is reached the highest result of the active aspirations of all nations: Muslims, Jews, Greek, and Latin Christians. Christ is the connection between God and the world because in him are realized all the intrinsic possibilities of human nature brought to their fullness and through him the human species brings the whole universe to perfection and unity.

4.5. *On medieval science and Ramon Lull's contribution to the history of philosophy*

Lastly, Lohr took Lull to belong to those few thinkers who consciously lived at the limit of the periphery of Christianity and integrated this limit into their thought, while remaining at a distance from the theological ideology dominating central Europe. In the history of medieval thought, in the countries of the Mediterranean, we may observe original attitudes and conceptions developed by people who reflected on Christianity at its frontiers, that is, a Christianity in dialogue with other religions. Thinkers from the Mediterranean did not demand another faith, but the consideration of their own faith from a more real and more universal perspective.

Finally, Lohr pointed out that in our histories of medieval thought, we have traditionally concentrated on the history of Christian philosophy. And assuming that Christian philosophy did nothing more than elaborate *præambula* to make the revealed message acceptable, we have been concerned above all with the history of metaphysics, ethics, and rational psychology. We have mainly taken into consideration the development of philosophical systems in Paris and Oxford, which were closely linked to the evolution of scholastic theology. That is why we have not taken into consideration the great progress of medieval science in the fields of mathematics and the philosophy of nature, political theory and epistemology. This view has constrained us to see all that we call Averroism as an aberration and the fourteenth century as the end of a clear journey. This is why we have been unable to insert organically into our surveys characters such as the English Roger Bacon, the Italian Peter of Abano, or the Spanish Arnaldo de Villanova, and the same may also be said about the likes of Dante Alighieri or Nicholas of Cusa. For similar reasons, we have overlooked the contribution to philosophy of the Majorcan Ramón Lull.

Lull develops his method of contemplation not only, as it were, horizontally, distinguishing successively the nine divine names, but also clearly and insistently points out the three vertical levels of power contained in the divine names. The Art is thought of as an ascensional method that develops in two stages: through sensible knowledge one jumps from the positive degree to the comparative degree of the *dignitates* (*bonum-melius*). In a second stage and through rational knowledge one ascends from the comparative to the superlative degree of the *dignitates* (*melius-optimum*). Lull maintains that sensations do not constitute an adequate foundation for the knowledge of truth, since it remains at the positive level, that is, that of perceptible things. Reason can rise to the comparative level because it is proper to rational knowledge of objects. According to this view, Aristotle and Averroes have only reached this level, but have gone no further.

The last level is not yet that of true knowledge. It is evident that the things of the sensible world are good and great and that the things of the rational world are better and greater, but compared with all His creatures, God is optimal and maximal (*optimum-maximum*). The intellect arrives at the knowledge of eternal truths thanks to a second ascent. At these heights the differences are seen. God is placed in the superlative degree, and consequently it is no longer possible to distinguish between His being the greatest and the most powerful: the mystic discovers a supreme level of reality, that which shows itself in its superior essence in which all differences disappear, all divine names become synonymous.

There is no doubt that Charles Lohr sees Ramon Lull as a philosopher-renovator who broke a system of old assumptions open. Lohr's positive judgment on Lull thus mirrors that of Johann Jakob Brucker (1696-1770) who spoke of *Primus philosophiae reformator Raimundus Lullus*.

