

Coralba Colomba

Ramon Lull at the Council of Vienne (1311-1312): the Last Anti-Averroistic Fight for the Demonstrability of the Faith

The twelve miniatures of the *Breviculum*, or *Electorium parvum*, drawn up in the fourteenth century (ca. 1325) by Ramon Lull's Parisian disciple Thomas Le Myésier, show the most significant events of Lull's life and the fundamental features of his epistemological system.¹ Among them the miniatures number 6 and number 7 seem to contain essential elements for a deeper understanding of Ramon Lull's anti-Averroist campaign.² Miniature number 6 portrays the assault of Aristotle and Averroes' armies on the tower of Falsehood (*turris falsitatis*). The Philosopher sitting on the saddle of a grey horse, *Ratiocinatio*, takes up a lance which bears the inscription: «Instrumenta abundandi in syllogismis» (the means of abounding in syllogisms); behind him the Commentator, also himself on a grey horse (*Imaginatio*), wields a lance which bears on its sides two inscriptions: «Esse perfectum in speculativis et in eis exerceri summa est felicitas» (to be perfect in speculative [things] and to exercise oneself in them is supreme happiness); «Intelligentem oportet phantasmata speculari» (to understand one must explore appearances).³ Miniature number 7 represents Ramon Lull's assaulting the same tower. Lull on a horse called *Recta intentio*, takes up a lance, on which can be read: «Intelligentem spiritualia oportet sensus et imaginationem transcendere et multotiens se ipsum» (it is necessary that a man who understands spiritual things transcends meaning and imagination and often himself). The two armies symbolise two different ways of liberating Truth which is imprisoned in the tower of Falsehood: the first is the Scholastic science and its Aristotelian-Averroist development (as one can see in the miniature number 6) while the second represents Ramon Lull's Artistic and alternative system (as seen in miniature

¹ RAIMUNDUS LULLUS, *Breviculum seu Electorium parvum Thomae Migerii (Le Myésier)* (Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Mediaevalis, 77; Raimundi Lulli Opera Latina. Supplementi Lulliani I), eds. Ch. Lohr, Th. Pindl-Büchel, W. Büchel, Turnhout 1990, pp. 28-31.

² See miniatures at the following website:
<http://www.ub.uni-freiburg.de/fileadmin/ub/referate/04/breviculum-miniaturen.htm>.

³ Inscriptions translated by J. N. HILLGARTH in *Ramon Lull and Lullism in Fourteenth-Century France*, Oxford 1971, pp. 262-263. Unless otherwise stated, the translations from Latin are mine.

number 7). These miniatures contain what we could define the manifesto of Lullian thought. Lull's aim is, in fact, that of replacing with his Art the Aristotelian-Averroist science which does not satisfy the *recta intentio* that should direct human activity but puts felicity and human perfection in a speculative science limited to the region of *phantasmata* (sensible images), thus denying the opportunity to know God, man's final end. These two miniatures perfectly summarise a precise moment in the life and work of Blessed Lull, that Anti-averroist «campaign» which Lull began in Paris around 1298 and which had its conclusion at the Council of Vienne (13 October 1311 – 6 May 1312).

In order to understand better the reasons which led Lull to oppose with so much tenacity the Averroistic Parisian current, it is necessary to go back and remember the main elements of Lull's thought.

Ramon Lull and the Artistic utopia

Ramon Lull is a complex figure. Complex was his life, complex was his personality: a mystic and a poet, a missionary and a preacher, a philosopher and a theologian, father of the Catalan language and of scientific prose in the vernacular, a precursor of formal logic and mnemotechnics (art of memory). None of these definitions qualifies him completely, each of them belongs to him, but he deserves others. The story of his life and his work is found in *Vita coetanea (The contemporary life)*, a biography-autobiography dictated by Lull himself to a monk of the charterhouse of Vauvert during his last stay in Paris (1311). Here it is sufficient to remember a few elements necessary for this specific study. Lull was a layman at the Majorcan court, was converted still young, *adhuc iuvenis* (1263 ca.),⁴ left his wife and children, and consecrated himself *ex corde integre* (heart and soul) to God. He received his divine illumination on the mountain of Randa, after which he studied hard for ten years. Then he devoted his attention, for more than forty years, on the fulfilment of an evangelization programme based on a new general science, the *Ars*, able to renew the entire human knowledge. We know little about his *curriculum studiorum*, which was definitely apart from the traditional university programme. Undoubtedly influenced by Arabic and Jewish thought, with which he came into contact in Catalan circles, he conceived a heuristic method (*Ars*) based on the combination of principles (i.e. the *dignitates divinae*) common to the three religions and the three cultures, using symbols (letters) and mobile figures, and an extremely formalized and rigorous way of arguing. Lull's ambition was to convert the infidels, first of all Muslims, through a rational and positive demonstration of Christian dogmas (the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Eucharist, the Immaculate Conception). In brief we could say that he gathered, as it were at the last moment, the Neoplatonic-Augustinian and Anselmian inheritance,

⁴ On Lull's life see F. DOMÍNGUEZ-J. GAYÀ, *Life*, in A. FIDORA-E. RUBIO (eds.), *Raimundus Lullus. An Introduction to his Life, Works and Thought* (Corpus Christianorum. Continuatio Mediaevalis, 214), Turnhout 2008, pp. 3-124.

developing a rational theology aimed at a knowledge of God and His intrinsic and extrinsic operations, and thus of the whole of reality. His missionary strategy, his theology for the mission, to use Jordi Gayà's words,⁵ does not limit itself to the Art. Lull promoted, apart from the Artistic method, the establishment of colleges where missionary-monks could study the infidels' languages, because Lull's system developed through the encounter with the «other» (he never stopped insisting on this point, as testified by the petition presented at the Council of Vienne).⁶ His commitment in this sense is total and it evolved in two directions: a political and an apologetic one. If, on the one hand, Ramon looked for the support of European kings, lords and pontiffs from Paris to Rome, from Genoa to Sicily, from Venice to Naples in order to put into practice his project, on the other hand he sailed for Northern Africa, ready for martyrdom, in the attempt to convert the infidels with the only force of the *rationes necessariae*. It was precisely about the limits of reason when speaking *in divinis* that Lull collided with the Aristotelian-Averroist trends circulating at the Faculty of Arts in Paris in order to defend his Art and the supremacy of theology over a more and more independent natural philosophy.⁷

Ramon Lull's anti-Averroist campaign developed in two phases, during two of his Parisian stays. I think it is worth underlying here the role that the Ville Lumière played in Lull's experience. «Ramon Lull has always been attracted to the incomparable glory of Paris, the town of power, of spirit and of science» affirmed Helmut Riedlinger in an opening lecture as Magister at the Escuela Lullistica.⁸ The University of Paris always represented for Lull the wisdom core of Christianity. There he would have liked to study immediately after his conversion, there he chose to present his Art to the world, and there he realized for the first time how difficult his arguments appeared to such a prestigious audience. The approval of the University of Paris would mean, according to him, setting the seal of earthly wisdom to that Art, a gift of divine inspiration. And Ramon Lull came back to Paris several times in order to testify the degree of improvement of his method, but also (as we will see) to look for influential supporters for his «mission».

⁵ J. GAYÀ, *Raimondo Lullo. Una teologia per la missione*, Milano 2002.

⁶ R. IMBACH, *Lulle face aux Averroïstes parisiens*, in *Quodlibeta. Ausgewählte Artikel / Articles choisis*, Fribourg 1996, pp. 261-282.

⁷ It is necessary here to underline that Averroism is only one of the many different currents in which Aristotelianism can be found. Defining Aristotelianism as a current of the Scholastic is reductive and misleading; as every great intellectual strength, it gained in extension what it lost in definition, differing itself in a series of Aristotelianisms, related to one another because of the same problems, principles of the argumentative methods and sources, more than because of their contents (see L. BIANCHI [ed.], *La filosofia nelle università, secoli XIII-XIV*, Firenze 1997).

⁸ H. RIEDLINGER, *La última estancia de Ramón Lull en París*, in «Estudios Lullianos» 12 (1968), pp. 87-93, p. 88: «Ramon Lull se sintió siempre atraído por el incomparable encanto de París, la metropolis del poder, del espíritu y de la ciencia».

Parisian Averroism and Stephen Tempier's two condemnations

Between XII and XIII centuries the Aristotelian corpus filtered into Latin culture, thanks – above all – to the impressive activity of the translations of Greek and especially of the Arab comments to the Stagirite texts. Such a significant combination of philosophical and scientific pagan writings gradually revealed a fundamental contradiction between the Christian vision of the world and Aristotelian doctrines which would give birth to a real intellectual revolution. The Parisian artists enthusiastically welcomed the new natural philosophy, and in 1255 Aristotle's works became «textbooks», the basis of their course of study. Beside the *vetus* and *nova* logic, the first 4 books of the *Ethica*, the *Metaphysica*, the *Physica*, the *De caelo*, the *De generatione et corruptione*, the *Meteorologica*, the *De anima*, the *Parva naturalia*, the treatises *de animalibus* and the apocryphal *Liber de causis*, *De plantis*, *De differentiae spiritus et animae* were all object of study.⁹

Inevitably, following an evolution common to all the European universities, the Faculty of Arts of Paris became a Faculty of Philosophy, achieving its own independence and disregarding its propaedeutic function to the study of theology, and thus causing a deep crisis in the unity of Christian knowledge. Averroes, or better the Latin Averroes given to us through the translations of Michael Scot, Herman the German, William of Luna and Pedro Gallego, is the commentator *par excellence* of Aristotle's texts. The most subversive doctrines against Christian knowledge are traced back to him: above all the unity between the agent intellect and the possible intellect (monopsychism) and the so-called theory of double truth (a form of radical scepticism). Starting from the work of Ernest Renan and Pierre Mandonnet onwards, critical researches have significantly modified the traditional vision of Averroes' influence on Western philosophy, making it possible to distinguish between two kinds of Averroism in XIII century: in the first Averroism (1225-1250/55) there is no trace of Avicenna's theory of the oneness of the agent intellect and the possible intellect for every human being, which characterizes the second Averroism, from 1250/55 onwards. In both cases, as R.-A. Gauthier affirms, Averroes has never been Averroist. Many of the theses attributed to the Cordoba philosopher are the fruit of bad translations or misunderstandings upon which political propaganda carried weight.¹⁰

The ecclesiastical institutions reacted at that time with the two condemnations of Stephen Tempier, the Bishop of Paris (and the chronicle of the University of Paris is studded with prohibitions and condemnations). The first one (10 December 1270) prohibited 13 philosophical theses, whilst the second and more famous one (7 March 1277) increased the number of interdictions to 219, criticizing explicitly the artists of the University of Paris, those several Parisian students of the Faculty of Arts who go

⁹ See *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*, cur. H. DENIFLE-E. CHÂTELAIN, 3 voll., Paris 1889, vol. I, p. 278.

¹⁰ M.-R. HAYOUN-A. DE LIBERA, *Averroè e l'averroismo*, Milano 2005, see pp. 67-103. Averroes' destiny seems to follow that of Fredrerik II, Michael Scot's protector: from the one hand the excommunicated emperor, from the other hand the condemned philosopher.

beyond academic limits and dare to deal in their teaching with the evident and execrable errors contained on the roll after this prologue: «Nonnulli Parisius studentes in artibus proprie facultatis limites excedentes quosdam manifestos et execrabiles errores, immo potius vanitates et insanias falsas, in rotulo seu cedula presentibus hiis annexo seu annexis contentos [...] tractare et disputare presumunt».

This list of errors, drawn up by Tempier helped by a commission of sixteen theologians (among which was Henry of Ghent), is striking because of its disorganized and chaotic nature; the articles (in the form of anonymous sentences without any source) refer to different disciplinary areas, they are qualitatively unequal and sometimes contradictory and serious heresies and perfectly orthodox theses appear side by side. This would show - as Luca Bianchi has noted - that more than by theoretical interests, Tempier was animated by pastoral purposes and wanted to stop the audacity of the philosophical debates and contrast the dangerous pagan arguments which could lead astray more «simple» and inexperienced people.¹¹ The aim of the bishop of Paris (and of the Pope John XXI) was to intimidate and better bring under control the teaching of the Faculty of Arts, and thus to stop that university teaching practice consisting in quoting pagan authors (*auctoritates*) who defend the theses considered as erroneous because against the faith.

As Dragos Calma has recently reminded, according to the prologue of censorship in 1277, Tempier did not sanction the individuals, but a method of teaching. He did not condemn the masters, but intended to limit or eradicate the ways of dissemination of falsehood, i.e. citing Greek and Arab authors.¹² We could say, in brief, that the clash between the Faculties of Arts and Theology was considered as an *auctoritates* conflict between the authority of Augustin and that of Aristotle. As the slogan “or Augustin or Aristotle”, ascribed to John Peckham (founder of a new-Augustinian school in Paris), summarizes.¹³

There has been someone – as Pierre Duhem – who has seen in this condemnation the date of birth of modern science, the emancipation of Western culture from Aristotle, but besides the meaning that historiography has attributed to *Syllabus* in the course of the centuries, the condemnation of 1277 censored essentially the autonomy and the religious disengagement of natural reason, declaring that reason should return to its apologetic function, ordering it to recognize and confirm the precepts of tradition and faith: and the philosopher has also to capture and force the intellect to the service of Christ [*etiam philosophus debet captivare intellectum in obsequium Christi* (art. 216)].¹⁴ Many were the protagonists of this «ideological» clash. On the

¹¹ L. BIANCHI, *Il Vescovo e i filosofi: la condanna parigina del 1277 e l'evoluzione dell'aristotelismo scolastico*, Bergamo 1990, pp. 197-201.

¹² D. CALMA, *Du bon usage des grecs et des arabes. Réflexions sur la censure de 1277*, in L. BIANCHI (ed.), *Christian Readings of Aristotle from the Middle Ages to the Renaissance* (Studia Artis-tarum 29), Turnhout 2011, pp. 115-184.

¹³ E.-H. WEBER, *Dialogue et dissensions entre saint Bonaventure et saint Thomas d'Aquin à Paris (1252-1273)*, Paris 1974, p. 142: «[Peckham] se fait le champion de l'augustinisme intégral et appelle à la guerre sainte contre Aristote».

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

heterodox side were Siger of Brabant, Boethius of Dacia, later John de Janduno and on the orthodox side Albertus Magnus, Thomas Aquinas, Bonaventure, Giles of Rome. Although Ramon Lull entered the debate quite late, he distinguished himself as one of the most indefatigable defenders of anti-Aristotelianism of Tempier and Parisian theologians.

Lull and the Parisian Averroism

Lull's campaign against Averroism¹⁵ developed, as we have said, in two phases. The first one is placed in Paris in the years 1297-1299. During that period Lull wrote a critical comment to the 219 theses condemned in the *Syllabus*, the *Declaratio Raimundi per modum dialogi edita* (1298). However, it is not possible to speak of a specifically anti-Averroist work. Written «contra aliquorum philosophorum et eorum sequacium opiniones erroneas et damnatas», the *Declaratio*, in the form of a dialogue between Ramon and the philosopher Socrates, contains a general reaction to the new paganism that was threatening Christian knowledge in which Averroes or the Averroists are never mentioned, nor the monopsychism.

The Averroist as interlocutor, as a new «enemy» appeared gradually and more and more evidently in Lull's thought during his last trip to Paris, between November 1309 and September 1311, where Lull (he was 77 years old) went in order to present his Art and obtain its approval by the University. According to the story told in the *Vita coetanea* here he gave a public lecture in front of a large audience of masters and students (*Artem suam legit... Adfuit autem lecturae suae tam magistrorum quam etiam scholarum multitudo*).¹⁶ And, in fact, in February 1310 forty masters of the Faculty of Theology and Medicine signed a document approving his *Ars brevis*. In August 1311 Philip the Fair gave Lull a letter of recommendation. Finally, in September 1311 the chancellor of the University, Francesco Caracciolo, attested that Blessed Lull's work was in conformity with Catholic theology.

It was in this period that Lull realized that the *Syllabus* of 1277 had not had the expected effects and that because of the teaching of the Commentator of Aristotle (Averroes) many people were turning away from the rectitude of the Catholic faith, affirming that Christian doctrine is unprovable (*ad modum intelligendi... impossibile*), but true according to faith (*veram... ad modum credendi*). Ramon, aware that this position was dangerous not only for Christian unity but also for the whole structure of his method and his own missionary project, devoted himself strongly to fighting against it, *via demonstrativa et scientifica*, looking first of all for the support of the King of France, Philip the Fair, who had in that period supremacy over both the Empire and the Church. This commitment was carried out through about thirty pam-

¹⁵ Or better Averroist Aristotelianism, which today is defined radical Aristotelianism.

¹⁶ RAIMUNDUS LULLUS, *Vita coetanea*, in *Opera Latina 178-189 Parisiis anno MCCCXI composita* (Corpus Christianorum. Continuatio Mediaevalis 34; Raimundi Lulli Opera Latina 8), ed. H. Harada, Turnhout 1980, p. 302, ll. 685-8.

phlets and treatises (27 according to the Domínguez-Gayà);¹⁷ 17 of those are devoted to the confutation of the Averroistic theses, whose analysis reveals the evolution of Lull's knowledge and awareness of this pervert philosophy, starting from his enemies' perceptions (see appendix number 1).

The first Parisian work is the *Ars mystica theologiae et philosophiae*, the last one is the *Liber de ente*.

In the *Ars mystica* (November 1309) he opposes to those who put philosophy against theology (*qui posuerunt philosophiam contra theologiam*), a real heresy in Lull's view. For Lull real philosophy should serve and not oppose the *domina theologia*. Slowly Lull's argument becomes more specialised on the Averroist doctrines which he fights against and the identification of his opposer becomes clearer. In the *Liber de perversione entis removenda* (December 1309) Lull attributes the responsibility of the separation of philosophy from theology generically to those philosophers who are too docile towards the ancients' teachings: a few new disciples of ancient philosophers are now the reason of this opposition/disunion (*aliqui novi philosophi qui sunt sequaces antiquorum philosophorum, sunt causa dissensionis*). In the following writings, from January to April 1310, the debate is still vague: that is in *Metaphysica nova*; *Liber novus physicorum et compendiosus*; *Liber de ente infinito*; *Liber correlativorum*; *Liber de praedestinatione et praescientia*. Starting from the *Liber reprobationis aliquorum errorum Averrois* (July 1310) the doctrine which is fought becomes more precise; Lull compiles a list of ten errors identifying their origin in Averroes, who is already mentioned in the title (i.e. he speaks about ten Averroes' opinions against faith – *decem opiniones Averrois quae sunt contra fidem*). Lull's opponents are here those Christians, who follow the philosophical theses attributed to Averroes and, at the same time, believe in Christian dogmas which are opposed to Averroes' theses. They affirm that they believe in what they cannot understand: *fidem autem catholicam dicunt se ipsos credere, intelligere vero nequaquam* (they affirm to believe in Christian faith, but not to understand it). In the *Disputatio Raimundi et Averroistae* (October 1310) Lull uses for the first time the term «Averroist» in order to indicate those Christian philosophers previously called *philosophantes moderni* or *aliqui artistae*. Although the term was already present in the treatises against the unity of the intellect by Albertus Magnus and Thomas Aquinas, it was Ramon who gave this definition its fortune, using it extensively to identify a precise group of Parisian masters. He speaks about «averroista christianus» in the *Liber lamentationis philosophiae* or simply about *averroistae* in the *Liber contradictionis* and in the *Liber de syllogismis contradictoriis*. Together with these «averroistae» another figure appears in these works: the «Raimundista», i.e. a Ramon follower, who defends the true philosophy and refutes the Averroists' false theses. However, the use of the term «averroista» is found, above all, in the works written between January and April 1311; then it almost disappears, in favour of a more and more specific analysis of the doctrinal content.

¹⁷ F. DOMÍNGUEZ-J. GAYÀ, *Life*, cit., p. 108.

The list of the errors which are indicated and fought widens and it is defined with greater precision, and exactly in the *Liber de syllogismis contradictoriis* Blessed Lull presents a list of 44 theses (see appendix number 2), an independent catalogue which represents the basis of Lull's criticism of the Averroists. Ten of these errors are described in the *Liber de ente*, written in September 1311 for the Council of Vienne, where Lull indicates precisely to which texts by Aristotle and Averroes the source can be traced. In this group of so-called anti-Averroist works, one can thus notice an evolution in Lull's perception of the Averroist danger.

In the same way Antoni Bordoy Fernández divides Lull's criticism of Averroism into three phases: 1) a pre-philosophical or theological period; 2) a philosophical period; 3) a period of divulgation. During these three phases the content of his works has a qualitative change, passing from almost total ignorance of Averroism to an in-depth analysis of Averroes and Aristotle's doctrines.¹⁸ Bordoy focuses his attention on 16 works written between 1310 and 1312, subdivided as follows (see appendix number 3).

We can notice that Lull passes from a general and abstract criticism, which does not distinguish Averroes' doctrines from Aristotle's, to a greater accuracy of the arguments that depart from a theological nature, and to a clear identification of Averroist theses and their relations with Aristotelian philosophy. Finally the works which belong to the period of divulgation are characterized by a rhetorical style, reduced length and greater abstraction of concept. A similar progression is evident also in the adaptation of the *Ars* to the dispute with the Averroist. The Lullian *disputatio* is grounded on a new logic, based on a *demonstratio potissima*, that is the syllogism *per aequiparantiam*, which means equality and convertibility of divine dignities.

Ruedi Imbach has examined Lull's anti-Averroist works in an attempt to identify the sources which Lull used and has noticed that, in the first period from July to the end of 1310, Lull used an *elenchus errorum* (different from Tempier's *Syllabus*) in order to formulate the first list of 10 Averroistic theses in the *Liber reprobationis* (July 1310).¹⁹

The works written between 1310 and the beginning of 1311 – between the *Disputatio Raimundi et Averroistae* (December 1310) and the *Liber Natalis Pueri* (January 1311) – represent theses literally copied from the *De erroribus Averrois et Aristotelis*, an anthology of errors previously attributed to Lull himself (see appendix number 4). And exactly the *De erroribus* would be the source of the list of 44 errors compiled by Ramon in the *Liber de syllogismis contradictoriis*.

According to Imbach, Lull never read Averroes and Aristotle's texts which he indicated, for example, in the *Liber de ente*, but he simply copied from the *De erroribus* anthology. The fact that he did not read Averroes and Aristotle does not mean that Lull ignored their doctrines. Likewise, even though he does not indicate

¹⁸ A. BORDOY FERNÁNDEZ, *Ramón Lull y la crítica al averroísmo cristiano*, in «Taula» 37 (2002), pp. 21-35.

¹⁹ R. IMBACH, *Lulle face aux Averroïstes*, cit.

any of these Parisian artists, does not mean that he did not know who among them was a follower of Averroes.

The dialogical structure of many of these works, the spirit itself of Ramon Lull's method based on the encounter and the confrontation with the other-interlocutor-adversary and the testimony of the *Vita coetanea* lead us to suppose that Lull had public disputes with some of these Averroist Christians in Paris. But who were these Averroists who Lull addressed? In those years John de Janduno was already in Paris and was to become in the years immediately after, from 1315, the champion of Averroism of the Faculty of Arts. It is possible that Lull's anti-Averroist activity was addressed also against him (as suggested by F. Van Steenberghe, Ruedi Imbach and recently by Constantin Teleanu).²⁰

Moreover, in my view, the Lull's attack was not addressed in particular to one or more Averroist philosophers, but to what the Averroist Aristotelianism represented for Christianity: i.e. the collapse of the primacy of theology, and of the possibility to prove *rationaliter* the whole reality, both human and divine, that is to say the founding element of his thought and entire work.

There are traces in these Lull's anti-Averroist works of other sources different from the condemnation of 1277 or from the anonymous compilation of the *De erroribus*, which can probably be traced back to the Parisian milieu of the years 1309-1311. One question remains on the nature of these sources: whether they were oral or written.²¹

The Averroist heresy

Lull – as we have seen – identified and opposed with a greater and greater precision the errors of Averroism, to the point when he presented the ten philosophical theses which he considered the most dangerous in the distinction IV of the *Liber de ente*, written specifically for the Council of Vienne: I. *De trinitate*; II. *De incarnatione*; III. *De creatione*; IV. *De omnipotentia Dei*; V. *De sacramento altaris*; VI. *De resurrectione*; VII. *De aeternitate mundi*; VIII. *De intellectu forma corporis*; IX. *De scientia Dei circa particularia*; X. *De partu virginis*. Lull indicates the Averroistic or Aristotelian source for any of these errors, except for the last one (see appendix number 5).

²⁰ *Ibid.*; F. VAN STEENBERGHEN, *La Signification de l'oeuvre anti-averroïste de Raymond Lull*, in «Estudios Lulianos» 4 (1960), pp. 113-128; C. TELEANU, *Art du Signe. La réfutation des Averroïstes de Paris chez Raymond Lulle*, Université de Paris-Sorbonne, Paris 2011 [not seen].

²¹ Regarding the Averroist milieu at the university of Paris you can see H. Riedlinger's rigorous study in Raimundi Lulli Opera Latina 5, Palma de Mallorca 1967, pp. 123-160. Although it is outworn, it can be considered as a good introduction at Ramon Lull's last Parisian stay. H. RIEDLINGER, *Introductio generalis (Qualem Raimundus anno 1309 Parisiorum civitatem invenerit. De facultate artium Parisiensi. De facultate theologica Parisiensi)*, Raimundi Lulli Opera Latina 5, Palma de Mallorca 1967, pp. 5-113.

These single doctrines certainly threatened apart from the principal dogmas of the Catholic Creed (the Trinity and the Incarnation) also the fundamental elements of the metaphysics of Creation, putting into doubt the creation of the world in time (the thesis of the eternity of the world), the existence itself of man's soul (the unicity of the agent intellect), the freedom of action of man and even of God (necessarism and determinism) and Divine omnipotence (*vigor infinitus*: one of the widespread thesis among Parisian artists was in fact that God did not have infinite power, *Deus non est infiniti virgoris*). But the greatest danger, to combat in every possible way, which Lull found in the influence of these new ideas, was in the separation of philosophy from theology, in this stopping of the *intellectus* before the Divine relegated to the area of faith. *Quoniam si fides catholica secundum modum intelligendi est improbabilis, impossibile est, quod sit vera* (Because if the Catholic faith is unprovable, it is not possible that it is true): Lull's entire programme is contained in this sentence from *Vita coetanea*.²² Theology and philosophy are linked with one another in Lull's thought. His is a philosophical theology which offers rational arguments (*rationes necessariae*) and does not have recourse to *auctoritas*. He developed to an extreme point the *fides quaerens intellectum* of the Anselmian theological rationalism. *Fides* and *ratio*, theology and philosophy are on the same level participating together in the process of knowing the Divine. «*Quoniam fides est intellectus illuminatio*», human reason, enlightened in Augustine's way, can succeed in understanding (*intelligere*) the object of faith itself through a way of ascent which leads following transcendent points from sensible knowledge to intelligible knowledge, as far as God (*sensibile – imaginabile – intelligibile*): imagination goes beyond sense, intellect goes beyond imagination, but intellect transcends itself with the help of Divine Grace²³. It is exactly the Faith that allows man, through an *excessus mentis*, to know those truths which transcend the world, according to Isaiah's saying: *Nisi credideritis, non intelligetis* («if you do not believe it, you will not understand it», Is. 7, 9). By limiting knowledge to the field of what is sensible (to the *phantasmata*), Averroism represented for Lull an intolerable perversion, the negation itself of his thought.

The Parisian artists, *aliqui novi philosophi... sequaces antiquorum philosophorum*, were seen by Lull more and more as infidels: the followers of the infidel Muslim Averroes become themselves infidels and are to be converted. It was necessary to stop the Averroist threat, the entrance of «l'Islam dans la philosophie» (in Ernest Renan's words), or even better, of Islam within Christianity, as Otto Keicher specified.²⁴ The anti-Averroist campaign became a mission for the mission, that is useful for the good result of that project which he had direct his attention to with tenacious and unflinching devotion for almost fifty years. Lull, thus, almost anachronistically,

²² RAIMUNDUS LULLUS, *Vita coetanea*, cit., p. 302.

²³ ID., *Liber de quattuordecim articulis fidei*, prol.: Venezia, Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana, Lat. 200 (= 2757) f. 68r.

²⁴ O. KEICHER, *Raymundus Lullus und seine Stellung zur arabischen Philosophie. Mit einem Anhang, erhaltend die zum ersten Male veröffentlichte «Declaratio Raymundi per modum dialogi edita»* (Beiträge zur Geschichte des Philosophie des Mittelalters, VII), Münster 1909.

more than 30 years after the great condemnation, began a stronger and stronger fight against the Averroist enemy and the betrayal of these *philosophantes moderni*. From the doctrinal point of view he did not add anything to the activity carried out by Albertus Magnus and Thomas Aquinas; the greatest contribution that he made to this intellectual fight was his passionate action.

A final comment has to be made. Latin Averroism or radical Aristotelianism did not deny the existence of God nor faith in Christian dogmas, but it created a new model of rationality and new intellectual ambitions, an attitude of superiority in this kind of philosophers. Perhaps it was this demand for intellectual felicity, the ideal of theoretic wisdom, the *summam felicitatem speculari et esse perfectum in scientiis speculativis*²⁵ which inspired the Parisian *artistae*, to make Lull more indignant.

From Paris to Vienne

Gradually Lull convinced himself of the incapacity of the University of Paris, and in particular of the Faculty of Theology, to stem the «pagan» tendencies which had by then taken root in the Faculty of Arts. Together with the «doctrinal» fight against the Averroist, testified by the writings of these years, Lull carried out an intense «diplomatic» activity at the court of Philip the Fair in order to obtain support and protection from the person who was, at that time, the most powerful king in Christendom and who exerted supremacy even over the Pontiff. We have already mentioned the letter of introduction which he obtained from the King and which certainly influenced the positive reception of his Art at the University of Paris. Seven of the twenty-seven works produced during the years 1309-1311 were dedicated to the King of France, *in quo viget hodie defensio veritatis*:²⁶ *Liber de possibili et impossibili*, *Liber natalis pueri*, *Liber lamentationis philosophiae*, *Liber de syllogismis contradictoriis*, *Liber de divina unitate et pluritate*, *Sermones contra Averroistas*, *Liber reprobationis aliquorum errorum Averrois* (this last work was dedicated both to Philip IV and Clement V). In these texts there are constant appeals to the King, asking him to intervene, as in the *Liber reprobationis*:

Ad laudem... Domini nostri... papae quinti domini Clementis et serenissimi Francorum regis... Philippi... reverendissimis dominis supra dictis supplicans humiliter et attentius quanto potest, quatenus eis placeat istum librum multiplicare pro posse, *cum ipsi sint directores ritus fidei christianae [because they are the guides of the Christian faith]*, et ex ipso possint errores contra fidem sanctam catholicam radicitus extirpare.²⁷

²⁵ RAIMUNDUS LULLUS, *Breviculum*, cit., p. 31.

²⁶ J. N. HILLGARTH, *Ramon Lull and Lullism in Fourteenth-Century France*, cit., p. 116.

²⁷ RAIMUNDUS LULLUS, *Liber reprobationis*, in *Opera Latina 156-167 Parisiis anno MCCCX composita*, ed. H. Riedlinger, Turnhout 1978, pp. XIII-521 (Corpus Christianorum. Continuatio Mediaevalis 33; Raimundi Lulli Opera Latina 6), p. 318 (*colophon*).

Ramon placed the King of France on the same level as the Pontiff (*ipsi sint directores ritus fidei christianae*) giving him the right to intervene in religious issues. Certainly Lull who had never been able to obtain the *placet* of the Roman Curia and who was gifted, in my view, with a remarkable «political» sensibility, understood that Philip was the real champion of Christianity: *pugil verus et legalis... columna maxima veritatis* (the true and legal pugilist... the greatest pillar of the Truth), we can read in the *Liber lamentationis philosophiae*. Moreover, in the *Liber Natalis pueri parvuli Christi Iesu* one can read:

Cum ipse [Philippus rex Franciae] sit pugil ecclesiae et defensor fidei christianae, libros et dicta Averrois expelleret et extrahi faceret de Parisiensi studio, taliter quod nullus de cetero auderet allegare, legere vel audire; quia multos errores turpissimos continent contra fidem, et, quod est deterius et periculosius, dictos errores frequenter generant in pluribus et diversis. Et est turpe et dedecus dicere christianis, quod fides magis est improbabilis, quam probabilis vel apparens; quod dicunt et asserunt Averroim haereticum imitantes.²⁸

After the *Sermones contra Averroistas* the name of Philip IV disappears from the prologues and the epilogues of his following works, as if to testify that the hopes placed by Lull in the King were weakening. Philip, who was heavily committed after the conflict with Boniface VIII and thus to exercising his influence on the new pontiff, Clement V, in order to solve the Templar issue, did not seem to be interested in the false Averroist doctrines which were circulating at the University of Paris. However, it was thanks to the King of France's recommendation, it is worth saying it once more, that Lull received the attention and the approval so much desired from the University of Paris.

In the summer of 1311 Clement V announced, finally, the next convocation of a new Council in Vienne, near Lyon in the Dauphine Region. Lull's activity during the Council has to be seen as a continuation of his relations with the Court of France.²⁹ He wrote in the view of this assembly the *Liber de ente* (September 1311), in which the anti-Averroist question is included in a wider programme, composed by ten requests: 1) the foundation of three colleges of languages (Rome, Paris, Toledo); 2) the union of the military orders; 3) the imposition of a tithe in order to finance a new crusade in the Holy Land; 4) the regulation of ecclesiastic prebends and 5) of

²⁸ ID., *Liber Natalis pueri parvuli Christi Iesu*, in *Opera Latina 168-177, Parisiis anno MCCCXI composita* (Corpus Christianorum, Continuatio Mediaevalis 32; Raimundi Lulli Opera latina 7), ed. H. Harada, Turnhout 1975, p. 69 ll. 987-994: «Since he [the King of France] is *the Church's pugilist and the defender of the Christian faith*, he should banish and remove the writings and opinions of Averroes from the University of Paris, in such a way that in future nobody should dare quote them, read them or listen to lectures upon them, because they contain the foulest of errors against our faith, and, what is worse and more dangerous still, these errors often generate others, both many and varied. And it is vile and shameful for a Christian to say that the faith is unprovable or apparent rather than susceptible of proof, as those who mimic the heretic Averroes state and maintain».

²⁹ J. N. HILLGARTH, *Ramon Lull and Lullism in Fourteenth-Century France*, cit., p. 126.

clerical and monastic clothes; 6) the suspension of the Mastership for the philosophers who attack theology; 7) heavy sanctions against usury; 8) an apologetic programme to be carried out in mosques and synagogues, respectively on Friday and Saturday; 9) the reform of legal studies and 10) of medical studies. All these requests are gathered in Part VI of the *Liber de ente* and they have an independent tradition under the title: *Petitio Raymundi in Concilio generali ad acquirendam Terram Sanctam*.³⁰

Besides the distinction IV entirely devoted to Averroes' ten errors, point six of *sexta ordinatio* (and thus of the *Petitio*) is closely linked to Lull's Parisian activity. We can consider it as the last act of his anti-Averroist campaign. Lull summarizes his position in this way:

De sexta ordinatione:

Ordinatum est, quod intellectus faciat scientiam, primo cum sensu et imaginatione, et hoc de rebus corporalibus et imaginabilibus; post ascendit ad obiecta spiritualia, sicut ad Deum, ad angelos, ad animas racionales obiective; et faciat scientiam cum ipsis et de ipsis, quae imaginabiles neque sensibiles non sunt.³¹

Et ideo aliqui philosophi credunt philosophice improbare sanctam fidem catholicam, quae sensibilis et imaginabilis non est; et ideo patitur fides. Et passio multiplicatur, quia multi christiani dubitant ipsam esse veram, eo quia antiqui philosophi dixerunt multa contra fidem. Hoc pro tanto dico, quia bonum esset, quod dominus papa et reverendi domini cardinales et praelati ordinarent, quod nulla philosophia legeretur contra theologiam, sed legeretur philosophia naturalis, quae concordaretur cum theologia. Quae philosophia esset vera et necessaria, ipsa existente ordinata et constituta ex principiis primitivis, veris et necessariis, in prima, secunda et tertia distinctione significatis; et cum tali vero philosophia omnes falsae philosophiae destrui possunt.³²

Qui autem talem ordinationem facere potest, et ipsam impedit, ipse est contra finem, ratione cuius Deus agit. Et talis autem non potest Deum decipere neque cogere, neque a suis manibus evadere in die iudicii. *Qui habet aures, audiat* (Marc. 4, 9); et qui non habet, conscientiam habeat.³³

³⁰ E. LONPRÉ, *Deux opuscules inédits du B. Raymond Lulle*, in «La France Franciscaine» 18 (1935), pp. 145-54; for an insight on Lull's requests during the Council of Vienne see C. Compagno contribution.

³¹ These few lines contain the entire gnoseology of Ramon Lull.

³² I translate from the second paragraph: «For this reason some philosophers think that it is not possible to prove philosophically the Catholic faith, which (the faith) would not be perceptible neither with senses nor with imagination; and therefore the faith suffers. So suffering increases because many Christians doubt that the faith is true for the fact that ancient philosophers argued (many things) against faith. Consequently I say that it would be good if the pontiff and the cardinals and prelates order that philosophy is not lead against theology, but that natural philosophy agrees with theology. Philosophy should be true and necessary because built upon primitive principles, true and necessary, illustrated in the first, second and third distinction; and with this kind of philosophy all the other false philosophies can be destroyed».

³³ This last sentence sounds like a *damnatio Raymundi*; for the 6th *ordinatio* see RAIMUNDUS LULLUS, *Liber de ente*, in *Opera Latina 178-189*, cit., pp. 242-243.

The Council opened on 16 April 1311 and closed on 5 May of the following year (1312), and confirmed the supremacy of Philip IV over the Papacy. In Renan's words the Council of Vienne was the council of the King of France. It was also for Lull a partial success: the *Inter sollicitudines* bull established the foundation of language schools in Paris, Oxford, Bologna and Salamanca. Then on 1 December 1312 the *Redemptor noster* bull set a tithe in order to finance a new crusade. The debate on the unification of the military orders was included in the section related to the abolition of the Templars (strongly desired by Philip and ratified on 3 April 1312 with the *Vox in excelso* bull) but the unification was never realised. In *De locutione angelorum*, written in Montpellier in May 1312, immediately after the end of the Council, Lull affirms that he himself had presented his petitions to the Pope and the Cardinals, obtaining their approval on the *studia* and the crusade to the Holy Land.

* * *

The intense years of a doctrinal commitment, and not only doctrinal, against those *moderni philosophi* who threatened the Christian faith did not in the end receive any official recognition, «Averroism became despite his philippics the greatest article of French exportation». ³⁴ Such a failure can be partly attributed to the lack of interest which the Averroistic issue and Lull's project in general aroused among the King of France and the Papacy distracted from internal political interests. But Lull's commitment in defence of the truth of Christianity did not waver. More than forty years had passed since Ramon had put himself in the service of God, years in which his faith had been reinforced, overcoming disappointments and misunderstandings (as some Lullian works testify such as *Desconhort*, *Cant de Ramon*).

«Nam iam elapsi erant anni quadraginta, postquam totum cor suum et totam animam suam, omnes et totas vires suas et totam mentem suam in Deum <Raimundus> direxerat». ³⁵

With these words the story of the *Vita coetanea* ends, finished before he left for Vienne, with what seems to be an introduction. The text, in fact, circulated among the Vienne Council, almost as if to contrast the «bizarre» reputation of a fool, visionary, utopian man (*phantasticus*) which Lull had acquired among his contemporaries and of which he was perfectly aware, as the *Liber disputationis Petri et Raimundi* – known also as *Phantasticus* – testifies. ³⁶ This short work, in the form of

³⁴ HAYOUN-DE LIBERA, *Averroè e l'averroismo*, cit., p. 95.

³⁵ *Vita coetanea*, p. 303, ll. 728-730: «By now 40 years had elapsed since he had first directed his heart and soul, body and mind toward God».

³⁶ RAIMUNDI LULLI, *Disputatio Petri et Raimundi* (Raimundi Lulli Opera latina 16), ed. A. Oliver et al., Turnhout 1988, p. 14: «Mox uero clericus, ut haec uerba audiuit, risum profudit uehementer. Credebam, inquit, Raimunde, te phantasticum esse. Modo uero per haec tua uerba cognosco te non modo phantasticum, sed esse phantasticissimum» (As soon as the clergyman Peter heard those words [the petitions which Lull brought at the Council] laughed loudly. Ramon, – said – I thought that you were a crazy Utopian. Now from what you are saying I have understood that you are not only crazy but the craziest visionary in the world).

a dialogue between Ramon himself and a not-better identified clergyman Peter (his alter-ego), was written on the way to Vienne, and it gives us a magnificent summary of the Lullian experience. Besides the presentation of the requests which Blessed Lull declares that he wishes to take to the Council (the foundation of colleges for languages, the unification of the military orders, the condemnation of university Averroism), which contextualize the text in a precise historical moment, the by then eighty-year-old Ramon summarized in a few lines the meaning of his entire existence: his tenacious, complete and even «fool» devotion to the task God called him to:

Homo fui in matrimonio copulatus, prolem habuit, competenter diues, lasciuus et mundanus. Omnia, ut Deo honorem et bonum publicum possem procurare et sanctam fidem exaltare, libenter dimisi. Arabicum didici, pluries ad praedicandum saracenis exiui, propter fidem captus fui, incarceratus, uerberatus. Quadriginta quinque annis, ut ecclesiam ad bonum publicum et christianos principes mouere possem, laboraui. Nunc senex sum, nunc pauper sum, in eodem proposito sum, in eodem usque ad mortem mansurus, si Dominus ipse dabit³⁷

Appendix I

Works written in Paris between 1309 and September 1311:³⁸

- 154.**³⁹ *Ars mystica theologiae et philosophiae* (Paris, November 1309)
- 155. *Liber de peruersione entis removenda* (Paris, December 1309)
- 156. *Metaphysica nova et compendiosa* (Paris, January 1310)
- 157. *Liber novus Physicorum et compendiosus* (Paris, February 1310)
- 158. *Liber de ente infinito* (Paris, February 1310)
- 159. *Liber correlativorum innatorum* (Paris, March 1310)
- 160. *Liber de praedestinatione et praescientia* (Paris, April 1310)
- 161.** *Liber de modo naturali intelligendi* (Paris, May 1310)
- 162. *Supplicatio Raimundi venerabilibus et sublimis sacratissimae Theologiae professoribus et baccalariis Studii parisiensis* (Paris, June 1310)

³⁷ *Ivi*, p. 15: «I was once a married man, and begot children; I was rich, lascivous and wordly: Willing did I forsake everything to advance the glory of God, the good of men, and the holy faith. I learned Arabic; often have I departed to preach to the Saracens. Because of my religion I have been seized, imprisoned and whipt. Forty-five years have I laboured to draw the Church and Christian princes to advantage of men. Now I am old and poor, yet steadfast will I remain unto death, if God wills it».

³⁸ These works have been edited in volumes V-VIII of the Raimundi Lulli Opera latina (ROL) series.

³⁹ Works numbered following the ROL catalogue's order, see F. DOMÍNGUEZ, *Works*, in A. FIDORA-E. RUBIO (eds.), *Raimundus Lullus*, cit., pp. 125-242.

163. *De conversione subiecti et praedicati et medii* (Paris, July 1310)
 164. *Liber reprobationis aliquorum errorum Averrois* (Paris, July 1310)
 165. *Liber in quo declaratur quod fides sancta catholica est magis probabilis quam improbabilis* (Paris, August 1310)
 166. *Liber de possibili et impossibili* (Paris, October 1310)
 167. *De fallaciis* (Paris, November 1310)
 168. *Disputatio Raimundi et Averroistae* (Paris, 1310)
 169. *Liber natalis pueri parvuli Christi Iesu* (Paris, January 1311)
 170. *Liber lamentationis philosophiae* (Paris, February 1311)
 171. *Liber contradictionis* (Paris, February 1311)
 172. *Liber de syllogismis contradictoriis* (Paris, February 1311)
 173. *Liber de divina unitate et pluralitate* (Paris, February 1311)
 174. *Sermones contra errores Averrois* (Paris, April 1311)
 175. *Liber de efficiente et effectu* (Paris, May 1311)
 176. *Liber facilis scientiae* (Paris, June 1311)
 177. *Quaestiones factae supra Librum facilis scientiae* (Paris, June 1311)
 178. *Liber de Deo ignoto et mundo ignoto* (Paris, June 1311)
 179. *Liber de forma Dei* (Paris, July 1311)
 180. *Liber de divina existentia et agentia* (Paris, August 1311)
 181. *Liber de quaestione valde alta et profunda* (Paris, August 1311)
 188. *Liber de ente, quod simpliciter est per se et propter se existens et agens* (Paris, September 1311)

Lost works: 182. *Liber de beatitudine*, 183. *De articulis rationum divinarum*, 184. *De maiestate divina et individua*, 185. *De proprietatibus Dei*, 186. *Liber intellectus*, 187. *Ars navigandi*.

Appendix 2

Errors of Aristotle and Averroes listed in *Liber de syllogismis contradictoriis*.⁴⁰

1. Deus non est infiniti uigoris.
2. Deus non est trinus.
3. Deus non possit incarnari.
4. Deus non potest, quod non est in actu nec in potentia.
5. Deus non potest agere immediate in ista inferiora.
6. Deus non est causa efficiens angeli.
7. Deus non potest facere angelum.
8. Deus non fecit mundum.
9. Deus non potest de nouo ponere unam stellam in caelo.
10. Deus non posset facere unam speciem de nouo.

⁴⁰ RAIMUNDUS LULLUS, *Liber de syllogismis contradictoriis*, in *Opera Latina 168-177*, cit., pp. 159-198.

11. Deus non posset facere resurrectionem.
12. Deus non potest esse sine angelis.
13. Deus non potest esse sine caelo.
14. Deus non intelligit particularia.
15. Deus nihil intelligit extra se.
16. Mundus est aeternus.
17. Motus est aeternus.
18. Ex nihilo nihil fit.²³
19. Materia est aeterna.
20. Generatio est aeterna.
21. Omnes species sunt aeternae.
22. Intellectus non est forma dans esse corporis.
23. Intellectus est unus in numero in omnibus hominibus.
24. Intellectus agens est substantia, non potentia.
25. Impossibile est hominem habere felicitatem angeli omnio, neque similem, nisi breui tempore
26. Impossibile est Deum cum homine facere unum suppositum in essentia.
27. Impossibile est esse iudicium.
28. Impossibile est esse daemones.
29. Infernus nihil est.
30. Paradisus nihil est.
31. Impossibile est hominem habere uitam aeternam.
32. Impossibile est uirginem parere.
33. Impossibile est hominem non generatum ab homine esse.
34. Impossibile est eundem, si sit, esse eiusdem speciei.
35. Impossibile est accidents sine subiecto.
36. Impossibile est duo contraria sub esse perfecto esse in eodem.
37. Impossibile est actiuum approximatum passiuo, ut talia sunt, quin sit actio.
38. Impossibile est idem in numero resurgere.
39. Impossibile est corpus transire per corpus sine performatione.
40. Impossibile est plura corpora se pati inuicem.
41. Impossibile est corpus idem numero essentialiter non habere easdem operationes in specie et specialiter necessarias.
42. Impossibile est eundem hominem numero esse sine eisdem dispositionibus necessariis.
43. Impossibile est esse caelum empyreum.
44. Deus non potest perpetuare ens novum.
- 44a] Deus non intelligit infinita.

Appendix 3

The three phases of the Lullian anti-Averroist works:⁴¹

work	year	period
<i>Liber de natalis pueri paruli Christi Iesu</i>	January 1310	Pre-philosophical or theological period
<i>Liber reprobationis aliquorum erroris Averrois quos contra Christi fidem sanctam catholicam aliqui nituntur inducere</i>	August 1310	
<i>Disputatio Raimundi et Averroistae</i>	1310/1311	
<i>De erroribus Averrois et Aristotelis</i>	February 1311	Philosophical period
<i>Liber contradictionis</i>	February 1311	
<i>Liber de syllogismis contradictionis</i>	February 1311	
<i>Liber de lamentationis philosophiae Liber de divina unitate et pluralitate</i>	February 1311	
<i>Liber de eddiciente et effectu</i>	May 1311	
<i>Sermones contra errores Averroes</i>	April 1311	
<i>Liber de ente quod simpliciter est per se et propter se existens et agens</i>	September 1311	
<i>Liber disputationis Petri et Raimundi sive Phantasticus</i>	1311, during the Council of Vienne	
<i>De locutione angelorum</i>	May 1312	
<i>Liber de sermonibus factis de decem praeceptis</i>	August 1312	

⁴¹ See A. BORDOY FERNANDEZ, *Ramón Lull y la crítica al averroísmo cristiano*, cit.

Appendix 4

*De erroribus Averrois et Aristotelis*⁴²

1. Deus non est infiniti uigoris. Auerroes, in II *Caeli et Mundi*.
2. Deus non est trinus. Auerroes, XII *Metaphysicae*.
3. Deus non possit incarnari. Potest capi ab Aristotele et Auerroe, VIII *Physicorum*, et XII *Metaphysicae*, quia Deus est actus purus et nulli materiae coniunctus ullo modo.
4. Deus non potest, quod non est in actu nec in potentia. Quia quod fit, potest fieri, ut patet IX *Metaphysicae* et II *Peri Hermeneias*. Si ergo non esset in potentia, fieret impossibile.
5. Deus non potest agere immediate in ista inferiora. Aristoteles, I *Metaphysicae*, et Auerroes, IX et XII *Metaphysicae*.
6. Deus non est causa efficiens angeli. Auerroes, IV *Caeli et Mundi*, et XII *Metaphysicae*; et ab Aristotele idem potest haberi.
7. Deus non posset angelum de nouo facere. Potest capi ab Aristotele, I *Caeli et Mundi*. Quia, cum angelus sit perpetuus aperte, prius non erit, nouus aperte autem. Et quia aeternum non est factibile ac minus substantia, et angelus est aeternus.
8. Deus non fecit mundum de nouo. Aristoteles, I *Caeli* et VIII *Physicorum*. Quia est aeternus.
9. Deus non posset de nouo ponere unam stellam in caelo. Auerroes, II *Caeli et Mundi*. Quia tunc moueret cum fatigatione et poena, et motus esset corruptibilis. Et caelum est perfectum, ut patet I *Caeli*. Hoc autem non esset, si ei deficeret una stella.
10. Deus non posset facere unam speciem de nouo. Aristoteles, I *Caeli*. Quia species sunt aeternae, et tunc mundus esset imperfectus.
11. Deus non posset facere resurrectionem. Aristoteles, in libro *De generatione*. Quia quorum substantia deperit, impossibile est eos in numero reduci, quae identitas requiritur ad resurrectionem.
12. Deus non posset esse sine angelis nec sine caelo. Primo, quia haec sunt aeterna, quae non possunt non esse; secundo, quia tunc destrueretur ordo uniuersi et per consequens bonum, quia in ordine consistit bonum uniuersi, ut patet XII *Metaphysicae*.
13. Deus non intelligit particularia. Auerroes, XII *Metaphysicae*.
14. Deus nihil intelligit extra se. Aristoteles, XII *Metaphysicae*, et Auerroes ibidem.
15. Mundus est aeternus. Aristoteles et Auerroes, I *Caeli* et VIII *Physicorum*.
16. Motus est aeternus. Aristoteles et Auerroes, VIII *Physicorum*.
17. Ex nihilo nihil fit. Aristoteles, I *Physicorum* et I *De generatione*, et Auerroes ibidem et VIII *Physicorum*.
18. Materia est aeterna. Aristoteles, I *Physicorum* et I *De generatione*, et Auerroes ibidem.
19. Generatio est aeterna. Aristoteles, I *De generatione* et Auerroes.
20. Omnes species sunt aeternae. Aristoteles, I *Caeli*.

⁴² RAIMUNDUS LULLUS, *De erroribus Averrois et Aristotelis*, in *Opera Latina 178-189*, cit., pp. 247-257.

21. Intellectus non est forma dans esse corpori. Auerroes, III *De anima*.
22. Intellectus est unus in numero. Auerroes, III *De anima*.
23. Intellectus agens est substantia et non potentia. Auerroes, III *De anima*.
24. Impossibile est hominem habere felicitatem angeli nec similem, nisi breui tempore. Auerroes, III *De anima*; quia non intelligimus separata nisi in fine uitae; et ab Aristotele, XII *Metaphysicae* in illa parte, deducto autem.
25. Impossibile est Deum cum homine facere unum in esse. Potest haberi ex VIII *Metaphysicae*; quia ex duobus actu non fit unum per se. Homo autem et Deus sunt duo actu.
26. Impossibile est esse iudicium. Potest haberi ex libro *De generatione*; quia idem in numero non potest regenerari.
27. Impossibile est esse daemones. Potest haberi in IX *Metaphysicae*; quia in separatis et aeternis non est peccatum nec malum, quae sunt in daemonibus.
28. Infernus nihil est. Et istud sequitur ex duobus immediate praecedentibus. Paradisus nihil est. Istud sequitur ex immediate praecedentibus.
30. Impossibile est hominem habere uitam aeternam. Potest haberi a I *Caeli*, quia substantia corruptibilis perpetuari non potest.
31. Impossibile est uirginem parere. Et potest haberi per magnam partem philosophiae.
32. Impossibile est hominem non generatum ab homine esse. Istud patet ex praecedenti.
33. Impossibile est eundem, si sit, esse eiusdem speciei cum aliis. Potest haberi ab Auerroee in VIII *Physicorum*, ubi probat, quod una species in animatis perfectis non potest habere duos modos generationis distinctos in specie.
34. Impossibile est accidens esse sine subiecto. Illud potest haberi in *Praedicamentis* et I *Physicorum* et VII *Metaphysicae*.
35. Impossibile est contraria sub esse perfecto esse in eodem. Potest haberi ex libro *De generatione*.
36. Impossibile est actiuum approximatum passiuo, ut talia sunt, quin sit actio. Aristoteles, I *De generatione*.
37. Impossibile est idem in numero resurgere. Aristoteles, in libro *De generatione*.
38. Impossibile est corpus transire per corpus, si non cedat, sine foramine. IV *Physicorum*.
39. Impossibile est corpora esse in uno loco proprio. IV *Physicorum*.
40. Impossibile est idem corpus numero essentialiter non habere easdem operationes in specie, quia operatio attingit formam, et transmutatio materiam. Commentator, I *Physicorum*.
41. Impossibile est idem corpus in numero esse sine eisdem dispositionibus necessariis. Istud sequitur ex praecedentibus.
42. Impossibile est esse caelum empyreum et crystallinum. Potest primo haberi ex VI *Physicorum*, quod omne corpus est mobile et tales caeli non sunt mobiles; secundo ex tota astrologia, quae non ponit nisi nouem sphaeras; et Aristoteles II *Caeli et Mundi* non uidetur ponere nisi octo.

Appendix 5

The ten Averroes' theses in the *Liber de ente*:

- I. *De trinitate*: Deus non est trinus. Averroes XII *Metaphysicae*
- II. *De incarnatione*: Deus non potuit incarnari [...] ab Aristotele et Averroee VIII *Physicorum* et XII *Metaphysicorum*.
- III. *De creatione*: Deus non fecit mundum de novo, Aristoteles I *Caeli et mundi* et VIII *Physicorum*
- IV. *De omnipotentia Dei*: Deus non est infiniti vigoris. Averroes in II *Caeli et mundi*.
- V. *De sacramento altaris*: Impossibile est accidens esse sine subiecto. Illud potest haberi in *Praedicamentis* et I *Posteriorum* et I *Physicorum* et VII *Metaphysicorum*
- VI. *De resurrectione*: Deus non potest facere resurrectionem. Aristoteles in libro *De generatione*.
- VII. *De aeternitate mundi*: Deus non potest esse sine angelis nec sine caelo [...] ut patet XII *Metaphysicae*.
- VIII. *De intellectu forma corporis*: Intellectus non est forma, dans esse corpori. Averroes III *De anima*.
- IX. *De scientia Dei circa particularia*: Deus non intelligit particularia. Averroes XII *Metaphysicae*.
- X. *De partu virginis*: Impossibile est virginem parere. (no source indicated).