

Preface

The philosophical concept of «ars artium», the tradition of which dates back to the Alexandrian school, passed from Greek (τέχνη) into Latin (*ars*) through the Latin Stoic definition of art as a «set of percepts¹ exercised together toward some end useful in life»². This has many implications such as a prudent life, divine contemplation, comprehension of nature and productive operations. This collection of principles —manifest in every art— is an implicit justification of the speculative life, and therefore, in a broad sense, of wisdom and happiness. It is not surprising that Isidore of Seville said:

Item aliqui doctorum philosophiam in nomine et partibus suis ita definierunt: Philosophia est rerum divinarum humanarumque, in quantum homini possibile est, scientia probabilis. Aliter: Philosophia est ars artium et disciplina disciplinarum³.

-
- ¹ John of Dacia had defined *ars* as «set of percepts» (*collectio plurium preceptorum*) by the time the term *praeceptum* became *principium*: «Ars enim, ut dicit Tullius, est collectio principiorum ad eundem finem operis sui tendentium», Albertus Magnus, *Ethica I*, VI, 10, ed. A. BORGNET, (Opera 7), Vives, Paris, 1891, p. 97a. Despite this, *praeceptum* kept a juridical and practical sense, e.g. in rhetoric and medicine, while *principium* denoted a high speculative degree in any discipline.
 - ² The Ciceronian definition of *ars-techne* was transmitted to the Middle Ages by the grammarian Diomedes: «Tullius hoc modo eam definit ‘ars est rei cuiusque scientia usu vel traditione vel ratione percepta tendens ad usum aliquem vitae necessarium’», Diomedes, *Grammatici latini I*, ed. H. KEIL, Leipzig 1857, p. 421.
 - ³ Isidorus Hispalensis, *Etymologiarum sive originum libri XX*, Lib. II, xxiv, 9-10: «Again some of the learned have defined philosophy in name and in its parts in this way: philosophy is the provable knowledge (probabilis scientia) of human and divine things, insofar as this is possible for a human. Otherwise: philosophy is the art of arts and the discipline of disciplines», *The Etymologies of Isidore of Seville*, edited and translated by S. A. BARNEY – W. J. LEWIS – J. A. BEACH – O. BERGHOF, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2006, p. 80a.

The medieval masters considered the liberal (*trivium-quadrivium*) and mechanical arts as parts of philosophy, in which they included speculation on immaterial entities, nature, and language. Consequently, defining philosophy as *ars artium et disciplina disciplinarum* meant accepting all parts of the sciences. In accordance with this conception, Ramon Llull formulated his own project of *Ars magna* in order to gather each part of philosophy into the one unique *ars artium*.

To commemorate the 700th anniversary of the renowned Mallorcan philosopher, University of Porto held a colloquium in which Lullian scholars dealt with different parts of the Lullian art project. The colloquium *Ars artium sive ars magna: The Roots of Llull's Artistic Project (Ramon Llull's 700th Anniversary)* took place at the Faculty of Arts on 29-30 October 2015, organized by the research unit Instituto de Filosofia (Gabinete de Filosofia Medieval / Medieval and Early Modern Philosophy thematic line), with the support and funding of the Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia and the University of Porto. This volume collects the papers presented at that meeting, covering the issues connected to the Lullian conception of *ars*: method, logical and mathematical problems, psychology and philosophy of nature, the medieval theory of science, literary theory and the historical reception of Llull's work.

The volume starts with Constantin Teleanu (Paris). He proposes a *tour-de-force* going back to the ancient origin of the concept of *ars artium*. The first definition of this philosophical syntagma was very close to speculative life in the Alexandrian school. Therefore, Teleanu attempts to establish an interpretative guide in order to provide a place for Lullian art in the tradition that dates back to late antiquity. In the second part of his paper, he points out how this expression can explain the first formulation of the Lullian project in the *Liber contemplationis*. Scholars consider that work as an early treatise prior to Lullian art formulations.

The contribution of Celia López Alcalde (Porto) offers an approach to the historical relation between anatomical disciplines —ancient treatises and medieval comments about the soul— and the Lullian conception of the intellectual operations. Llull went beyond the tradition, according to his epistemological conception, describing the sections of the brain and their functions. He seems to hold that the rational parts of the soul depend on their physical constitution in the brain and heart, a position that is contrary to the main view, which locates in the brain only the faculties of perception.

Antoni Bordoy (Palma de Mallorca) introduces into the medieval debate, implicit in Lullian art, on the notion of continuous and discrete quantity in the *quadrivium* disciplines: arithmetic and geometry. Bordoy, after exposing the

Aristotelian definitions of quantity, suggests that the question about point and number units depends on the notion of matter. The notion of matter set limits to this issue, since the abstract unity could be applied to the body's continuous quantity without denying the abstraction of number and magnitude made by the intellect. At this point, Llull shows his most syncretic aspect, indicating that metaphysical unity pertains to first being while quantity belongs to entities that have matter. Consequently, the substantial sphere joins the discrete and the continuous perspectives of quantity.

José Higuera Rubio (Porto) points out how the medieval conception of the division of sciences is latent in the Lullian Art. The debate focuses on the Aristotelian distinction of *art-science*, as well as on the implicit dichotomy of demonstration and artistic production. In his own way, Llull responded through the choice of a set of principles, *substantialia et accidentalia*, from the Arabic-Latin tradition transmitted by the Latin versions of al-Fārābī's *De Scientiis*, where those metaphysical principles generated the other arts and sciences.

Roger Friedlein (Bochum) deals with the literary aspects of the Lullian dialogue. On the one hand, he offers traditional aspects of philosophical dialogues in which the elucidation of the atmosphere and characters is the main narrative strategy. On the other hand, he focuses on the symbolic and semantic conception of the characters' voices, since each one represents a philosophical conception that is vindicated or attacked by the other characters of the dialogue. To conclude, Friedlein offers a reconstruction of the Lullian dialogue in terms of traditional narrative strategies.

In the next section of the volume, three contributions throw a new light on the reception of Llull's work in the Iberian region and modern philosophy. Through the figure of Fernando de Cordoba, Rafael Ramis Barceló (Palma de Mallorca) introduces the contrasts between Scotism, Lullism and Antilullism, emphasizing the philosophical oppositions of these philosophical perspectives that Fernando de Cordoba underwent. It can be seen as an evolution of the Lullian reception, a paradoxical devotion in the midst of the contradictions generated by other lines of thought.

Francisco Díaz Marcilla (Lisbon) studies the Portuguese works considered Lullistic (*Leal conselheiro*, *Boosco deleitoso*) to show unrevealed passages of Llull's works in order to illustrate the ways in which Llull's works were read and their circulation among the Portuguese clerical and secular communities.

Finally, José Portugal dos Santos Ramos (Santana da Feira, Brazil) connects Descartes' dreams with the Lullian universalizing art project. In Descartes'

descriptions of his dreams, he gathered symbols that match Lullian representations, which is not an accident when we consider the knowledge of Llull that Descartes had through Beeckman and the intellectual atmosphere of his time.

The volume closes with a section on novelties referring to the Lullian bibliography, which includes a review of an a documentary by Alessandro Tessari (Padova) showing the places in Italy Ramon Llull traversed, leaving behind some of his works.

With this publication the editors and contributors recognize and praise two of the main sources for Lullian scholars in the late 20th and early 21st centuries. The first source is the critical edition of Llull's Latin works (Raymundi Opera Latina - *ROL*) managed by the Raimundus-Lullus-Institut staff, based at Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg, which was first coordinated by Charles Lohr, later by Fernando Domínguez Reboiras until his retirement in 2009, and is now coordinated by Viola Tenge-Wolf. The second is the online *Lullian Database* headed by Anthony Bonner —since 1995— (<http://orbita.bib.ub.edu/llull/>) which gathers the information on Llull's works (both original and attributed), Lullian manuscripts digitalized by the Lullus-Institut (<http://freimore.uni-freiburg.de/lullus/index.html>), the catalogues of the Lullian *corpus*, bibliographical information, the long list of Lullist and the digital version of *Studia Lulliana* (<http://ibdigital.uib.es/greenstone/collect/studiaLulliana/>).

In short, this special issue of *Mediaevalia* seeks to pay tribute to Ramon Llull and to show the progress of the philosophical studies on the illustrious philosopher and the history of his astonishing heritage.

José Higuera Rubio*
Celia López Alcalde*

* Instituto de Filosofia da Universidade do Porto (Gabinete de Filosofia Medieval /Medieval and Early Modern Philosophy), Via Panorâmica s/n, 4150-564 Porto, Portugal.