

Editing Texts with a Multilingual Tradition The Case of Ramon Llull

Albert Soler

The existence of a vast multilingual tradition of manuscripts of many of the works written by the multi-faceted Majorcan writer Ramon Llull (1232-1316) is a specific, unusual phenomenon in medieval European culture.¹

Llull was a layman lacking any kind of formal academic education,² who during the second half of the 13th century developed a spiritual and intellectual interests. This led him to educate himself and to write an ambitious body of work, both regarding size (265 titles) and scope (on the most varied topics, and in all genres and shapes), and, in view of his goals (converting infidels and training believers) he wrote his originals in Latin, Catalan and Arabic. Llull's was, therefore, an early example of one of the most relevant late medieval advances in the world of knowledge: that of giving lay people access to a cultural sphere which hitherto had been reserved to the clergy.

The fact that a layman like Llull had access to high written culture is an effect of these changes; however, a case like Llull's is not only a consequence, but also a factor leading to innovation in production modes and in the way knowledge was disseminated. These developments account for the fact that some of his works have been preserved in various languages. This paper shall attempt to explain, firstly, how and in which

¹ This work has greatly benefited from the suggestions provided by a great number of research colleagues, whom I warmly thank for their generous patience and interest: Lola Badia, Anthony Bonner, Lluís Cifuentes, Montserrat Lluch, Sadurní Martí and Joan Santanach. Also, this research has been carried out within the DGES BFF-1200 project, funded by the Spanish Education Ministry, and also within the SGR 2001 00286 research group of the DURSI of the Generalitat de Catalunya.

² He said it himself on several occasions: “Confiteor, quod ego Raimundus sum illitteratus, et per *Artem generalem* multos libros feci, forte plus quam centum, Dei semper gratia ministrante.” (Ramon Llull, *Liber de experientia realitatis Artis generalis*, 1308). There is no evidence that Llull was ever received into any religious order, nor even of his being a Franciscan tertiary; see Albert Soler, “Espiritualitat i cultura: Els laics i l'accés al saber a final del segle XIII a la corona d'Aragó”, *Studia Lulliana* 38 (1998), pp. 3-26; n. 1.

context these versions were produced; and secondly, how they affect the edition of Lull’s works.

1. Multilingualism as an innovation in text production and dissemination modes

Llull plays an unusual role within the culture of his age. His position was strangely independent from all the institutions which at the time harbored or produced knowledge, and created the tools for the dissemination of this knowledge: the Court, universities, the Church in general, and mendicant orders specifically. Nevertheless, he did have a close relationship with them all, and he resorted to them both to create and to disseminate his own work.

The wisdom Llull wants to disseminate is a radically new, efficient way of transmitting faith through knowledge. Hence his anxiety to reach all types of audiences: from the common people, possessing a very limited textual competence, to university clerics, but also wealthy laymen with a more usual connection with written culture, and last but not least, infidels.³ This task, which he viewed as a personal mission, led him to develop all kinds of strategies in order to communicate and disseminate his ideas; these strategies were as unthinkable for a university *magister*, as they might have been for a troubadour.⁴

³ Llull was much aware of the how much lay people wanted to have access, in their own language, to theological speculation, and also of the need to create works of this kind in vernacular: “The reason why we have expressed this *amancia* [= the *Ars amativa*, 1290] in the vernacular tongue, is so that men who do not know Latin might possess its art and its doctrine [...]” (“la entenció per què nós esta amància posam en vulgar, és per ço que los hòmens qui no saben latí pusquen aver art e doctrina [...]” *Obres de Ramon Lull*, 21 vols. (Palma de Mallorca, 1906-50) (=ORL), 17: 7; this does not prevent him from writing, also in Latin, works suitable for laymen: “Et etiam facimus istum librum propter aliquos homines laicos, habentes intellectum subtilem et magnam voluntatem ad cognoscendum divinam trinitatem et incarnationem, ut per magnam notitiam de Deo possint ipsum multum amare et contemplari”. *Liber de actu maiori*, 1313, *Raimundi Lulli Opera Latina*, 29 vols. (Palma de Mallorca, Turnhout, 1959-...) (=ROL) 1: 165-6.

⁴ It is impossible to imagine intellectuals like the theologian Thomas Aquinas or the jurist Ramon de Penyafort, both contemporaries of Llull’s, writing a novel like *Blaquerna* or an autobiographical poem like *Desconhort*. And although the production by a troubadour like Cerverí de Girona, also his contemporary, shows a great interest in his work being a vehicle for knowledge and instruction, Cerverí did not go as far as to write theological or philosophical treatises in Latin, suitable for higher education.

The convergence of both phenomena, Lull's specific position in the cultural sphere of his age and his desire to disseminate a message of salvation, accounts for the usage of three languages for his writings: Catalan vernacular for laymen, Latin for the clergy, and Arabic for infidels. This also accounts for the manifold topics, genres and literary forms Lull used in his work: philosophical, theological, medical, astronomical and legal treatises, poems, novels, encyclopaediae, letters, sermons, collections of *exempla* and proverbs, texts of his Art with an almost algebraic appearance, mystic prose, epistolary prose, verse, *quaestiones*, etc. etc.

A significant example of Lull's concern about the dissemination of his work and the specific characteristics of this process is provided by his will, granted in Majorca on April 26, 1313, which includes various provisions resulting from this concern. The initiative and the funding for the process, in this case, were private: most of his estate was to be used for the translation and dissemination of the last books he had written. The format of the resulting manuscripts remains within the usual codicological rules, but the application to vernacular texts was a novelty: they were to be copied in parchment, both in Romance language and in Latin ("fiant inde et scribantur in pergamento in romancio et latino"). The locations he provides in order to ensure the survival of the works belong both to the church and to the private sphere and, what is more remarkable, they are strategically distributed abroad: these codices are to be sent to the Carthusian Monastery of Vauvert in Paris, and to the home of the Genoese patrician Perceval Spinola. Other books, which he ordered to be copied with the rest of his funds, he left to monasteries and convents in Palma de Mallorca, a Church sphere, but not necessarily a scholarly one; he also explicitly demanded that they should be available to anyone, and not only to the clergy.⁵

⁵ The will has been reproduced and published in volume 18 of the *ROL*. In it, Lull provides that his books should be kept chained to the closets-cum-bookstalls of churches ("ponantur in armario cuiuslibet ecclesiae, in qua illos dabunt, cum catena") and that they should be available to anybody interested in them ("quilibet ipsius ecclesiae uolens illos legere, possit ipsos legere et uidere"). The will to make his books available for public consultation can also be seen in the fund created at the Vauvert Monastery, as shown by a note to ms. 16111 at the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, which Lull had donated to the Sorbonne library.

It is known that Llull also used the infrastructure, the resources and the scribes of the lords and institutions with whom he was in contact with, but it must be remembered that he had no systematic, stable relationship with one single centre.

It is within this context of proselytism and innovation in dissemination strategies that we should consider Llull’s concern for the multilingual dissemination of some of his works.

1.1 Multilingualism in the creation of Lull’s works

Most of the work written by Lull has been preserved in Latin; a smaller, though in no way negligible part, has a double version in Catalan and Latin; finally, an even smaller part is written exclusively in Catalan. The figures are quite illustrative: out of approximately 265 works he wrote, 57 have been preserved in Catalan, and from these, 20 are only in Catalan and the other 37 have a double Catalan-Latin version.⁶ So far, none of the works has been found in its Arabic version.⁷

Regardless of this remaining evidence, Lull declared in many books his desire to produce another version of the same work; furthermore, in many cases there is a clear wish to obtain triple versions, in Catalan, Latin and Arabic. Doubtlessly, this is a unique situation in the Middle Ages: there are indeed similar cases, but this was the only one in which: 1) the phenomenon implied such a large number of texts; 2) there was such a great diversity of contents, genres and registers; 3) such different

⁶ Anthony Bonner, “Recent Scholarship on Ramon Lull,” *Romance Philology* 54 (2001), 54. For a better estimation of the number of works by Lull, distinguishing the ones preserved from the ones lost, see Anthony Bonner, “Estadístiques sobre la recepció de l’obra de Ramon Lull”, *Studia Lulliana* 43 (2003), 83.

⁷ However, there is no doubt whatsoever that Lull did write in this language. On this topic, see Fernando Domínguez, “Ramon Lull, ‘catalán de Mallorca’, y la lengua árabe. Contexto sociolingüístico”, *Literatura y bilingüismo. Homenaje a Pere Ramíez* “Problemata Literaria” 15 (Kassel: Reichenberger, 1993), pp. 3-17. In addition to the many comments he made in this respect, it is also known that the versions were read in the Islamic world after his death. There is evidence, for example, that the *Liber de trinitate et incarnatione* (1312) was the reason for a dispute before the king of Fez in the late 14th century; see Miquel Batllori, *Arnau de Vilanova i l’arnaldisme*, ed. Eulàlia Duran; pr. Giuseppe Tavani, “Obra Completa” III (València: Tres i Quatre, 1994), 312.

languages were involved, and 4) the author himself was the translator or the direct driving force behind the translations.⁸

A paradigmatic case of multilingualism in text creation is the *Book of Contemplation* (*Llibre de contemplació*, ca. 1274), which Lull says he wrote first in Arabic, then he translated it into Catalan, and also a Latin version was made.⁹ In the following passage it can be observed that the starting version of the text, in Arabic, is considered worse than the target version, in Catalan, to such an extent that the translator “transporta e muda” the contents of the book to a higher degree of complexity. This is caused, firstly, by the author being the same as the translator, and secondly, because of the different intellectual category expected from the addressees of the two versions. The novelty of the situation should not be disregarded:

“This being the case, O Lord, therefore because your servant by Your Grace is the translator (‘romançador’) of this work from Arabic into Romance, and since his memory and his understanding and his will try with all their strength to rise up to worship and contemplate their honored creator, for this reason your servant has transposed and changed in this translation many arguments which, in the Arabic version, are not on such a high level as those which your servant instead has changed, creating other loftier and more finished arguments for the sake of adoring and contemplating your holy human nature and your glorious divine nature.”¹⁰

⁸ For example, the contemporary Catalan doctor and spiritual activist Arnau de Vilanova (ca. 1240-1311) also wrote theological and doctrinary works in Latin and Catalan. However, in this case the use of the two languages is governed, in general, by clearly defined criteria: he wrote in Latin the treatises addressed at the clergy, and in Catalan the works for the lower classes. The former are books extremely rich in content, whereas the latter have an educational purpose. Some of Arnau’s works (albeit very few) have a double version in Latin and Catalan, which presumably were close to the author himself; some were translated into Italian (perhaps at Vilanova’s initiative, although there is no evidence of this), into Spanish, and also into Greek.

⁹ “This translation of the *Book of Contemplation* from Arabic into Romance is hereby ended and concluded, the which translation was finished on the first day of the year of common usage, whereas the Arabic compilation was finished and terminated on Good Friday of Easter, in which Our Lord Jesus Christ, son of the glorious Virgin, our lady Saint Mary, suffered death and passion.” (“Acabada e complida és aquesta translació del *Llibre de contemplació* d’aràbic en romanç, la qual translació fo fenida lo primer dia de l’any en vulgar, e la compilació d’aràbic fo fenida e termenada en lo sant divenres de Pasqua, en lo qual pres mort e passió nostre senyor Déus Jesucrist, fill de la Verge gloriosa, nostra dona sancta Maria.” Ramon Lull, *Obres Essencials*, 2 vols. (Barcelona: Selecta, 1957-60) (=OE), Cap. 366, , II, 1258.

¹⁰ “On, com açò sia enaixí, Sényer, doncs per ço car lo vostre servidor per gràcia vostra sia romançador d’aquesta obra d’aràbic en romanç, e com la sua memòria e son enteniment e son voler s’esforcen en lur

The use of Arabic in the creation of some works is a constant throughout Llull’s life. The procedure “Arabic original > Catalan version > Latin version” appears several times; often he attributes to himself the first two versions, and he says that he commissioned the third one.¹¹ The process “Catalan original > Latin version” is even more frequent, and also in this case the translation seems to have been commissioned from a third party.

These immediate processes of creation and translation lead to some reflection on their justification and legitimacy. Writing the first version in Arabic is explained, rather more implicitly than explicitly, by the missionary objective of all of Llull’s works;¹² however, in order to justify writing about certain topics in a Romance language, these topics being usually reserved for the scholarly tongue, Ramon mentions the need to reach those who do not speak Latin.¹³ This is the same reason given by contemporary translators who produced vernacular versions of Latin works.¹⁴ Nevertheless, it seems that Llull never felt the need to justify the

poder a pujar adorar e contemplar lur honrat creador, per açò *lo vostre servidor transporta e muda en esta translació moltes raons qui no són tan altes en l'exemplar aràbic* a adorar e a contemplar vostres virtuts glorioses, com són celles que lo vostre servidor en loc d'aquelles *muda e puja altres raons pus altes e pus acabades* a adorar e a contemplar la vostra sancta humana natura e la vostra gloriosa natura divina.” Cap. 352, *OE*, II: 1185. Unless stated otherwise, all emphases are ours. As has been said, the Arabic version has unfortunately been lost. However, there is one copy of the Latin version that Llull himself gave and dedicated to the Vauvert monastery, in Paris: the present manuscript 3348A at the Bibliothèque Nationale de Paris, for which see below (n. 21).

¹¹ Thus, in one of the last works he wrote, the *Ars consilii*, we read: “Finivit Raimundus istam scientiam Tunicii mense Julii anno 1315 incarnationis Domini nostri Jesu Christi. Istum librum *fecit Raimundus primo in arabico, et postmodum in romantium translatavit, et de romantio fecit in latino poni.*” (*ROL* 2: 269).

¹² See, for example: “Et ideo bonum est, quod iste liber sit translatus in arabico et in aliis linguis, ad extirpandum errores, quos infideles ducunt contra sanctam fidem catholicam”. (*Liber de divina habentia*, *ROL* 16: 161)

¹³ An example: “And we have written them [= the *Hours of Our Lady*] in the vernacular tongue so that those who do not understand Latin, might understand those things by which they commend and offer prayer to Our Lady.” (“E aquelles [= les *Hores de nostra Dona*] fem en romanç per ço que aquells qui latí no entenen, sapien entendre aquelles coses ab les quals preguen e loen nostra Dona” *ORL* 10: 232).

¹⁴ In the Catalan sphere, more or less in the same period, this justification is used by Guillem Corretger, in the prologue to his translation of Teodorico Borgognoni’s *Chirurgia* (ca. 1302-1304), and by Berenguer Sarriera, in the prologue to his version of Arnau de Vilanova’s *Regimen sanitatis* d’Arnau de Vilanova (ca. 1308-1310). See Lluís Cifuentes, “Vernacularization as an Intellectual and Social Bridge. The Catalan translations of Teodorico’s *Chirurgia* and of Arnau de Vilanova’s *Regimen Sanitatis*”, *Early Science and Medicine* 4 (1999), 127-48.

translation of any of his works from Latin into Catalan, though strangely enough, he did make a few novel remarks concerning the opposite process, from Catalan into Latin. Firstly, he applied the widely known principle of St Jerome, “non uerbum de uerbo, sed sensum exprimere de sensu” to a translation from the vernacular to learned language.¹⁵ Secondly, in the prologue to his *Art amativa* (1290), Lull declares that he wrote the book in Catalan because in this way he created a model for writing in the vernacular, especially concerning lexis and rhetoric, and allegedly also concerning semantics, which is to be applied to the translation into Latin. Ramon emphasizes that vernacular tongues have their own rhetorical principles, and at the same time warns that a sufficient knowledge of Latin does not automatically make anyone a translator:

“... and moreover, for this reason we put it in the vernacular tongue, so that men who know Latin may have a doctrine and method of how to make Latin words descend to speak beautifully in the vernacular tongue, using the vocabulary of this art, for there are many who do not know how to transpose Latin science into the vernacular tongue for the lack of vocabulary, which, by means of this art, they will be able to learn.”¹⁶

When Lull writes in Arabic, and needless to say, in his native Catalan, he appears to feel more comfortable than when he uses Latin. This is why he constantly mentions translating his works into Latin, or even requests help to carry them out, which, to the best of our knowledge, he never mentions regarding the creation of an Arabic version.¹⁷ The problem involves lack of rhetorical resources, but also has a practical side, for it

¹⁵ For instance, the colophon to the *Compendiosus tractatus de articulis fidei catholicae*: “Translatu est iste tractatus de uulgari in latinum non tamen in pluribus de uerbo ad uerbum, sed ad sensum, ut rationes multiplicarentur. [...] Translatio huius operis facta est de uulgari in latinum, ut dictum est, in ciuitate Maioricensi anno incarnationis domini nostri Iesu Christi 1300 mense iulii.” (*ROL* 19: 504)

¹⁶ “[...] e encara, per ço la posam en vulgar, quels homens qui saben latí ajen doctrina e manera com de les paraules latines sapien devallar a parlar bellament en vulgar, usant dels vocables d’esta art, car molts homens son qui de la sciencia en latí no saben transportar en vulgar per defalliment de vocables, los quals per esta art aver poran.” (*ORL* 17: 7)

¹⁷ For example, in 1315 Ramon asked King Jaume II of Aragon, to send to him in Tunisia a collaborator, fra Simó de Puigcerdà, who had worked with him on other occasions. The letter has been preserved (dated August 5 of that year) in which this request was transmitted to the head of the Franciscan convent in Lleida where fra Simó lived: “[...] set quod tam pro hiis quam pro quadam *Arte consilii*, quam dictus Raimundus nunc facit, significavit se plurimum indigere persona ydonea, que dictos libros et *Artem scribat et transferat de romancio in latinum*. Ad quod quidem religiosum fratrem

must have been easier to find help for the Latin versions than for the Arabic ones.¹⁸

When collaborators participate in such a basic and urgent dissemination process as text creation, the gates lie open to intervention in the text subject to translation. Thus, in the colophon to the *Llibre dels articles de la fe* (1296), a collaborator is entrusted with a Latin version which must be prepared considering meaning and not literally, and in addition to this, it is suggested that an even more remote authority, the Holy See, should produce versions in the languages of infidels:

“For this reason, I, the contemptible Raymond, have written this book and had it translated into Latin, though in keeping with its sense rather than literally, so that each meaning should retain its vitality and power of persuasion; and I beg that this book, which has been translated into Latin and presented to the Lord Pope and the Lord Cardinals, should be sent to the infidels by way of men of understanding who know the languages of these latter.”¹⁹

What is being used here, therefore, is not simply a set of mere scribes copying the texts, but rather people who are able, in Lull’s own words, to “bene ordinare nec in bono dictamine ponere” his works, in a pro-

Simonem de Podio Ceritano ordinis et conventus vestri, qui per aliquod tempus fuit iam scolaris ipsius Raimundi, sufficientem et ydoneum reputans, postulavit, ut apud vos super hoc intercedere deberemus, cum dicti fratris Simonis presencia sibi pro premissis multum necessaria sit et utilis esse possit tam pro adiscenda dicta *Arte consilii* et in regressu aliis docenda quam aferendo ad nos et ad partes istas opus librorum predictorum.” (J. N. Hillgarth, *Diplomatari lullia: documents relatius a Ramon Llull i a la seva familia*, trad. L. Cifuentes, “Collecció Blaquerna” 1 (Barcelona/Palma: Universitat de Barcelona i de les Illes Balears, 2001), 94).

¹⁸ Although Lull’s frequent mentions of his ignorance of Latin can be attributed to proverbial humility, they do seem to suggest a problem in rhetorical competence: “So I beg the Holy Apostolic Father and the Lord Cardinals to have [this book] translated into good Latin, for I would not know how to do so, since my knowledge of Latin is very poor.” (“Soplec doncs al sant Payre Apostoli e als seynors cardenals quel fassen posar [el llibre] en latí en bel dictat, car yo no li sabria posar, per so car ignor gramàtica” *Cent noms de Déu*, ORL 19: 79-80). However, it is impossible to believe that the author of such a large work could not have spoken Latin. See Lola Badia, *Teoria i pràctica de la literatura en Ramon Llull* “Assaig” 10 (Barcelona: Quaderns Crema, 1992), 178, and Marta M. M. Romano, “Un modo nuovo di essere autore: Raimondo Lullo e il caso dell’Ars amativa”, *Studia Lulliana* 41 (2001), pp. 39-63, 44.

¹⁹ “Per que yo, Ramon, indigne, he fet aquest libre e ell fet posar en latí, emperó no letra a letra, mas sen a sen, per ço que cascun [sentit] ne romanga en sa virtut e en sa rectoricha; e aquell qui es en latí e presentat al senyor Papa e als senyors cardenals soplican quel trameten als infels per homens entenents e qui sapien los lenguatges d’aquells.” *Nova Edició de les Obres de Ramon Llull*, 7 vols. (Palma de Mallorca: Patronat Ramon Llull, 1990-...) (=NEORL) 3: 70).

cess in which it is hard to define clearly the limits between composition and dissemination.²⁰ This is shown in the manuscript lat. 3348A of the French Bibliothèque Nationale, in which is preserved the original of the Latin translation of the *Book of Contemplation*, in which one can detect the intervention of different collaborators in the process of elaborating the new version of the work, and a notable sense of practicality and economy in the diffusion of texts shown by the fact that the same codex can serve at the same time as an original rough draft of the translation and as an archetype from which other copies will be derived.²¹

It is impossible to disregard the exceptional fact that a private, non-clerical author, not professionally related to a public authority (such as a chancellery, or a university or church *studium*), should develop composition and dissemination methods for his works involving, in some cases, the intervention of collaborators.²² This shows to what extent for Ramon Llull, the divulgative purpose influences the notion of authorship.

²⁰ In his *Declaratio Raimundi per modum dialogi edita* (1298), Llull makes a rhetorical admission of his limitations as a Latin writer, and he refers explicitly to a stylistic problem: “Et licet hoc, quod dixi, non bene ordinavi neque in bono dictamine posui, quia grammaticus non sum neque rhetoricus [...]” (ROL 17: 400-01). Undoubtedly, these limitations open the path to the intervention of collaborators.

²¹ This volume, which Llull gave to the Chartreuse of Vauvert in 1289, as stated on folio 1v, is the original on which was carried out an intensive collective labor, one which included the author himself, in the translation of the *Book of Contemplation* into Latin as well as the revision of this translation. At the same time, however, it was initially conceived as a còdex to be conserved and from which copies would be made. This it was why it was composed of mixed quires of parchment and paper, and why it was deposited along with other Lullian in Vauvert. See Albert Soler, “Difondre i conservar la pròpia obra: Ramon Llull i el manuscrit lat. paris. 3348A”, *Randa (Homenatge a Miquel Batllori 7)* 54 (2005), pp. 5-29.

²² Llull had a team of collaborators, which probably varied depending on the place and circumstances in which he worked. There are historical references to these helpers (the *Vita coelanea*, an autobiographical story told to the monks at the Vauvert monastery in Paris in 1311, makes passing references to people who accompanied him in some of his travels). Also, as we said before, Llull asked the King of Aragon to obtain the services of fra Simó de Puigcerdà, so that he could help him to translate books from Catalan into Latin. We also know of Guillem Mestres (o Mestre), the director of the grammatical *studium* in Palma de Mallorca, who translated two small works by Llull from Catalan into Latin, in 1316); see Badia *Teoria i pràctica* 157, and J. N. Hillgarth *Ramon Llull i el naixement del lullisme*, ed. Albert Soler; trad. Anna Alberni i Joan Santanach, “Textos i Estudis de Cultura Catalana” 61 (Barcelona: Curial-Publicacions de l’Abadia de Montserrat, 1998), 178. On the other hand, an exhaustive analysis of some of the earliest Lullian codices might yield more specific information on the way these collaborators worked: such is the case of the Vatican ms. Ot-tob. lat. 405 or the lat. paris. 3348A just mentioned. I am at present working on a study of the manuscripts which can be related directly or indirectly to Llull.

1.2 Multilingualism in the dissemination of Lull’s works

While the use of Catalan, Latin or Arabic in text composition stays the same throughout Lull’s life, his interest in the dissemination of his work in Romance languages other than Catalan seems to be especially intense during the period from 1274 to 1289.²³

At least in the case of the *Book of Evast and Blaqueria* (*Llibre d’Evast e Blaqueria*, ca. 1283) there is evidence that ca. 1287 an Occitan version was produced, very likely promoted by Lull himself, considering the short time span between the date of writing and the purpose to which it was used: it is known that Lull used it to promote a French version, which was produced between 1287 and 1289, during his first stay in Paris. The errors that can be seen in the Occitan version regarding the understanding of the Catalan original show that Lull could under no circumstances have been the translator. The same occurs with the French version: the errors of understanding with regard to the Occitan model suggest that the translator had an insufficient command of the language. Finally, it is also known that, during the same stay in Paris, Lull commissioned the translation of the *Book of the Lover and the Beloved* (*Llibre d’amic e amat*), the famous mystical opuscle contained in *Blaqueria*, from Occitan into Latin.²⁴

An identical process, whereby the original is written in Catalan and disseminated in Occitan, leading in turn to a French and a Latin version, is repeated in the case of the *Doctrina pueril* (ca. 1274-76), which can be attributed to a decision by Lull himself. However, unlike the case of *Blaqueria*, there are no codicological data confirming this.²⁵

²³ This is the initial stage of his work. Also, between these dates Lull made his first trip outside the immediate Catalan area, a trip (1287-89) which took him first to Rome and then to Paris. The harsh experience and the difficulties he encountered in communicating his project and his system led to a radical change in his *Ars*, which he carried out in his *Ars inventiva veritatis*, written on his return to Montpellier in 1290. It must also be considered that the end of the period coincides with the end of the production of literary works comparable to Romance narrative genres existing at the time, in spite of the innovative treatment Lull chooses. Whatever the case, Lull resorted again to disseminating his works in Romance languages to the same extent he had done so far.

²⁴ Albert Soler, ed.: Ramon Lull, *Llibre d’Amic i Amat*, ed. Albert Soler i Llopert, “Els Nostres Clàssics. Col·lecció B” 13 (Barcelona: Barcino, 1995): 30-34.

²⁵ See Santanach in *NEORL* 7.

In the case of the *Book of Wonders* (*Llibre de meravelles*, ca. 1289) we have (in addition to six catalan manuscripts of the 14th and 15th centuries) one manuscript from the end of the 13th century, which had been programmed as the Occitanian version of the work, but which erroneously only partially incorporated the linguistic equivalences of the Catalan point of departure. The result is a language which is accidentally hybrid between Català and Occitanian, one corresponding to no dialectical nor a controlled used of any kind of language mixture.²⁶

It is slightly more problematic to determine the direct participation in other similar processes of dissemination in Romance languages. Although there is no evidence of this, it would not be surprising if the French versions of the *Book of the Gentile and the Three Wise men* (*Llibre del gentil e dels tres savis*), the *Doctrina pueril* and the *Book of Wonders* had some direct connection to Llull; the first two, because they are preserved in a contemporary manuscript; the third (even though it is less probable), because at least part of the original Catalan version of the work was written in Paris.

Llull’s pragmatic, unprejudiced position in the face of linguistic diversity, both concerning text creation and dissemination, is quite surprising, and lies at the heart of the innovations we have mentioned so far. Similar practices and lack of inhibition are only found in other spheres, beyond literary translation or the reflections on translation generated at the time by Jean de Meun, Brunetto Latini or Dante. Such an approach is usually only found in the vernacular translation of scientific and technical texts (a field that has received much less attention by translation historians and text editors), a practice which greatly increased from the 13th century on throughout Europe: *regimina sanitatis*, treatises on the plague,

²⁶ Badia *Tèoria i pràctica* 160-161; and now also Lola Badia, Joan Santanach, Albert Soler, “Le rôle de l’occitan dans la production et la diffusion des oeuvres de Raymond Lulle (1274-1289)”, *Actes du Huitième Congrès International de l’Association Internationale d’études Occitanes, 12-17 septembre 2005*, Université de Bordeaux. Regarding Occitan, there are Catalan manuscripts with various features similar to Occitan, but no other versions strictly in this language: they are evidence of interferences which might be caused accidentally in the process of copying, by the graphical habits by copyists, by incomplete changes from Catalan into Occitan, or back from Occitan into Catalan. This is the case of some manuscripts: such as one of the *Book of contemplation* (which is significant, because it is the oldest codex by Llull that has been preserved, dated 1280), one of *Blaquerna* (retranslation into Catalan of an Occitan copy) and of the *Llibre d’intenció*. There is the certainty that the Occitan translation of works such as *Blaquerna* or the *Doctrina pueril* was made by a translator who, in order to carry out his task, had to generate a real original text with this new version.

books on antidotes, prescription books, treatises on surgery, veterinary or falconry books, treatises on trade, arithmetic, books on philosophy or natural history, alchemy, etc.²⁷

These are mostly works addressed to a new lay audience, who were deeply involved in the political and commercial activity of urban societies. These books are mostly practical, and often have a direct application, and most of them relate Arabic to Latin, often through a Romance language.²⁸ In the Catalano-Aragonese area the audience is, for a start, multilingual (Occitan-Catalan), and there is frequent exchange of didactic and religious texts between the two languages.²⁹ The attitudes and procedures of the translators of these texts, but also of their readers, make a suitable background for the development of a multilingual writing and disseminating practice, such as Lull's, who opens up new grounds re-

²⁷ See Lola Badia, *Textos catalans tardomedievals i "ciència de naturales". Discurs llegit el dia 21 de novembre del 1996 en l'acte de recepció pública de l'autora a la RABLB* (Barcelona: RABLB, 1996), 101 pp., and Lluís Cifuentes, *La ciència en català a l'Edat Mitjana i el Renaixement* "Col·lecció Blaquerna" 3 (Barcelona/Palma: Universitat de Barcelona i Universitat de les Illes Balears, 2001).

²⁸ A significant case is that of the Valencian Berenguer Eimeric, who before 1318 had already translated a fragment of Albucasis' *Kūtab al-tasrif* on diets for the sick, from Arabic into Catalan and from Catalan into Latin (Cifuentes, *La ciència en català*, 102).

²⁹ Concerning scientific and technical texts, there is evidence that the Occitan verse 13th century version of the *l'Epistola Aristotelis ad Alexandrum* was circulated in the Catalan area; of the same origin and date, we also have the *Sanitat del cors* and the *Libre del Sezar*, which are known to have been read in Catalonia in the 14th century (Cifuentes, *La ciència en català*, 97-98). Also, the Occitan verse version of Roger Frugardo's *Practica chirurgiae*, by Raimon d'Avinhon, is preserved in a manuscript copied in Catalonia in the second half of the 13th century (*ibid.*, 126); a similar case is that of Daude de Pradas' *Romans dels auzels cassadors*, also from the first half of the 13th century, preserved in a 14th century codex copied in Catalonia (*ibid.* 154). In addition to these, close links between Occitan and Catalan alchemy can be confirmed, especially through Arnau de Vilanova (see S. Thioliér-Méjean (ed.) *L'Alchimie médiévale: "L'obratge dels philosophes", "La soma", et les manuscrits d'oïl*, "Centre d'enseignement et de recherche d'oc" 10 (Paris: Presses de l'Université de Paris-Sorbonne, 1999). and the comments by M. Pereira, "Alchimia occitanica e pseudolullismo alchemico. Osservazioni in margine a una recente ricerca", *Studia Lulliana* 43 (2003), pp. 93-102, on this work). Concerning works on religious instruction, the connection between Occitan and Catalan occurs in the case of the *Homilies d'Organyà* (in spite of the opinion of Armand Puig i Tàrrach, "Les *Homilies d'Organyà*: estructura i fonts", a *Homilies d'Organyà*, a cura d'Amadeu J. Soberanas, Andreu Rossinyol i Armand Puig "Els Nostres Clàssics. Col·lecció B" 20 [Barcelona: Barcino, 2001], pp. 137-336.) and the *Homilies de Tortosa*, between the 12th and the 13th centuries; of the *Legenda aurea*, the *Vida de Santa Margarida*, the *Vida de sant Alexi*, the *Vida de sant Jordi*, the *Debat del cos i l'ànima*, various versions of the Bible (including the Apocryphal Books), the *Somme le Roi* by fra Laurent d'Orléans, and the *Breviari d'amor* by Matfre Ermengaud. In the development of a positive attitude towards translation, one should not forget the influence exerted by the linguistic affinity between Catalan and Occitan, which facilitated the early exchange of works in both directions.

garding the number and variety of works this multilingualism encompasses. Llull's works were written at the same time this vernacularization process started in Catalan, but were probably based on the Occitan experience, which had happened slightly earlier. This is all the more likely if we consider the political bonds between Llull's native Majorca and the Occitan city of Montpellier.³⁰

1.3 Multilingual dissemination after Llull's death

After Llull's death in 1316, and up to 1500, his works continued to be translated into several languages. There is medieval evidence, which to our knowledge was not related to Llull's initiative, of translations of the *Book of the Order of Chivalry* (*Llibre de l'orde de cavalleria*, into French and Scottish), the *Book of the Gentile* (into Spanish), the *Book of Wonders* (into Italian, French and Spanish), the *Principles of Medicine* (*Començaments de medicina* into Italian), the *Dictat de Ramon* (into Spanish), and the *Ars brevis* (into Hebrew). Needless to say, some Catalan works were also translated into Latin and vice versa.³¹

All these versions are due to the spectacular spatial and temporal dissemination of Lullism, which makes them specially interesting by themselves and for the delimitation of the text. After 1500, with the arrival of the printing press, the number of translations greatly increased.

It is not surprising, then, that as a result of the specific writing and dissemination techniques used by Llull, an exceptional situation should have evolved in which is found a formidable corpus of works written by disciples and followers, but attributed to the Master. It should be kept in mind that the works of all kinds (on alchemy, theology, philosophy or the Kabala) which are in some way or other attributed to or derived from

³⁰ Cifuentes, *La ciència en català*, 50-51.

³¹ There is the significant example of the *Taula general*, written in Catalan in 1294. From this original a Latin version was made, by disciples or collaborators of Llull's. Afterwards, the two versions were used for the development of a new Latin version. Even later, another compiler used the Catalan original and the second Latin version in order to produce a second Catalan version (Viola Tenge-Wolf, "The textual tradition of the *Tabula generalis*: from Ramon Llull to the critical edition in *ROL XXVII*", *SL* 43 [2003], pp. 39-56).

him, equal the number of books he wrote himself, and, as we said before, he wrote no less than 260!³²

2. Multilingualism and text edition

A work with such a rich and varied dissemination as Lull’s (no doubt, a unique case in medieval Catalan literature, and seldom found in Romance literatures) requires a new approach to the conventional distinction between direct tradition (that consisting of all the evidence from the original version, the immediate subject for edition) and indirect tradition (we refer in this case basically to translations, which are only occasionally considered). The interferences which may exist between these two categories in Lull’s work, and also the indeterminate areas we can find between the two, make it impossible to ignore any of the allegedly indirect textual data; rather, accepting the whole tradition becomes a *sine qua non*.

Thus, rather than any *a priori* criteria, what editing Lull’s texts requires is a treatment that visualizes a cross-section of all the consecutive deposits and sediments that make up the complex literary structure of the tradition of a certain work. Therefore, if as a rule any responsible editor should logically resort to a combination of textual and codicological studies for any text, this becomes an unavoidable premise in Lull’s case.

We shall now discuss four editorial possibilities which may show readers the essential complexity of Lull’s opus, according to our experience in this area over the last years.

2.1 Critical edition of the original text

In a critical edition, the thorough analysis of the textual data offered by the tradition, entails a differentiation process which must lead us, as far as possible, to distinguish the original text from the *textus recepti*.³³ This is

³² Anthony Bonner, “Ramon Lull i l’elogi de la variant”, *Actes del Novè Colloqui Internacional de Llengua i Literatura Catalanes. Alacant/Elx 9-14 de setembre del 1991* (Barcelona: Publicacions de l’Abadia de Montserrat, 1993), pp. 13-30, 25-26, and Bonner, “Estadístiques sobre la Recepció”, 83.

³³ Obviously, a critical edition of a work starts by collecting all the available data on the tradition that has transmitted such work. In a case as complex as Lull’s, this procedure is greatly simplified by the *ad hoc* creation of an electronic bibliographical tool with exceptional features, the Ramon Lull Database at the University of Barcelona (<<http://orbita.bib.ub.es/ramon/>>), which is freely

due to the fact that the ultimate purpose of the edition is reading Ramon Llull’s works and studying the philosophy they contain, while considering that neither the philosophy nor the works would exist without the historical factors transmitting them. The hypothetical approach to what Llull intended in one of his works is expressed in the edited text; historical variation is interpreted in the variants sections, which in many cases will reflect a multilingual tradition.

The edition of Llull’s Latin works has been carried out, since 1959, by the *Raimundi Lulli Opera Latina (ROL)*, of the Raimundus-Lullus-Institut at University of Freiburg i. B.; as of 2005 30 volumes have been published. The Catalan works are published by the *Nova Edició de les Obres de Ramon Llull (NEORL)*, which started in the 1980’s, and has continued the task carried out for over forty years by the *Obres Originals de Ramon Llull (ORL)*,³⁴ from 1906 till 1950. This project led to 21 volumes, whereas the

accessible and has a Catalan and English interface. All works included in the catalogue (which can be found from any fragment of the title or the invocation, the incipit or the explicit) allow access to seven information categories: catalogues and inventories where it is mentioned, *self-references* made by Llull in other works of his where the book is mentioned, the various *titles* it has been given, *incipits* and *explicit*s of its various versions, *manuscripts* and *editions* disseminating it in any language, and *bibliography* on the book. The database also includes a section on Llull’s manuscripts, based on the list of cities where the codices are found, giving a description and bibliographical data. A third section makes it possible to access the full text of Llull’s catalogues and inventories produced from the early 14th century to our time. Finally, the bibliographical section allows users to conduct various searches for authors or titles of any of Llull’s editions or any item on Ramon Llull, be it books or journal articles since 1475. From the Llull database it is also possible to browse the digital manuscript archive of the Raimundus-Lullus-Institut (Freiburg i. B.), which at present hosts almost web-browsable 500 microfiches, plus the various works by Llull and other digital studies on Llull which can be found on the Internet. Since February 2002, the Llull database has had over 80,000 visits, browsing over 600,000 pages.

³⁴ The *NEORL* is published under the patronage of the Patronat Ramon Llull, created by the cultural departments of the Govern Balear, the Generalitat de Catalunya and the Generalitat Valenciana. In 1906, Mateu Obrador started the publication of the *ORL* in Majorca, his explicit purpose being to facilitate the reading, and therefore the knowledge and appreciation, of Ramon Llull’s work, beyond the legendary and the romantic figure. Out of the 21 volumes published until 1950, 17 are due to the sacrifice and effort of Salvador Galmés. In the prologue to the first volume, Obrador stated his intention to recover the copied texts in a faithful, accurate manner; “taken directly by comparison among the best manuscripts, done in view of the purist and most distilled sources”. The terms used significantly illustrate the philological criteria of the time: *best*, *purist*, *distilled*; the purpose is to eliminate mistakes, delimit the text and, in short, to reduce the objectionable medieval variation and complexity to contemporary textual criteria, that is, into a purified, immovable, static, fixed text following the author’s intention, like our modern texts. The editors were clearly aware that theirs was an urgent project, and not a critical edition strictly speaking. Amongst other limitations, the editors did not always have access to all the sources from the Catalan tradition,

NEORL, now intending to complete and update the task, has published 7 volumes between 1990 and 2005.

The editorial criteria for each volume of the *NEORL*, of whose editorial committee I am a member, are determined by the nature of the work to be published, but also of the tradition that has transmitted such work. In the case of works with a multilingual tradition, it has been especially fruitful to carefully consider all the variants, because it has significantly enriched the data available on the way the text was written, disseminated and received. Thus, the second volume in the collection, the *Book of the Gentile and the Three Wise men* (1993, ²2001), edited by Anthony Bonner, is the first real critical edition of the text, and it considers the medieval versions in Catalan, French, Latin and Spanish; the Spanish version, from the late 14th century. It is an accurate rendering faithfully following the Catalan original, and has proved useful for the delimitation of the text because it is a key testimony to one of the branches of the tradition.³⁵ The result is an essentially new text, different from the one we had been able to read so far.

The last volume published (2005) is the *Doctrina pueril*, edited by Joan Santanach, the textual tradition of which frequently resembles a jigsaw puzzle: there are thirty testimonies, either manuscripts or printed editions, from contemporary volumes to 18th century editions, with numerous fragmentary testimonies as well as versions in Catalan, Spanish, French, Latin and Occitan. Although the book had already appeared in two modern editions (1906, *ORL* 1; 1972), this is the first time that the whole tradition has been taken into account.

Outside of this collection, I have published a critical edition of the *Book of the Lover and the Beloved* (Soler, 1995), an interesting chapter of *Blaquerna* with regard to its vast history of dissemination: forty manuscripts have been preserved, from the 13th to the early 20th century, in six languages, and more than a hundred editions, since 1505 until the present

and of course, never fully considered the issue of multilingual writing, and much less multilingual dissemination.

³⁵ “While the Castilian text (C) is very literal and faithful to the original, the French text (P) [...] is so bad as to be almost unusable of the task of comparison. As for the Latin tradition in general (L), which ultimately derives from the translation produced in the circle of Pierre de Limoges [...] it is rhetorical and innovative, and sometimes more *ad sensum* than *ad litteram*.” (*NEORL* 2: xxxvii).

time, in fourteen languages. At the time of writing this paper I am well into the complete edition of the novel, which is to appear in the *NEORL*. In addition to this, a team coordinated by Lola Badia is preparing the edition of the *Book of Wonders*, which shall consider the Occitan, French, Italian and Spanish versions.

In the specific instances of the four texts we have just mentioned, the evidence suggests that there was only one original version in Catalan, without substantial variants,³⁶ and an archetype derived therefrom, in the most classical sense of the word. Whatever the case, the enormous effort that is entailed by compiling and analyzing the thousands of variants in these multilingual traditions, is rewarded by the amount of data which is obtained, especially when the data are related to the historical and codicological information supplied. Indeed, there must be few cases such as Lull's opus, where a combination of a reconstructed tradition history and a critical analysis of the text proves so fruitful. This makes it possible to draw nearer to the words of the author, and to overcome a historical variation which, nevertheless, is a genuine one and the source of an enormous wealth of cultural information.³⁷

However, the multilingual apparatus does not exhaust the large amount of data contained in multilingual versions, and often the very nature of this part of the edition might make the reader overlook the relevance of these data. Thus, we believe it important to summarize and interpret the essential information supplied by a critical apparatus; this can be done in an introductory study, through lexical and semantic analyses of variation or through comparative studies of the different versions.

³⁶ In the French and Latin versions of the *Doctrina pueril* and in the Occitanian and French versions of *Blaquerna* one finds added chapters (on the subject of chivalry in the first and on Jesus' passion in the second) which seem to have been added by Lull himself when setting to have these works translated.

³⁷ In this respect, see Bonner "Ramon Lull i l'elogi de la variant". The generally negative opinion on variation is proved by the position the variants occupy in our critical editions: in footnotes or, at worst, at the end of the book, in extremely small type, in pages accumulating all sorts of variants taken out of context, incomprehensible text fragments whose interpretation is a philological feat reserved for the few, who undoubtedly will be worthy of everlasting praise.

2.2 *Editing the translated versions*

The *ROL* and the *NEORL* publish not only works originally written in the language proper to each collection (the former in Latin, the latter in Catalan), but also versions in such languages produced either following Lull’s instructions, or after his death. Thus, for instance, the seven volumes of the *NEORL* include 10 works, from which 7 were originally written in Catalan, and 3 in Latin. The 7 Catalan originals all have a Latin version, which has been, or will be published in *ROL*, and in addition to this, 3 of these works have versions in other languages.³⁸

Nevertheless, other versions have been published in languages beside Catalan and Latin. For some years now, various editors have published the early French versions of the *Book of the Gentile*, the *Book of the Order of Chivalry*, the *Doctrina pueril*, *Blaquerna* and the *Book of the Beasts* (*Llibre de les bèsties*), the Occitan version of the *Doctrina pueril* and the Italian version of the *Book of the Beasts*.

Both in Romance and Latin versions, it is fundamental to determine, as accurately as possible, the specific copy, with its own variants and historical circumstances, from which the translation being published has been derived, or at least, mention should be made of the branch of the tradition to which the translated text belongs. Although this evidence has seldom been preserved, this does not excuse the editor from attempting an ideal reconstruction of this tradition to the greatest feasible extent, based on the textual and codicological data offered by the testimonies transmitting the translation.³⁹ The ultimate reason for this is that it is extremely important to show the reader what is related to the original tradition and has been transmitted within the translation, and what is

³⁸ The volumes are the following: 1. *Llibre de virtuts e de pecats*: originally written in Catalan; a Latin version has been preserved. 2. *Llibre del gentil e dels tres savis*: originally written in Catalan; a Latin, a Spanish and a French version exist. 3. *Llibre dels articles de la fé. Llibre què deu hom creure de Déu. Llibre contra anticrist*: Catalan original and Latin version in all three cases. 4. *Lògica nova*: Latin original and Catalan version. 5. *Començaments de medicina*: Catalan original and versions in Latin and Italian. 6. *Tractat d’astronomia*: Latin original and Catalan version. 7. *Doctrina pueril*: Catalan original and version in Occitan, French, Latin and Spanish.

³⁹ In this respect, see the valuable methodological remarks by Montserrat Lluch, “Editar el *Jugurta* català del segle XIV: un plantejament metodològic”, *Cultura Neolatina* 64 (2004), pp. 559-593.

related to the transmission of the translated version. In this respect, those of us who have edited Lull's works must acknowledge that our editions have not always been as accurate as could be desired.

2.3 *Synoptic editions*

Another way of showing and compiling the various versions of a book is through a synoptic arrangement of the texts. In my opinion, this strategy should be reserved for justifiable cases, such as works or versions with compositional variants, or with variants derived from a complex compositional process. This has been done, for instance, in volume 18 of the *ROL*, when editing the *l'Art abreuçada de predicació*: the pull-out pages contain the original Catalan text, preserved in only two manuscripts, followed by the critical text of the three medieval Latin versions, preserved in eighteen sources. Each of the published versions has been subjected to an ecdotic study and a critical edition, and each of them is supported by a critical apparatus.

A case so singular in medieval literature as that of the *Book of the Lover and the Beloved*, with versions in Catalan, Occitan, French and Latin produced within a period of only six years (between 1283 and 1289), consisting of short prose fragments, is ideal for a synoptic publication; which would make it possible to compare the various translations with the original text, and would prove very interesting for any kind of linguistic study.

2.4 *Electronic editions*

There are many unexplored possibilities to be derived from computer processing of the various versions of one work, or the variants thereof; this would greatly facilitate comparison and make it much more visible. While accepting that on-screen versions are more suitable for consultation than for reading purposes, we believe that this possibility for text edition should under no circumstances be disregarded.

In the field of Lullian Studies, the most interesting computer edition so far has been *The Augsburg Web Edition of Lull's Electoral Writings* (<<http://www.math.uni-augsburg.de/stochastik/lull/>>), carried out by the Institut für Mathematik at Augsburg University, directed by M. Drton, G. Hägele, D. Haneberg, F. Pukelsheim and W. Reif. This website,

as its name indicates, contains the three works written by Lull on the subject of elections: the *Artifitium electionis personarum*, chapter 24 of *Blaquerna*, and *De arte electionis*. The works may be browsed on a screen divided into four strips, showing a digital reproduction of the source manuscript, an edition of the text, a translation into either English, German or French, and an apparatus of variants. The strips are linked to one another, in such a way that when a fragment is selected from the manuscript, the same fragment is highlighted in the other sections, and viceversa.

3. Conclusion

Whichever the way a text by Lull is published, the edition must account for the original complexity and the wealth in transmission. This should be clearly presented to the modern reader, explaining, and not hiding, the complexities involved. Lull resorted to a disconcerting variety of procedures when writing or disseminating his works, which, as we have seen, sometimes even entailed the intervention of other people. This questions the very concept of what constitutes an original, and requires a very careful analysis of each case, without any preconceived ideas, of what is the source text and what are variations on the text. This is why the editor must be predisposed towards making the problems evident and explain rather than simply resolving them. What matters is not to obtain a fixed text for reading, but rather to analyze and present, as clearly and visibly as possible, the complexity of the text that has been transmitted to us. For such purpose, it is basic to pay attention to all the data obtained from a work's tradition (both direct and indirect), and to consider such data as an asset, and not an obstacle, for the understanding of that work.

(Barcelona, November 2005)