

The textual tradition of the *Tabula generalis*: from Ramon Llull to the critical edition in *ROL XXVII*

The *Tabula generalis* is one of Ramon Llull's most outstanding writings, at least in terms of manuscript dissemination. It ranks as number two among the top ten of Llull's most frequently copied works (though competing for this rank with the *Liber Apostrophe*), and only the *Ars brevis* with its more than sixty manuscripts preserved seems to have attracted more attention on the part of medieval and Renaissance scribes and scholars.¹

While preparing the critical edition of the *Tabula generalis* for the *ROL* series,² I was able to make a number of interesting observations throwing light on some aspects of the textual tradition of the work, and I would like to present them in this article. I've given a more detailed presentation of the text and its development in my introduction to the critical edition,³ but since that introduction was written in German, some readers might be grateful to have the basic information in what would be for them a more accessible language.

Taula general and Tabula generalis

The *Tabula generalis* has been preserved both in Catalan and in Latin. The Catalan text has come down to us in only three copies, while the Latin version is extant in 38 manuscripts: 26 of them present the complete text of the work, whereas the others are either incomplete or even fragmentary.⁴

¹ See p. 91 of this same issue of *SZ*.

² *Raimundi Lulli Opera Latina*, vol. XXVII (CCCM 181) (Turnhout: Brepols, 2002).

³ *ROL XXVII*, pp. 78*-93*.

⁴ For descriptions of the manuscripts, see my introduction to the critical edition of the *Tabula generalis* in *ROL XXVII*, pp. 55*-76*. The list of codices given there comprises only 37 Latin manuscripts instead of 38. Number 38 turned up out of the blue - as manuscripts very often seem

There can be no serious doubt that the work was originally written in Catalan and later translated into Latin. Numerous Catalanisms in the Latin text and a sentence construction that is mostly very close to that of the Catalan language point in this direction even at first sight. Besides, the most remarkable indication for this fact is that the Latin version very often uses two synonyms (or quasi-synonyms) consecutively to translate one single term from the Catalan text, such as:

tocan = tangendo siue temptando
 de vertutz guoanyades = uirtutum lucratarum siue acquisitarum
 estament = consistentia siue status
 compliment = complementum siue perfectio
 judisci = iudicium siue cognitio
 vocable = uerbum siue uocabulum
 espassific = specificum siue speciale
 complir = finire siue perficere
 es aytan luy = distat siue elongatur.

It seems that the Latin translator was frequently undecided as to whether to choose one or the other of two possible translations for a Catalan word, and instead of making a choice, he simply used both.⁵ Examples like those listed above can be found all over the Latin text of the *Tabula generalis*, and from this it follows with certainty that the Latin version is a translation.

Two Latin redactions

When looking at the Latin manuscripts more closely, it soon becomes evident that they present two different versions of the text. The differences between these two versions, which I have called *lat. I* and *lat. II*, are much too significant to be explained as mere variant readings introduced by some intelligent scribe and then

to do - while *ROL* XXVII was already in the process of being printed. Some brief remarks concerning this codex (Augsburg, Staats- und Stadtbibliothek, 4^o Cod. 63) and the text of the *Tabula generalis* presented there will be made below in an appendix. The *Ramon Llull Database* of the University of Barcelona (<http://orbita.bib.ub.es/llull/>) lists 41 Latin copies of the *Tabula generalis* because it includes three more manuscripts containing small fragments of the text. As the origin of these fragments is mostly unsure, they have been disregarded in the critical edition (for a brief assessment see *ROL* XXVII, p. 54*, n. 131). In that note, I erroneously ascribed the fragment listed as no. 2 to the *Union Theological Seminary Library* in New York, while actually it belongs to Ms. 3 of the *Franciscan Institute at St. Bonaventure University, N.Y.*)

⁵ This is a well-known phenomenon in those Lullian works which were translated into Latin from a Catalan original. See, for instance, the introduction to *ROL* XV, pp. xci-xcii.

copied by others; but, on the other hand, *lat. I* and *lat. II* are much too close to be totally independent of each other. The 38 Latin manuscripts can be clearly separated into two groups, one of them offering the text of *lat. I* and the other the text of *lat. II*.⁶

Lat. I appears to be the first Latin translation of the *Tabula generalis*, and it offers a text which is fairly decent with regard to its contents but leaves a lot to be desired as concerns the quality of its Latin style and grammar. *Lat. II* presents a *completely* revised version of the text, one that must have been created very soon after the *lat. I* redaction by using *lat. I* as a textual basis and the original Catalan version as a control. In the process of the revision, the basic text offered by *lat. I* was corrected and more or less heavily reworked with regard to grammar and style, and in large part this was obviously done with the help of a Catalan manuscript. Numerous passages must even be considered as new translations. Some examples:

In the manuscripts belonging to the *lat. I* group, the introductory sentence to the prologue of the *Tabula generalis* reads: «Ratio, quare ista tabula ponitur esse generalis, consistit in hoc, quia de generalibus principiis, regulis et quaestionibus consistit».⁷ In the *lat. II* manuscripts, this sentence has been corrected to read: «Ratio, quare ista tabula ponitur esse generalis, consistit in hoc, quia de generalibus principiis, regulis et quaestionibus *compilatur*». Apparently, the *lat. II* redactor disliked the repetition of *consistit* and therefore changed it into *compilatur* at the end of the sentence. Similar corrections of minor stylistic or grammatical blunders are ubiquitous in *lat. II*: «quia ... demonstrabimus» is turned into «ut ... demonstramus»;⁸ «eo modo» into «tali modo»;⁹ and so on. Very often the attempt to improve style and grammar even leads to a reformulation of entire sentences.

In some cases the text of *lat. I* is amplified with explanations that can be found neither in the Catalan version nor in its first translation but must have been added by the redactor of *lat. II*, as in the following example:

A sentence which reads in *lat. I*: «Quantitas et tempus principia accidentalia significant ...»¹⁰ is completed in *lat. II* with a list of the accidental principles in question («... quae sunt nouem, scilicet, quantitas, qualitas, relatio, actio, passio, habitus, situs, tempus et locus»). Here, as in many other cases, the redactor proves to be familiar not only with the basics of contemporary Aristotelian philosophy

⁶ For the two groups of manuscripts, see *ROL* XXVII, p. 79*.

⁷ *ROL* XXVII, p. 1.

⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹ *ROL* XXVII, p. 11.

¹⁰ *ROL* XXVII, p. 15.

but also with Llull's teaching. This enables him to insert into his text additional information in places where his master Llull was, at least in his eyes, all too brief. Because of these explanatory additions we can be sure that the text of *lat. II* is secondary to that of *lat. I*.

The examples quoted up to this point serve to demonstrate that *lat. II* must be considered as a revised version of *lat. I*. What hasn't been proved yet is that the *lat. II* redactor also used a Catalan manuscript to correct the text of his Latin source. But he must have done so, because otherwise he couldn't have given correct new translations of certain phrases that are unclear or even completely wrong in *lat. I*. I'd like to confine myself to giving one single but significant example for such a new translation:

It's a passage from the third distinction of the *Tabula generalis* where the Lullian rules are being explained, and it deals with the first rule B (*utrum*). In the Catalan version, the passage reads: «Aquesta regla es en esta art per entensió d'ensercar les causes qui son demanades *sotz raó de sí*».¹¹ In this context, «*si*» is doubtlessly supposed to mean «*utrum*». But the *lat. I* translator obviously interpreted the «*si*» as a reflexive pronoun and consequently turned the sentence into: «Regula ista posita est in hac Arte intentione inuestigandi illud, quod quaeritur *sub ratione sui ipsius*»,¹² which makes no sense at all.¹³ The *lat. II* redactor copied the first part of the sentence from his *lat. I* source, but then he corrected the second part, most probably with the help of a Catalan manuscript: «Regula ista posita est in hac Arte intentione inuestigandi illud, quod quaeritur *sub ratione huius quaestionis 'utrum'*».¹⁴

As this example shows, the *lat. II* redactor must have composed his own Latin version of the *Tabula generalis* on the basis of at least one Latin and one Catalan copy of the text. This theory can be backed up by a couple of further examples which demonstrate that in some cases the redactor didn't choose between using *either* the *lat. I* version *or* offering a new translation from his Catalan text but compiled a new phrase from *both* sources:

For instance, a sentence which reads «... e *sabuda* la theòrica d'esta sciencia, sola aquesta figura abasta a la practica»¹⁵ in Catalan, and «Unde *intellecta* theorica huius scientiae ...»¹⁶ in *lat. I* is changed into «Unde *intellecta siue scita* theorica

¹¹ *ORL* XVI, p. 339.

¹² *ROL* XXVII, p. 53, apparatus.

¹³ Serious mistakes of this kind, which can also be found in *lat. II*, make it very clear that Llull can't have translated the *Tabula generalis* himself.

¹⁴ *ROL* XXVII, p. 53.

¹⁵ *ORL* XVI, p. 311.

¹⁶ *ROL* XXVII, p. 26.

huius scientiae ...» in *lat. II*. Most probably, the redactor took the «intellecta» from his Latin source and then added «scita» as a more literal translation of «sabuda» from his Catalan source.

In a similar fashion, two terms from two different sources are being added in the following example:

cat.: Eternitat es de savieia e de comensament per so que-n savieia no sia entellectiu enans que entellegible, ni entellegible enans que *entès*, e que entendre sia aytant eternal com *amdós*.¹⁷

lat. I: Aeternitas est de sapientia et de principio, ut in sapientia non sit intellectuum antequam intelligibile nec intelligibile antequam *intellectum*, et quod intelligere sit in tantum aeternum sicut *intellectuum et intelligibile*.¹⁸

lat. II: Aeternitas est de sapientia et de principio, ut in sapientia non sit intellectuum antequam intelligibile nec intelligibile antequam *intellectuum*, et quod intelligere sit in tantum aeternum sicut *ambo, scilicet intellectuum et intelligibile*.

In this case, the «ambo, scilicet intellectuum et intelligibile» offered by *lat. II* must be considered as a combination of the Catalan «amdós» and the «intellectuum et intelligibile» in *lat. I*.¹⁹ If the redactor of *lat. II* had not been in possession of a Catalan manuscript, there would have been no reason to insert *ambo* into his text.

In short, the two Latin versions of the *Tabula generalis* can be characterized as follows: *Lat. I* was translated from the vernacular in a clumsy Latin style which shows that the translator was familiar with Lull's teaching but not exactly an expert in the subtleties of the Latin language. The sentence construction of *lat.*

¹⁷ *ORL* XVI, p. 438.

¹⁸ *ROL* XXVII, p. 158.

¹⁹ In this passage, the *lat. II* redactor also converted the *entès/intellectum* that he found in his sources into *intellectuum*. This is interesting because the original Catalan text is indeed difficult to understand. First Lull operates with *three* terms (entellectiu, entellegible, entès), but then he doesn't make quite clear to which two of them *amdós* is supposed to be referring. The translator of *lat. I* replaced *amdós* by *intellectuum et intelligibile* and thus chose the two terms that he believed to be the ones concerned. In *lat. II*, *intellectum* is substituted by *intellectuum* so that there are only two terms left and the text reads without posing any problems. The critical edition in *ROL* XXVII presents the text of *lat. I* as the version that is closer to the Catalan text and, at the same time, as the *lectio difficilior*.

I is usually extremely close to that of its Catalan source, and large parts of the text are literal translations, many of which are so literal as to turn out unclear or even incomprehensible. On the other hand, there are several cases in which the translator apparently felt free to reformulate entire sentences, to omit some smaller phrases or to give interpretations rather than translations. On most of these occasions he proves to have a sound understanding of what Llull was intending to say, and his free translations are often even better than those of *lat. II*. On the whole, *lat. I* presents a text that is very close to the Catalan original and to Llull's thinking but often faulty and peppered with stylistic and grammatical blunders in detail.

The redactor of the *lat. II* version tried to correct the mistakes of his *lat. I* source and to improve its text with regard to style and grammar. The alterations he made can be divided into three categories:

- 1) corrections of real or supposed mistranslations²⁰
- 2) improvement in style or grammar
- 3) explanatory additions.

As a result, his text is a lot more pleasant to read, but it has lost much of the earthy, naïve charm of the first translation.

Two Catalan versions

To make the textual situation of the *Tabula generalis* even more complicated, not only the Latin but also the Catalan version of the text has been preserved in two different redactions. Of the three Catalan manuscripts of the *Taula general* that have come down to us, one presents the first redaction, *cat. I*²¹ and the other two the second redaction, *cat. II*.²² Even at a rather superficial glance, *cat. I* shows clear parallels with *lat. I*, and *cat. II* with *lat. II*. Actually, most of the corrections and additions that were introduced by the redactor of *lat. II* have their counterpart in *cat. II*.

While the resemblance of *cat. I* and *lat. I* can easily be explained by considering *cat. I* as the source for *lat. I*, the relationship of *cat. II* and *lat. II*

²⁰ Not all the alterations made by the *lat. II* redactor prove to be for the better. In some cases he «corrected» a phrase which was unclear in *lat. I* but still fairly accurate. If in these cases he didn't consult his Catalan source – and from time to time he obviously didn't – his new version of the phrase sometimes turned out to be clearly wrong whereas *lat. I* had been basically correct. For an example see *ROL* XXVII, p. 86*, n. 171.

²¹ Palma de Mallorca, Biblioteca Pública, ms. 1103.

²² Palma de Mallorca, Biblioteca del Convent de Sant Francesc, ms. 11; Cambridge (Massachusetts), Harvard College Library, Houghton Library, ms. catal. 12.

seems to pose some serious problems at first sight. If *lat. II* was compiled, as I have shown above, by a redactor who used *lat. I* and *cat. I* as a basis for his work, then how does *cat. II* fit into this frame?

A closer examination of the manuscripts leads to the conclusion that *cat. II* must have been redacted by employing both *cat. I* and *lat. II* (but not *lat. I*) as textual sources. The variant readings in *cat. II* that correspond with similar variants in *lat. II* can then be explained to be *retranslations* from Latin into Catalan. The following example, which depicts the development of a passage from *cat. I* via *lat. I* and *lat. II* up to *cat. II*, may serve to illustrate the situation:

cat. I: On, feta aquesta *temptació*, requer l'art que hom fassa la conclusió sotz forma de major quantitat ...²³

lat. I: Unde: Facta ista *temptatione*, requirit Ars, quod conclusio fiat sub forma maioris quantitatis ...²⁴

lat. II: Unde: Facta ista *probatione uel quaestione*, requirit Ars, quod conclusio fiat sub forma maioris quantitatis ...

cat. II: On, fet aquest *asagament o questió*, requer l'art que hom fassa la conclusió sotz forma de major quantitat

Temptatio in *lat. I* is, of course, a literal translation of *temptació*. Literal translations of this kind are very frequent in *lat. I*, as I have pointed out above. From the context it becomes clear that Llull is talking about an *attempt* or a *test*. *Temptatio*, however, can easily be associated with *temptation*, and this is probably why the *lat. II* redactor decided to give a new translation and to render *temptació* as *probatio uel quaestio*. Finally, *cat. II* with its *asagament o questió* corresponds exactly with *probatio uel quaestio*, and the easiest way to account for this correspondance is to identify *cat. II* as a retranslation from *lat. II*.

But it could still be the other way round. In the case outlined above, *lat. II* might also be explained as a translation from *cat. II*. Yet there are a few but striking examples by which we can conclude without any serious doubt that parts of *cat. II* must have been retranslated from *lat. II*, like, for instance:

cat. I: ... *enfora la semblansa de contrarietat e de menoritat* ...²⁵

²³ *ORL XVI*, p. 344.

²⁴ *ROL XXVII*, p. 60.

²⁵ *ORL XVI*, p. 344.

lat. I and *lat. II*: ... *exceptis* similitudinibus contrarietatis et minoritatis ...²⁶

cat. II: ... *acceptat* la semblansa de contrarietat et de menoritat ...

There is no way to explain how the original *enfora* from *cat. I* could possibly have been turned into *acceptat* in *cat. II* except by making a detour via the Latin text, which has *exceptis* in both versions. If pronounced with a Catalan accent, *exceptis* in Latin sounds very much like *acceptis*, and *acceptis* retranslated into Catalan (and put into the singular) leads up to *acceptat*. It is very likely that at this point someone with a Catalan accent read the Latin text of the *Tabula generalis* to the redactor of *cat. II* who translated it back into Catalan while writing it down.

As these examples show, *cat. II* may well be considered as a compilation of elements derived from both *cat. I* and *lat. II*, so that the textual development of the four different versions of the *Tabula generalis* can finally be summarized as follows:

Cat. I represents the original version of the text as it was written by Ramon Llull. *Lat. I* is a Latin translation of this original text which was probably done by one of Llull's companions or pupils. Both *cat. I* and *lat. I* were used by a redactor to constitute a new Latin version, *lat. II*. Another redactor eventually employed *cat. I* and *lat. II* to compile a second Catalan version, *cat. II*.

The Latin manuscripts

The four versions of the *Tabula generalis* are, of course, hypothetical reconstructions. Not a single manuscript has been preserved that presents the pure and unspoilt text of one of those versions. This is true not only for the three Catalan copies but particularly for the Latin manuscripts.

Aside from the usual errors and mistakes made by the copyists, a large number of Latin manuscripts of the *Tabula generalis* prove to be contaminated with variant readings derived from *the other Latin version* of the work. Or precisely: Some of the *lat. I* manuscripts are contaminated with *lat. II* variants, and most of the *lat. II* manuscripts have *lat. I* variants mingled into their text or written on the margins of the codex. Most probably, many copyists knew very well that there were different versions of the *Tabula generalis* in circulation, and so in order to construct their own text they tried to consult more than one manuscript if

²⁶ *ROL* XXVII, p. 60.

possible. Due to the copyists' attempt to compare and collate, the Latin manuscripts show various degrees of contamination. Some of them present hybrid texts in which *lat. I* and *lat. II* elements have been blended into a new mixture; other manuscripts generally stick to one of both versions but offer variant readings taken from the other redaction from time to time. Some *lat. I* manuscripts were later corrected according to the text of *lat. II*, and *vice versa*, and this was done either by the scribe himself or by another hand. In these cases, deletions of words or phrases and corrections between the lines or on the margins are ubiquitous.

In addition to being contaminated with variants taken from *the other* redaction, a great number of manuscripts also offer variants derived from a second copy belonging to *their own* group. Especially within the *lat. II* group, some copyists seem to have compiled their own version of the *Tabula generalis* by collating as many manuscripts as they could find.

After all, only very few manuscripts can be safely traced back to being copies of one single source, while most of them seem to be compilations of elements derived from at least two or three different sources. As a result, the setting up of a classical *stemma codicum* for the *Tabula generalis* proved to be virtually impossible, and the stemma printed in the introduction to *ROL XXVII* may only serve to give a first and very general impression of the two big groups of manuscripts and some dependencies within those groups.

Proaza's edition

The *Tabula generalis* was first edited by Alonso de Proaza in 1515.²⁷ Proaza's edition constitutes the first systematic effort to compile something like a definitive version of the text on the basis of a large number of manuscript copies. In a colophon, Proaza points out that he reconstructed the formerly corrupted text by using more than 20 manuscripts:

Et si vix fieri potuit quod viginti et amplius hinc inde aggregatis exemplaribus hec tabula ad suam primeuam integritatem et rectitudinem reuocari potuisset, cum infinitis prope mendis et deformitatibus scateret ...²⁸

There can be no doubt that Proaza's text is a milestone in the history of the *Tabula*. However, when he suggests that he finally restored the *Tabula generalis* to a state of quasi-virginal integrity and accuracy, that's pure rhetoric. In fact, his

²⁷ *Tabula generalis*, ed. Alphonsus de Proaza (Valencia, 1515), ff. LXXIIIr-XCIXr.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, f. XCIXr.

text generally follows the secondary redaction *lat. II*, so there can be no question of *primaeva integritas* whatsoever. Apart from that, Proaza, like many of his predecessors, constructed a hybrid text by interweaving his *lat. II* text with *lat. I* readings, and he also revised the *Tabula* once more and very heavily with regard to its Latin style. Last but not least, he added title lines for the single chapters and a table of contents.

The following examples demonstrate how Proaza reworked the text of the *Tabula generalis*. For instance, in the Latin manuscripts a passage from the prologue reads:

*Adhuc: Scientia ista generalis est, quia de (decem) generalibus regulis et quaestionibus consistit, ad quas quidem regulas et quaestiones omnia, quaecumque sunt, reduci possunt.*²⁹

Proaza changed this sentence into:

*Est adhuc scientia ista generalis, eo quia de decem generalibus regulis et quaestionibus constat, ad quas quidem regulas et quaestiones est reducibile quicquid est.*³⁰

The «decem» in the first quotation is put in brackets because it's missing in most of the *lat. I* manuscripts. It must be considered as one of the explanatory additions made by the *lat. II* redactor. Proaza copied this addition and polished the Latin style of the sentence without changing its meaning in any way. This manner of revising the language but not the contents is characteristic of his method of working. In a similar fashion, he reworked the following passage from the manuscripts:

*Praeterea: Generalis est haec scientia, quia in ipsa sunt mixta principia generalia et etiam regulae et quaestiones, uidelicet unumquodque principium in quolibet alio, ut in ipsis mixtis specialia, quae quaeruntur, possunt apparere affirmando uel negando tali modo, quod per talem generalem mixtionem factam fiat cum concordantia solutio quaestionis...*³¹

In Proaza's edition, this sentence reads:

Ponitur praeterea haec scientia generalis, quia in ipsa sunt mixta principia generalia et etiam regulae et quaestiones, uidelicet unumquodque principiorum in quolibet alio, ut in ipsorum mixtione specialia, quae inuestigantur, appareant,

²⁹ *ROL* XXVII, p. 4.

³⁰ Proaza, f. LXXIIIr.

³¹ *ROL* XXVII, p. 7.

affirmando uel negando, *ita* quod per *eiusmodi* generalem mixtionem fiat cum concordantia solutio quaestionis ...³²

All in all, Proaza's edition of *Tabula generalis* is a remarkably competent piece of work. Even though the Latin text was revised in great detail regarding style and grammar, it is nonetheless quite reliable with respect to its contents. Because of his thorough knowledge of Ramon Llull's thinking, and, of course, due to the more than twenty manuscripts he used, Proaza was able to get very close to what Llull had been intending to say. Although this first edition of the *Tabula generalis* is still a long way from being a critical edition, it might well be considered as a first step in this direction.

The *Moguntina*

More than two hundred years after Proaza's edition, the *Tabula generalis* was printed once more in the fifth volume of the *Moguntina*.³³ Ivo Salzinger, who prepared this second edition, had a copy of Proaza's version at his disposal, and he made up his own text by borrowing almost entirely from Proaza. In fact, both texts are nearly identical, which means that Salzinger copied Proaza's stylistic corrections, his title lines, the table of contents, and even the colophon quoted above. It goes without saying that because of its closeness to Proaza's text, the *Moguntina* version generally corresponds with the *lat. II* redaction of the *Tabula generalis*.

Yet there are a very few passages where Salzinger corrected Proaza's text, and he seems to have done this with the help of a manuscript or maybe even several manuscript copies. For example, Proaza had changed a sentence from the prologue, which reads «... ut Deus a suo populo multum recolatur, *intelligatur et ametur* ...» in the manuscripts, into «... ut Deus a suo populo multum recolatur, *ametur et intelligatur*... ».³⁴ Salzinger put *intelligatur et ametur* back into their original and much more Lullian order.³⁵

In another place, Proaza had falsely written *expectantia* instead of *spectantia*, thereby copying a variant that can be found in a handful of manuscripts.³⁶ Salzinger corrected it back into *spectantia*.³⁷

³² Proaza, f. LXXIIIr.

³³ *Raimundi Lulli opera omnia*, vol. 5, ed. I. Salzinger (Mainz, 1729; repr. Frankfurt/Main, 1965), pp. 212-300 (which will be quoted as *MOG V* in the following).

³⁴ *ROL XXVII*, p. 6; Proaza, f. LXXIIIr.

³⁵ *MOG V*, p. 222.

³⁶ *ROL XXVII*, p. 14; Proaza, f. LXXIIIv.

³⁷ *MOG V*, p. 223.

Finally, there are passages in the *Moguntina* where Salzinger – like Proaza and many copyists before him – compiled a hybrid text by employing variants from both *lat. I* and *lat. II* copies of the *Tabula generalis*. For instance, there's the following sentence in a great number of manuscripts, especially in those of the *lat. I* group:

... unde quaelibet ipsarum camerarum uniuersalis est ad *inuestigandum* omnia particularia, quae quaeruntur ...³⁸

Most *lat. II* manuscripts (but not all of them!) have *intelligendum* instead of *inuestigandum*, and this is also what Proaza wrote:

... unde quaelibet ipsarum camerarum uniuersalis est ad *intelligendum* sua particularia...³⁹

Salzinger, however, decided to combine both variants, and so his text reads in the end:

... unde quaelibet ipsarum camerarum uniuersalis est ad *inuestigandum et intelligendum* sua particularia ...⁴⁰

As these examples show, Salzinger didn't simply copy from Proaza's edition, but he collated the printed text with several manuscripts. In the course of his own editorial work, he usually decided to follow Proaza, but not without controlling his predecessor's text (or at least parts of it) meticulously. Since the text of the *Moguntina* is, after all, almost identical with that of Proaza's edition, most of what has been said above as a general assessment of the edition of 1515 goes for the text of the *Moguntina* as well.

The Catalan manuscripts and the critical edition in *ORL*

In 1932, the critical edition of the *Taula general* appeared as vol. XVI of the *Obres de Ramon Llull*. Salvador Galmés, who edited the work, had but two Catalan manuscripts at his disposal, that is, his manuscript **A**, which nowadays belongs to the *Biblioteca Pública* in Palma de Mallorca (ms. 1103), and his manuscript **B**, which is now ms. 11 of the *Biblioteca del Convent de Sant*

³⁸ *ROL* XXVII, p. 22.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, apparatus; Proaza, f. LXXIIIr.

⁴⁰ *MOG* V, p. 225.

Francesc in Palma. Apart from these two Catalan manuscripts, Galmés used the Latin text of the *Moguntina* and a Latin manuscript for collation (Palma de Mallorca, *Biblioteca Pública*, ms. 995). He lists four more Latin manuscripts in his introduction,⁴¹ but he doesn't seem to have examined them thoroughly.

The third Catalan manuscript mentioned above (Cambridge/Massachusetts, Harvard College Library, Houghton Library, ms. catal. 12) was unknown to Galmés. It was first catalogued in 1962 and then described by Friedrich Stegmüller in *Estudis Romànics* X (1962), 91-97. In *ROL* XXVII, I have called the three Catalan manuscripts *cata*, *catB*, and *catC*.

Galmés chose the text of *cata* as the basis for his edition and collated it with *catB*, whose variant readings are usually listed in the critical apparatus. Indeed, *cata* offers a much better text than *catB*, not only because *catB* is an unreliable manuscript containing numerous errors and mistakes, but also because *catB*, as a representative of the *cat. II* redaction, frequently interposes explanatory additions and interpretations derived from the *lat. II* redaction of the *Tabula generalis*. Galmés believed these interpolations to be the *source* for the corresponding additions in his Latin versions,⁴² whereas I have shown above that it must be the other way round, that is, that they must be regarded as *retranslations* from the *lat. II* text. As a matter of fact, both the *Moguntina* and the Latin manuscript Galmés used generally offer the text of the *lat. II* redaction, which means that he wasn't aware of the existence of two different Latin versions of the *Tabula generalis*.

Nevertheless, Galmés' edition presents a Catalan text which is highly reliable. *Cata*, used by Galmés as his editorial basis, is an excellent manuscript that he himself considered to be a direct copy of the archetype.⁴³ It is not free of errors and mistakes, but they're very rare, and in most of these cases Galmés made plausible conjectures.

In contrast to *cata*, which attests the *cat. I* version of the *Tabula generalis*, both *catB* and *catC* have the secondary Catalan version *cat. II*. They're so closely related that they might well be copies of the same source. Not only do they usually present the same variant readings, but above all, they both insert two larger chapters in the same place right before the epilogue, chapters that don't belong to the original text of the *Taula general*, namely, a) the *condicions* and b) the *Taula d'esta art*.

⁴¹ *ORL* XVI, pp. XX-XXI.

⁴² See *ORL* XVI, p. XIX. To be precise, Galmés believed an «original progenitor» of *catB* to be the source for the Latin text of the *Tabula generalis*, not *catB* itself.

⁴³ *Ibid.*

a) The *condicions* comprise two paragraphs entitled «De les condicions del primer coronel de la taula» and «De les condicions del primer coronel de la tersa figura», which don't have any counterpart whatsoever in the Latin manuscripts and editions of the *Tabula generalis*. However, they've been attached to the work as a supplement *after* the explicit in *catA*, and this is where Galmés decided to situate them in his edition.⁴⁴ In *catB* and *catC*, the *condicions* seem to form a part of the *Taula general* itself, but as such they're definitely out of place.

b) The *Taula d'esta art* (or: *Taula de paraules*) is a little dictionary with explanations of terms frequently used by Llull. It was inserted into *catB* and *catC* right after the *condicions* and before the epilogue, but it appears neither in *catA* nor in the Latin manuscripts of the *Tabula generalis*. In the past, it was usually regarded as an appendix to the *Ars amativa*, and it has been edited as such in *MOG* and *ORL*.⁴⁵ However, Bonner suggested listing the *Taula d'esta art* as an appendix to the *Tabula generalis*, mainly because of its interpolation into the text of the *Taula general* in *catB* and *catC*.⁴⁶ Later he corrected his viewpoint and assigned it once more to the *Ars amativa*.⁴⁷

Indeed, the *Taula d'esta art* can't have been conceived specifically as an appendix to the *Taula general* because seven of the terms that are being explained there don't appear in the *Taula general* at all, namely: *amabundós*, *bonaundós*, *bonós*, *amancia*, *contiguïtat*, *contingent*, *contingencia*. Supposedly it wasn't intended to be an appendix to the *Ars amativa* either, but simply a lexicographic reference book explaining terms of Llull's *Ars* in general.⁴⁸ The connection with the *Taula general* might have been made later because of the key word *taula* which appears in the titles of both works, maybe by the scribe who copied the manuscript that came to be the common source for *catB* and *catC*.

Apart from the interpolation of the *condicions* and the *Taula d'esta art* into the text of the *Taula general*, there's one more point in which *catB* and *catC* show striking parallels. In part nine of the fifth distinction, Llull lists 340 questions

⁴⁴ *ORL* XVI, pp. 518-522. For a comment by Galmés, see p. 516, n. 4.

⁴⁵ *MOG* VI, pp. 155-157; *ORL* XVII, pp. 389-398. The Latin version edited in the *Moguntina* is, as the editor himself points out in an explanatory note attached to the text, a new translation made from a Catalan manuscript. In fact, there are no Latin manuscripts of the *Tabula huius artis* attested (although Stegmüller erroneously mentions two Latin manuscripts in his introduction to *MOG* VI).

⁴⁶ *OS* II, p. 554, n. 50.

⁴⁷ A. Bonner, «Correccions i problemes cronològics», *SL* 35 (1995), 85-95; see p. 93.

⁴⁸ In ms. 1025 of the Biblioteca Pública in Palma de Mallorca, where the text of the *Taula de paraules* has been copied independently of any of the larger works cited above, its incipit reads: «Aquesta taula es de les paraules ho dels vocables qui son en lati en totes les sues arts e llibres que mestre Ramon luyll ha fetes...» (see *ORL* XVII, p. 389). From this note it can be concluded that the *Taula* was regarded as an independent dictionary referring to *all the works* of Llull's *Ars*, at least in the circles in which the copyist moved.

preceded by combinations of letters derived from the *tabula*. These combinations follow a strict logical order which has been completely destroyed in *catB* and *catC*, probably because there were folios mixed up in their common source. The new order of questions is identical in both manuscripts, except for the omission of a larger passage in *catB*, which makes it evident that *catB* can't have been the source for *catC*.⁴⁹

Due to the close relationship of *catB* and *catC*, the omission of *catC* in the critical edition of the *Taula general* in *ORL* is of no real importance. As a consequence, Galmés' text is still absolutely up-to-date today. Since it presents the version of the *Tabula generalis* that comes closest to what Lull wrote himself, the edition in *ORL* played a crucial role in the making of the critical edition in *ROL XXVII*.

The critical edition in *ROL XXVII*

The identification of two different Latin redactions of the *Tabula generalis* was one of the first and most important results of my editorial work with the manuscripts. When it came to the constitution of the critical text, the crucial question was whether to choose *lat. I* or *lat. II* as a textual basis for the edition, or to compile a new hybrid text from both versions. All three possibilities were clearly questionable:

To opt for *lat. I* as a basis and to ban all the *lat. II* variants into the critical apparatus would have been tantamount to copying a clumsy Latin translation full of mistakes. On the other hand, choosing *lat. II* would have meant to prefer not the original but a second (and thus secondary) Latin redaction. If *lat. II* offered an excellent text, this would nonetheless have been an option. But since the corrections and reformulations in *lat. II* are often unnecessary or even misleading, there was no justification for giving preference to the *lat. II* text in general. Finally, to construct a hybrid text by borrowing from both *lat. I* and *lat. II* manuscripts at pleasure would have amounted to compiling something like a third version *lat. III* that would have been neither fish nor fowl.

The critical edition in *ROL XXVII* now offers a text that attempts to avoid the pitfalls of all three possibilities outlined above. I decided to choose the *lat. I* redaction as an editorial basis and to follow its text as long as it is accurate in

⁴⁹ The order of questions in dist. IX seems to have posed serious problems for several copyists. It got mixed up not only in the source from which *catB* and *catC* were copied, but also in *catB* itself (where f. 73 was bound in with its verso side in front and in the wrong place) and in four Latin manuscripts stemming from Ms. 4180 of the Herzog August Bibliothek in Wolfenbüttel, in which ff. 208 and 209 had been interchanged (see *ROL XXVII*, pp. 75*, 77*, and 81*).

content and grammatically tolerable (sometimes from an exceedingly tolerant point of view). Only where the *lat. I* translation proved to be definitely mistaken, corrupted, incomprehensible or completely wrong with regard to its grammar, I preferred the corresponding *lat. II* variant. The Catalan edition and the *cata* manuscript were used as a corrective throughout the entire text, and in borderline cases I tried to choose the Latin variant that corresponds better with the Catalan text. The critical apparatus offers all the variant readings of the *lat. II* redaction and, wherever the *lat. II* version appears in the text itself, the respective *lat. I* variant. In addition, it frequently presents the Catalan wording of a certain phrase, either to demonstrate that the Latin variant chosen in the text corresponds with the Catalan version or to show that the Catalan version differs from its Latin translation. As the choice between *lat. I* and *lat. II* variants was often a matter of opinion, it would be advisable for readers striving to find out the exact meaning of a passage to consult the critical apparatus even more carefully than in other works of the *ROL* edition.

The critical Latin text of the *Tabula generalis* in *ROL* will surely disappoint classical philologists and other admirers of the beauties of the Latin language. It is not beautiful. With respect to the quality of its Latin, it takes not only one but even two steps backwards, behind the former editions and behind the *lat. II* redaction. But in this case, moving backwards means moving closer to Ramon Llull. The critical text may not be beautiful, it may even leave something to do for a grey-haired Latin teacher's red correction pen. Yet it breathes the air of Llull's surroundings and reflects the sound of his Catalan mother tongue.

Appendix

In the list of Latin manuscripts of the *Tabula generalis* in *ROL* XXVII, the codex from Augsburg, Staats- und Stadtbibliothek, 4^o Cod. 63 (XV), is missing. It has been described by Wolf Gehrt in: *Handschriftenkataloge der Staats- und Stadtbibliothek Augsburg*, vol. VI (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1999), pp. 122-124. A brief description is also available on the internet in the *Ramon Llull Database* of the *Universitat de Barcelona*.

The *Tabula generalis* covers ff. 93r-161r, of which ff. 95v-104v are blank. The text is incomplete: it breaks off in the middle of f. 95r in the course of the description of the second figure in dist. I, 2, and then continues with the last paragraph of dist. IV which normally follows the *tabula*. The fifth distinction is complete.

The manuscript presents the text of the *lat. II* redaction of the *Tabula generalis*.

RESUM

Aquest article repassa la tradició manuscrita de *Tabula generalis*, començant per la que seria una versió catalana original, de la qual es van fer dues traduccions/redaccions llatines, i amb una segona redacció catalana que havia de ser en part retraduïda del text llatí. Llavors repassa les dues edicions llatines, de Proaza (València, 1515) i Salzinger (*MOG* V, 1729), donant exemples de com els editors revisaren el text de la *Tabula generalis*. Finalment, després de discutir la relació entre els tres manuscrits catalans i d'assessorar l'edició crítica d'*ORL* XVI, explica els criteris per a la constitució del nou text crític llatí de *ROL* XXVII.