

**Ramon Llull's *Disputatio quinque  
hominum sapientium*:  
some remarks on the Latin version edited  
in ROL XXXV (2014)**

**Viola Tenge-Wolf**

Universität Freiburg im Breisgau

Raimundus-Lullus-Institut

Viola.Tenge-Wolf@theol.uni-freiburg.de

In October 2014, my critical edition of Ramon Llull's *Disputatio quinque hominum sapientium* was published in vol. XXXV of the *Raimundi Lulli Opera Latina*.<sup>1</sup> Given that the introduction was written in German and might therefore be difficult to understand for a non-German audience, I would like to recapitulate some of the most important information in this paper. However, *ut prolixitatem evitemus* (as Llull would say), rather than commenting on the contents of the work I will focus on the peculiarities of its Latin version.

Even though the issue has been discussed by scholars on various occasions, it is still a matter of doubt whether Ramon Llull had sufficient command of the Latin language. He obviously read and understood Latin, but it is open to question whether he would have been able to *write* a proper Latin text all by himself.<sup>2</sup> Be that as it may, when it came to producing treatises in the language

---

Rebut el 19 de maig de 2015. Acceptat el 14 de juny de 2014. doi: 10.3306/STUDIALULLIANA.110.31

<sup>1</sup> *Raimundi Lulli Opera latina*, vol. XXXV. *Op. 54-60, annis 1294-1296 composita*, Coralba Colomba, Viola Tenge-Wolf (ed.), Corpus Christianorum. Continuatio Mediaevalis 248 (Turnhout: Brepols Publishers, 2014).

<sup>2</sup> For instance, in his *Cent noms de Déu*, Llull claims not to be able to translate the book into good Latin: “Soplec doncs al sant Payre Apostoli e als seynors cardenals que l fassen posar en latí en bel dictat, *car yo no li sabria posar, per so car ignor gramàtica*” (ORL XIX, p. 79, italics mine). Although this statement has been “attributed to proverbial humility” (Albert Soler, “Editing texts with a multilingual tradition:

of scholars and clergy, Llull appears to have relied on external expertise whenever he could.<sup>3</sup> The *Disputació de cinc savis / Disputatio quinque hominum sapientium* is a fine example of a work first written in Catalan by Llull and later translated into Latin with the assistance of collaborators—at least *two different* ones in this case, as will be shown below. Furthermore, I will focus on the differences between the hitherto most widely used edition of the *Disputatio* (that is, the one printed in the Mainz edition) and the version of the Latin manuscripts newly edited in ROL XXXV.

## 1. The Catalan and Latin versions of the *Disputatio quinque hominum sapientium*

Ramon Llull's *Disputació de cinc savis*, written in Naples in 1294, has been preserved in one single Catalan manuscript from the early fourteenth century: Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Cod. Hisp. 60. It was edited by Josep Perarnau i Espelt, “La *Disputació de cinc savis* de Ramon Llull. Estudi i edició del text català”, *ATCA* 5 (1986), pp. 7-229.

The Latin *Disputatio quinque hominum sapientium* is a translation from the original Catalan,<sup>4</sup> well documented in seventeen manuscript copies. Twelve of them have the complete text, two manuscripts omit part IV, and three present a revised and abridged Latin version drawn up in Germany in the mid-fifteenth century.<sup>5</sup> There are five reliable witnesses dating back to the fourteenth century, two of which (*A* and *R<sub>1</sub>*)<sup>6</sup> were even copied in Ramon Llull's lifetime.<sup>7</sup> On the whole, the textual basis of the Latin *Disputatio* is sound, with a uniform

---

the case of Ramon Llull”, *Variants* 5, 2006, pp. 53-72, p. 60, n. 18), I am convinced that there is a big core of truth in it. I agree with Soler that “it is impossible to believe that the author of such a large work could not have spoken Latin” (*ibid.*). But there is an immense difference between the ability to simply *speak* a language and the competence to *compose* a text in accordance with the rules of grammar and style. Perhaps we should take into consideration (and inquire more deeply into the issue!) that Llull was indeed unable to write a Latin text all by himself.

<sup>3</sup> Albert Soler has discussed the question of Llull's collaborators in “Editing texts with a multilingual tradition”, especially pp. 56-61.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Perarnau's introduction, *ATCA* 5 (1986), pp. 15-16. My collation of the Catalan and Latin versions of the text has confirmed his observation.

<sup>5</sup> For a complete list of manuscripts and editions, see my introduction to the critical edition of the *Disputatio* in ROL XXXV, p. 273.

<sup>6</sup> *A* = Milano, Biblioteca Ambrosiana, A 5 Sup., ff. 1r-67r; *R<sub>1</sub>* = Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, lat. 16117, ff. 120r-144r.

<sup>7</sup> Albert Soler counts them among the first generation manuscripts of Llull's works. See his “Els manuscrits lul·lians de primera generació”, *Estudis romànics* 32 (2010), pp. 179-214, esp. p. 200 (*A*) and p. 184 (*R<sub>1</sub>*).

text unaffected by influences of different translations, severe contamination or other major corruptions.

The Latin text of the *Disputatio* was first edited by Alphonsus de Proaza (Valencia: Joan Jofre, 1510, ff. 42r-81r; RD 42). Independently from Proaza's text, Ivo Salzinger prepared another printed version for his *Raymundi Lulli Opera* more than two hundred years later (*MOG* II, iv, pp. 1-50, [125-174]).<sup>8</sup> Both Proaza's and Salzinger's editions are stylistically revised and often deviate from the text presented by the manuscript witnesses. Salzinger's edition relies heavily on the vernacular version of the text, drawing on both Latin and Catalan manuscripts and sometimes translating directly from the Catalan. He reworked part IV with regard to its contents and attached the *Petitio Raimundi pro conversione infidelium ad Coelestinum V papam* to the *Disputatio*, as will be shown in section three below.

While the language of the Catalan version is rather plain and straightforward, the prologue of the Latin version obviously strives for a certain elegance of expression. In the course of parts I-III, however, the Latin text adapts to the unornamented style of its vernacular source and generally stays close to the original. Essentially, the Latin version of parts I-III (except for the very last three paragraphs of part III) is a faithful translation of the Catalan *Disputació de cinc savis*.

This situation changes completely in the large final section of the work that starts with the concluding paragraphs of part III and continues through all of part IV. In this part of the work, the original text has been considerably revised. The differences between the Catalan and the Latin versions are so extensive that Josep Perarnau tried to present them in a synoptic edition, juxtaposing his critical Catalan text of part IV with the Latin text of ms. Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm. 10505.<sup>9</sup> The peculiarities of the revised Latin translation of part IV deserve to be discussed at length.

---

<sup>8</sup> The chronological catalogue of Lull's works by Fernando Domínguez in ROL, Supplementum Lullianum II, erroneously considers Salzinger's text to be a copy of Proaza's edition. See *Raimundus Lullus. An introduction to his life, works and thought*, Alexander Fidora, Josep Enric Rubio (ed.) (Turnhout: Brepols, 2008), p. 165. There is no textual evidence at all for this assertion. In fact, Salzinger owned a manuscript copy of Proaza's edition (Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm. 10591) but made no explicit use of it in establishing his own text (see my introduction to the *Disputatio* in ROL XXXV, p. 264).

<sup>9</sup> See Perarnau, *ATCA* 5 (1986), pp. 101-187. In parts I-III of his edition of the *Disputació dels cinc savis*, Perarnau listed the variant readings of the Latin text in his critical apparatus. But this would indeed have been impossible in part IV with its lengthy paragraphs of new or reworded text.

## 2. The Latin manuscript version of part IV of the *Disputatio*

While the first three parts of the Latin *Disputatio* form a homogeneous piece of work, the translation of part IV is internally inconsistent when compared to the Catalan original. In rendering the text into Latin, the translator (whoever he may have been) did not stick to a coherent method but switched between translating word by word and rewriting a sentence or paragraph more or less completely. There are large sections that correspond literally with the vernacular version, followed by others in which the text was altered to a significant degree. Sometimes the translation is free rather than literal while the contents substantially remain the same; in other sections even the contents have been modified. Various paragraphs have been deleted and extensive new ones added, with the result that part IV is 50 percent longer in the Latin version, as Perarnau has already pointed out.<sup>10</sup> Considering the major alterations introduced by the Latin translator of part IV, he may well be called a *redactor*:

Three main aspects of his revisionary work deserve to be commented on in detail.

### 2.1. Elimination of the frame narrative

The frame narrative telling the story of the five wise men has been completely eliminated in part IV of the Latin version. In the original Catalan it had run through the entire work, finally leading over to the *Petició de Ramon al papa Celestí V*. In the Latin version, however, the frame narrative ends in the final paragraph of part III, and in part IV the five wise men have disappeared from the scene altogether. There are no internal references to other sections of the work, so that part IV appears to be an independent treatise on the Christian doctrines of trinity and incarnation rather than an integral component of the *Disputatio*.

At the same time, the original link between the *Disputació de cinc savis* and the *Petició de Ramon al papa Celestí V* has been broken in the Latin version. In the Munich manuscript of the Catalan text, the *explicit* of the *Disputació* had connected the work with Llull's petition to pope Celestine V and the cardinals, following right after the *Disputació*:<sup>11</sup>

Fenit es aquest tractat a glòria e honor de nostre seynor Déus. E dix lo latín que so que él auia dit de la trinitat e de la encarnatió sotsposaua a corecció de la esgleya romana. E ab aitant partí's dels sauis e anà-se'n a ombra d'un bel arbre e concirà lon-

---

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 19.

<sup>11</sup> Just like the *Disputació de cinc savis*, Llull's petition to Celestine has only been preserved in Cod. Hisp. 60 of the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek in Munich.

gament com fees aquesta petició al seynor sant apostoli e als seyors cardenals per raó de pública vtilitat e per sò que per tot lo món sia amat e conegut nostre seyor Déus.<sup>12</sup>

In the Latin version, the *explicit* was completely rewritten and purged of any references to the frame narrative:

Anno incarnationis dominicae MCCXCIV in ciuitate Neapolitana fuit editum hoc opusculum ad gloriam et honorem summae trinitatis, quae ipsum uelit a linguis mordacibus custodire, ac ipsum faciat, si in aliquo indiget, corrigi uel etiam melius declarari per filios uniuersalis ecclesiae sacrosanctae. Commendo etiam ipsum beatissimae Mariae uirgini gloriosae, matri domini nostri Iesu Christi, qui cum Patre et Spiritu sancto uiuit et regnat Deus in saecula saeculorum. Amen.<sup>13</sup>

What is more, there is no petition appended to the *Disputatio* in any of the Latin manuscripts. In fact, a Latin petition written by Llull and addressed to Celestine V does not even exist.<sup>14</sup> Its equivalent would be the *Petitio Raimundi pro conversione infidelium ad Bonifatium VIII papam*, a revised translation of the Catalan *Petició* written some months after Celestine's resignation for his successor, pope Boniface VIII.<sup>15</sup> But this new Latin petition is totally independent of the *Disputatio* and never goes along with it in any of the Latin manuscripts.

At this point, we need to ask if it was Llull himself who originally connected the *Disputació de cinc savis* with the *Petició de Ramon al papa Celestí V*. Given that the two works have come down to us in a single manuscript, one might suspect that their connection is a peculiarity of this codex and that Llull never intended to have them linked so closely. If other Catalan manuscripts existed which are now lost, did they contain the *Disputació* and/or the *Petició* as separate and independent works?

Quite naturally, this question cannot be answered for sure. But there is a strong indication that the two works originally belong together. In the Aleppo codex described by Joseph Moukarzel, the Arabic version of the *Disputatio*, written in Garshuni by Gabriel Ibn al-Qilā'ī and dated 1498, is immediately succeeded by the *Petitio*, just as in the Catalan manuscript.<sup>16</sup> This means that Ibn

<sup>12</sup> ATCA 5 (1986), pp. 186-187.

<sup>13</sup> ROL XXXV, pp. 403-404.

<sup>14</sup> There is no contemporary Latin translation of the *Petició de Ramon al papa Celestí V*. The Latin text printed in *MOG* II, iv, pp. 50-51 (174-175) was prepared for the Mainz edition in the early 18<sup>th</sup> century. My new edition of the Latin version in ROL XXXV, pp. 428-437, is based on the *Moguntina* text, taking into account the original Catalan petition edited by Josep Perarnau i Espelt, "Un text català de Ramon Llull desconegut: la «Petició de Ramon Llull al papa Celestí V per a la conversió dels infidels». Edició i estudi", *ATCA* 1 (1982), pp. 9-46 (ed. pp. 29-43).

<sup>15</sup> See my critical edition and introduction in ROL XXXV, pp. 405-437.

<sup>16</sup> This Arabic version of the *Disputatio* has neither been edited nor translated into any European lan-

al-Qilāʿī either used what is now Cod. Hisp. 60 of the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek as the basis of his translation, or (more likely) that he had access to a very similar manuscript copy which was later lost. In any case, it must have been a codex presenting the *Disputació de cinc savis* and the *Petició de Ramon al papa Celestí V* one right after the other, with the frame story connecting them. This order was copied by Ibn al-Qilāʿī in his Arabic translation, which may therefore be counted as a second witness for the original connection between the *Disputació* and the *Petició*.

Strange as it may seem, the Lebanese Maronite Gabriel Ibn al-Qilāʿī appears to have used a Catalan source! It is highly improbable that he translated from the Latin, as Moukarzel erroneously believed.<sup>17</sup> Although the Latin *Disputatio* has come down to us in seventeen manuscript copies, none of them contains the petition to the pope and the cardinals, and none of them even mentions Celestine V. So the allusion to Celestine and the connection between the two works must originate from the vernacular version, that is, from a period in the development of the text which preceded the alterations introduced by the Latin redactor of part IV.

Thus, the elimination of the frame narrative and the cutting off of the petition to Celestine have rendered part IV of the Latin *Disputatio* much more abstract and academic than its Catalan counterpart. In the following, we will find this assessment confirmed by further observations.

## 2.2. Revision of contents

In the course of the translation process, large sections of the Latin version of part IV were modified with regard to their contents, as mentioned above. When an argument is developed or an objection solved, the main idea usually remains the same as in the Catalan version, whereas its level of abstraction and theological erudition is often decidedly higher than before.

---

guage. It is a non-literal translation, rewritten and altered to a considerable degree. For instance, in contrast to the Catalan and Latin versions, part III deals not only with the creed of the Jacobites but also with the religious beliefs of the Maronites and the Armenians. And at the end of the work, the frame narrative closes with the Jew and the Muslim being baptized by the pope. Cf. Joseph Moukarzel, *Gabriel Ibn al-Qilāʿī († ca 1516): Approche biographique et étude du corpus* (Kaslik: Pusek, 2007). The contents of the Arabic *Disputatio* are summarized on pp. 229-232. See also id., “Raymond Lulle en arabe”, *SL* 50 (2010), pp. 3-20, esp. pp. 13-16 for the *Disputatio* and the *Petitio*.

<sup>17</sup> Moukarzel, as he himself states, worked with the Mainz edition (cf. *Gabriel Ibn al-Qilāʿī*, p. 229, n. 7), obviously without knowing that the edited text differs considerably from the text of the Latin manuscripts. This led him to believe that Ibn al-Qilāʿī translated from a Latin manuscript source closely resembling Salzinger's version of the text. But if such a source ever existed (not impossible, but highly improbable), it must have been a nearly literal translation of the Catalan text, an alternative Latin version that has been lost today. None of the manuscripts extant at present can possibly have been the basis for Ibn al-Qilāʿī's Arabic translation.

Here is an example for a paragraph revised and extended by the redactor:<sup>18</sup>

Si tu dius que com lo cors de Xrist morí, que Déus, qui era aquel cors, morí, ver dius en quant él era home, mas no morí en quant és Déus, car Déus no pot morir, com sia eternal e infinit en granea de bonea e les altres; e encara, que en la persona de Xrist, natura diuina e natura humana són distinctes la una de l'altra, jassia assò que amdues sien una persona, qui és apelat Xrist; e si dius que no poden éser amdues les natures una persona, per so cor són distinctes, mal dius, car cascun home és de moltes natures, so és a ssaber d'ànima e de cors que són differens e cascun home no és mas una persona.

Et cum dicitur, quod si Deus erat homo et homo erat Deus, mortuo homine mortuus fuit Deus, quod absurdissimum est et falsum, respondetur, quod cum uere Deus sit homo per humanitatis assumptionem in unitate suppositi, et homo per eandem sit Deus, mortuo homine moritur Deus ut homo et non in quantum Deus, cum aeternus sit et immensus per bonitatem etc. Nec est inconueniens hoc dicere, nam toti supposito, quod non est nisi unum, attribui debet illud, quod competere potest alteri eius naturae, quae ambae sunt in eo distinctae. Cuius etiam exemplum, licet respectu illius ualde imperfectum, habetur in homine duas naturas in unico homine complectente:

Dicimus enim, quod homo est corruptibilis, et homo est incorruptibilis, et homo est intellectiuus, et homo est sensibilis, attribuendo homini illud, quod competit eius utrique naturae. Nec tamen homo, in quantum corpus, est intellectiuus et incorruptibilis, nec, in quantum anima rationalis, est sensibilis et compositus ex quattuor elementis.

Deficit autem exemplum in hoc, quod non possumus dicere perfecte, quod corpus intelligat nec quod anima sit ex elementis composita, quia ex ipsis duobus resultat tertium sicut ex uno materiali et altero formali. Sed in coniunctione naturae humanae et diuinae nulla resultat compositio nec aliquod tertium, sed sustentatur natura humana unius hominis in diuino supposito, utraque natura remanente distincta.

Quare potest dici, quod Deus est homo, et mortuo homine moritur Deus, et quod homo est Deus, et Deo immortali existente homo est etiam immortalis.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. *ATCA* 5 (1986), pp. 178-179, lin. 4575-4593, and *ROL* XXXV, p. 400, lin. 1438-1464.

The text is quoted from the second principal part of the treatise, dedicated to Christology. Llull is trying here to refute a popular Muslim objection to the Latin Catholic doctrine of the two natures in Christ: if God and man were one in the person of Christ, then God must have died on the cross. In the Catalan version, Llull argues that Christ only died insofar as he was human but not insofar as he was God because God cannot die. The divine and human natures in Christ are distinct although they are only one person, just like each human being is one person consisting of two natures, that is, body and soul.

The Latin version of the text deals with the same problem in a much more sophisticated language and on an academic level. While the vernacular text had stated in layman's terms that the two natures in Christ *are* one person (“jassia assò que amdues *sien* una persona”), the Latin redactor is clearly familiar with theological terminology and knows how to use it correctly. He designates the union of Christ's divine and human natures as “humanitatis assumptio [...] in unitate <diuini> suppositi”. The way he talks about one *suppositum* and two natures etc. leaves no doubt that he is an expert in theology and philosophy, skilled in academic language and perfectly at home with scholastic discourse. His academic skills have even made him notice a weakness in Llull's argument. The popular analogy between the two natures in Christ and the human being consisting of body and soul is actually inappropriate (or at least dangerous) when it comes to explaining the mystery of the hypostatic union. By introducing this analogy as an “exemplum ... ualde imperfectum”, the redactor makes quite clear that he is aware of its dangers and limits. However, he does not discard it but decides to rewrite it from scratch. The last three paragraphs of the Latin text, starting with “Dicimus enim ...”, have no parallel in the Catalan version, except that they deal with the same issue, that is, the example of the human body and the rational soul as two natures combined to form one single human being. What is more, the redactor not only rewrites the *exemplum* but he also explains at length *why* it must be considered “ualde imperfectum”, even in its new garb. The human being is a *tertium* resulting from the composition of body and soul, whereas in Christ there is neither composition nor *tertium*, but one single *suppositum* with two distinct natures. So whatever can be predicated of either of Christ's natures can be predicated of the other. This is impossible in the human being.

Another example:<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup> Cf. *ATCA* 5 (1986), pp. 145-146, lin. 3414-3456, and *ROL* XXXV, pp. 380-382, lin. 816-866. The corresponding passages in the Catalan and Latin text are printed synoptically. There are no Catalan counterparts for the Latin paragraphs in italics which were added by the redactor.



E si tu dius que·l Pare engendre Fil per entendre e entendre és enans que·l Fil, respon

que·l Pare engendre el Fil per paternitat, car segons relació del Pare e del Fil, lo Pare enans, axí parle, s'`a al Fil que al entendre e, per so que pusca fer Fil, s'`a a l'entendre

Cum uero dicitur, quod Pater intelligendo generat Filium, ex quo sequitur, quod intelligere sit ante quam Filius, respondetur, *sicut superius tactum est, quod temporis prioritas et posterioritas in aeternitate nullatenus esse possunt. Prioritas uero, quae aeterna est, et posterioritas originis et emanationis sane considerantur in Deo. Et sic dico,*

quod Pater per paternitatem Filium gignit, unde secundum relationem Patris et Filii Pater prius se habet ad Filium quam ad intelligere, et ut Filium gignere possit, se habet ad intelligere.

*Saepe in pluralitatis probatione dictum est, quod ipse intellectuius, qui gignens est, immediate respicit intelligibilem, qui genitus est, et ex ambobus resultat intelligere, qui spirare est utriusque. Et licet secundum facultatem nostri eloqui multum improprie nos oporteat loqui de Deo, intellectus tamen, supra se ipsum eleuatus in contemplatione et speculatione Dei, uidet et iudicat ea, quae sunt in Deo et ad Deum pertinent secundum naturam diuinam. Qui, si uellet semper iudicare secundum propriam sui ipsius naturam, numquam uidere posset nec per consequens ueraciter iudicare, sicut etiam intellectus considerans secundum imaginationem situs nostri antipodes, non uidet, quod possint persistere, imaginando semper situm nostrum, quousque eleuatur ad situs considerationem uniuersi totius.*

*Et sic, qui ueritatem uult de aliquo iudicare, debet illud speculari secundum illius naturam propriam et tractare. Quod, si discrete fecerit, multa ei primo obscura, occulta et etiam nubilosa, clara sibi et manifesta et lucida apparebunt. Iuuatur uero ad hoc plurimum intellectus, si bene sciuerit creaturarum naturas et earum operationes diligentius speculari. Et, ut ad*

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>e axí, e molt mils encara, com lo ferer, qui enans s' à a fer clau, segons entenció, que a martel, par asó martel és per entenció d' amdós.</p> <p>Enperò aquest exempli no és abasant en quant és en temps, mas per él se pot exalsar l' entenimén human a entendre anterioritat entel-lectual eternal, segons relatió de paternitat e filiatió e d' amdós és l' entendre e à·s enans per so car lo Pare à lo Fil per entenció per so que·l entendre pusca éser del Pare e del Fil,</p> <p>car, si aitantost s' auia sots forma d' entenció a l' entendre com al Fil, no poria éser l' entendre de la entenció del Pare e del Fil.</p> <p>E car coué éser de la entenció d' amdós, passa en la tersa entenció personal e lo Fil reman en la segona e lo Pare en la primera.</p> <p>En totes les tres entencions personals són eternal e en la comuna entenció, segons la qual la una entenció no és enans que l' altra, car totes són eternal, mas per so que la comuna entenció sia sustentada en les tres personals e que sien tres persones, és posada entenció en prioritat e secundàriament tersioritat.</p> <p>Per què la obiecció re no ual, pus que les entencions eternal remanen una comuna entenció eternal.</p> | <p>propositum redeamus, uidemus uisum prius se habere secundum intentionem ad obiectum quam ad uidere, ex quibus ambobus ipsum uidere procedit. Et sic ipsa uisio perfecta habetur, et totum fit in eodem instanti.</p> <p>Et licet hoc uel aliud exemplum ex creatura sumptum non sit perfecte sufficiens ad ea, quae de Deo dicuntur, potest tamen ex istis homo aliquo modo illustratus ad speculandum diuina clarius eleuari et uidere priorem intellectualem aeternam <i>per ipsam originem et emanationem internam</i> secundum relationem paternitatis, filiationis et spirationis utriusque communis, uidendo, quod Pater ipse prius se habet ad Filium per intentionem, ut ipse intelligere ab utroque procedit. Nam si sub forma intentionis Pater non se habet ad Filium prius quam ad intelligere, non ualet ipse intelligere fore ex intentione amborum. Sed cum oporteat esse ex amborum intentione, transit in tertiam intentionem personalem, Filio remanente in secunda et Patre in prima.</p> <p>Ipsae uero tres intentiones personales aeternae sunt et in una communi intentione, in qua non est aliqua prior altera, cum sint omnes aeternae. Sed ut ipsa communis intentio in tribus sustentetur personis, et quod sint ipsae tres personae, ponitur prioritas in intentione, secundioritas et tertioritas, sic loquendo.</p> <p>Quare obiectio nullius ualoris existit, cum sint ipsae tres intentiones aeternae remanentes intentio una communis aeterna.</p> |
|---|---|

This second example is taken from the first principal part of part IV, dedicated to the doctrine of the Trinity. It clearly demonstrates the redactor's intent to compensate for the difficulties of the original text by offering additional explanatory information (here in italics).

The objection implied and discussed in this section of the text may be outlined as follows: if, in agreement with the Latin Catholic doctrine outlined in the preceding parts of the *Disputatio*, the Father generates the Son by an act of divine understanding (*entendre / intelligere*),<sup>20</sup> this act of understanding must be *prior* to the Son. But that is impossible because, according to the Trinitarian dogma, the Holy Spirit (repeatedly identified by Lull with the divine *intelligere!*) is logically *posterior* in that he proceeds from both the Father and the Son. So apparently, the Catholic creed is inconsistent in itself.

Llull's response to this objection is basically the same in both the Catalan and the Latin versions of the *Disputatio*. Even though the Son is generated by an act of divine understanding, this understanding is *not* logically prior to the Son because the Father's *intention* is primarily aimed at the Son and not at his *intelligere*. The Holy Spirit proceeds from the intentions of both the Father and the Son and is endowed with a third intention, so that in the Trinity there are three personal intentions. These three intentions coincide in one eternal common intention in which none of them is prior to the others because they are all eternal.

The main differences between the vernacular text and the revised Latin version are as follows.

In the very first paragraph, the Latin redactor makes an amendment to the original text by distinguishing between temporal and non-temporal priority. He intends to point out that the succeeding argument is about eternal, i.e. non-temporal relations of priority and posteriority only. This was not sufficiently clear from the Catalan text.

In the subsequent paragraph, starting with "Saepe in pluralitatis probatione dictum est ...", he explains what is to be understood by the divine *intelligere* according to Llull's correlative doctrine. In the Trinity, the Father (*gignens*), the Son (*genitus*), and the Holy Spirit (*spirare*) are assigned the correlative terms *intellectiuus*, *intelligibilis*, and *intelligere*, respectively. A reader familiar with Llull's theology would have known this, but it was not explicit in the Catalan text. Further on, the line of thought starting with "Et licet secundum facultatem nostri eloquii ..." is especially intriguing because it provides an epistemological excursus that has no point of reference in the Catalan version. The redactor has taken the liberty to completely deviate from his source in order to introduce a new issue which, although it might well be considered Lullian, goes far beyond the text of the *Disputació de cinc savis*.

---

<sup>20</sup> See, for instance, the discussion between the Latin and the Greek in part I.2: "Cui Latinus dixit: Pater generat Filium intelligendo se ipsum esse Patrem ..." (ROL XXXV, pp. 303-305, lin. 212-264).

In the vernacular version, Lull had drawn on one of his most favored examples from everyday life in order to illustrate the (non-temporal) priority of the generation of the Son compared to the divine act of understanding. Just like the blacksmith's intention is primarily aimed at the nail he is forging and not at the hammer used as a tool in the process, the primary object of the Father's intention is the Son and not the act of understanding which results from both the Father and the Son—like the hammer derives from the intention (“és per entenció”) of both the blacksmith and the nail! The Latin redactor apparently disliked this rustic analogy, maybe because he considered it unsophisticated or maybe because he was afraid it might lead to associate God the Father with the blacksmith, the Son with the nail and the Holy Spirit with the hammer. This, of course, would be absurd and beside the point. In any case, in composing his own text the redactor introduced a new example (containing the sense of vision, its object and the act of seeing) that is more sophisticated and also less likely to be misunderstood.

The following paragraph (from “Et licet hoc uel aliud exemplum ...” till “... fore ex intentione amborum”) remains close to the Catalan text, with only a few minor amendments made by the redactor. The rest of the Latin argument (starting with “Sed cum oporteat esse ...”) is an exact and literal translation of the Catalan version.

As these two examples show, the Latin redactor of part IV of the *Disputatio* has done a lot more than simply translate the text and give it a cosmetic touch-up. He evidently intended to ameliorate it by introducing more accurate examples and additional scholarly explanations. At the same time, he stayed faithful to the basic statements of the Catalan original. His redactional interventions are substantial and competent, with the result that large sections of the Latin version of the text are clearer, more precise and thus easier to understand than their Catalan counterparts.

### 2.3. Differences in style and lexis

Part IV of the *Disputatio* also differs significantly from the rest of the text as far as vocabulary and style are concerned. Even a preliminary investigation of the language used by the Latin redactor leads to the conclusion that he cannot have been the same person as the translator of parts I-III. Given that a thorough linguistic analysis is impossible here, a few examples may suffice to illustrate this point:

- In twenty-five cases, the redactor of part IV employs the terms *immensum* / *immensitas* as synonyms for *infinitum* / *infinitas*. However, *immensum* or *immensitas* do not appear in the rest of the text of the *Disputatio*.

- He uses *ualere* instead of *posse* in about forty cases similar to this one: “Haec autem principia talia non *ualent* existere in opere, quod Deus habet in se ...” (ROL XXXV, p. 365, lin. 319-320) or “Sed cum aequalitas esse non *ualeat* sine differentia rerum aequalium, sequitur ...” (ibid., p. 366, lin. 342-343). In the rest of the text, *ualere* is used in this sense only one single time.
- More than twenty times he substitutes *potestas* by *posse* used as a noun. This substantivized form does not exist in parts I-III.
- He employs *fore / foret / forent* nearly forty times. In the first three parts of the *Disputatio* these words appear only five times.
- In ten cases, the redactor uses derivatives of *speculari*, which is an unknown term in parts I-III.
- Seven times he employs the comparative and superlative forms of *excellens* (i.e. *excellentior*, *excellētissimum* etc.) which are absent from the rest of the *Disputatio*.
- Seven times he replaces the usual *oportet* by the subjunctive form *oporteat*, for instance: “Sed cum in diuinis *oporteat* esse maiorem aequalitatem, quae possit esse, sequitur necessario ...” Throughout the first three parts of the text, the indicative *oportet* is used without exception in similar phrases.
- In three cases he concludes a train of thought with a phrase like “... sicut manifestum est *diligentius intuenti*”. While the exact wording of the phrase differs, the combination *diligentius intuenti* remains the same. Moreover, both *diligentius* and *intuenti* are used separately once more in part IV, but never in the rest of the text.
- Large sections of part IV have been translated in an elevated Latin style that differs noticeably from the style of parts I-III. For example, the simple Catalan sentence “Couén, doncs, que en Déu sia la maior obra que pot éser” (ATCA 5, p. 121) is rendered into “Sequitur igitur nobilissimum opus et excellentius, quod excogitari ualeat, fore in Deo necessario concedendum” (ROL XXXV, p. 366, lin. 360-361).
- Similarly: “Si tu dius que en Déu aia temps, per so cor Pare coué éser enans que Fil ...” (ATCA 5, p. 145) is rendered into “Ad hoc, quod dicitur, quod tempus cadit in Deo, cum Filius gigni non ualeat, nisi extiterit prius Pater ...” (ROL XXXV, p. 380, lin. 811-812).

In summary, a distinct break can be observed between parts I-III and part IV of the *Disputatio*. While the Latin translation of the first three parts remains

close to the basic and unostentatious language of Catalan original, the redactor of part IV has endeavored to improve the style of his source and to use a more sophisticated lexicon corresponding to the elevated level of erudition displayed by his Latin text. It may well be conjectured that the translation of the *Disputatio* was interrupted after part III had been finished, to be resumed later by another person and under different circumstances (different socio-cultural environment, addressee, audience?).<sup>21</sup>

## 2.4. Who was the Latin redactor of part IV?

In the light of these observations it must be asked whether, and if so to what extent, it was Ramon Llull himself who reworked part IV of the Latin *Disputatio*. This is a legitimate question, particularly because Llull's authorship of this part has been doubted in the past. It was no less a person than Ivo Salzinger who queried the authenticity of some sections of the text where the Latin version veers away from the Catalan original. In the middle of his edition of the *Secunda ratio quartae partis* he adds a remark put in italics: "NB. in Exemp. Lat. plura continentur, sed non sunt in Catal. nec ipsius Auth., sed alicujus Discipuli, ut patet ex stylo."<sup>22</sup> In Salzinger's opinion, it was not Llull himself who added the extra paragraphs in the Latin version, but one of his disciples. This explains why Salzinger paid special attention to the vernacular version of the *Disputatio* in establishing his own edition. Apparently, he considered the Catalan text as Llull's *ipsissima vox* and the Latin version as a later compilation, revised and extended by *someone else* and thus only partly authentic.<sup>23</sup>

But can this be true, given that the Latin *Disputatio* must have been finished either shortly after the Catalan version, or at least in Llull's lifetime?<sup>24</sup> Would Llull have let any one of his disciples seriously alter his text and publish it under the master's name without permission? This is hardly imaginable. Salzinger was doubtlessly right in concluding from the style of part IV that

---

<sup>21</sup> In part two of the general introduction to ROL XXXV (esp. pp. xiv-xxi), I have discussed the hypothesis that the translation of the *Disputatio* was suspended due to the resignation of pope Celestine V (to whom the work was originally dedicated) and taken up again after the election of Boniface VIII by another of Llull's collaborators.

<sup>22</sup> *MOG* II, iv, p. 34 (158).

<sup>23</sup> See below, section three.

<sup>24</sup> The Latin version cannot be dated with certainty because the reference to the year 1294 given in the *explicit* might simply have been copied from the Catalan original (cf. Perarnau in *ATCA* 5, p. 15, n. 30). In my general introduction to ROL XXXV (pp. xiv-xxi) I have suggested that part IV of the *Disputatio* was revised and translated shortly after the election of pope Boniface VIII, that is to say, in 1295. But even if I were wrong, the Latin translation cannot possibly have been made after Llull's death because the earliest manuscripts of the *Disputatio* (A and R<sub>p</sub>, cf. above, nn. 5 and 6) were copied in his lifetime.

large sections of the text must have been revised or added by someone other than Llull. But this does not necessarily imply that the person in question was unauthorized or that Llull was not involved in the process of translation and revision. Instead of ascribing parts of the *Disputatio* to a disciple acting on his own account, we should rather think of a collaborator helping his master to adapt his text for a Latin speaking (clerical and / or academic) audience.

In order to get a better picture of how the *Disputació de cinc savis* was turned into the *Disputatio quinque hominum sapientium*, we need to take a closer look at the translation process of some other of Llull's works. This process was complex in many cases. As is well known, Llull himself comments on the differences between the original and the translated versions of his writings on various occasions.<sup>25</sup> In the Catalan version of the *Llibre de contemplació* (chapter 352, §30) he points out that while translating the text from the original Arabic version into Catalan, he modified some of the arguments or replaced them by more subtle and elaborate ones:

... per assò lo vostre servidor tresporta e muda en esta translacio moltes raons qui no son tan altes en l'exemplar aràbic a adorar e a contemplar vostres vertuts glorioses, com son celles que lo vostre servidor en loc d'aquelles muda e puja altres raons pus altes e pus acabades ...<sup>26</sup>

When he rendered the text from Catalan into Latin, probably a few years later, it once again underwent a major revision.<sup>27</sup>

Another famous example of a text substantially rewritten in the course of its translation is the *Compendiosus tractatus de articulis fidei catholicae* (ROL op. 91), that is, the revised Latin version of the *Dictat de Ramon / Comment del dictat* (ROL op. 87/88).<sup>28</sup> In this case, Llull abbreviated and intellec-

---

<sup>25</sup> Cf., for instance, Albert Soler, "Editing texts with a multilingual tradition" (cited *supra*, n. 2), as well as Elena Pistolesi, "Tradizione e traduzione nel corpus lulliano", *SL* 49 (2009), pp. 3-50, esp. pp. 3-8.

<sup>26</sup> ORL VIII, p. 456; see also *MOG* X, p. 524. The Arabic original of the *Llibre de contemplació* has not come down to us. Mateu Obrador and Miquel Arbona have already pointed out that the Catalan version of the *Llibre de contemplació* must rather be considered a new redaction than a mere translation of the original text (see their introductions to the editions of the *Llibre de contemplació* in ORL II, pp. xix-xx and *OE* II, pp. 95-96).

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Jordi Gayà Estelrich, "La versión latina del *Liber contemplationis*. Notas introductorias", in *Gottes Schau und Weltbetrachtung. Interpretationen zum »Liber contemplationis« des Raimundus Lullus. Akten des Internationalen Kongresses aus Anlass des 50-jährigen Bestehens des Raimundus-Lullus-Instituts der Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg, 25.-28. November 2007*, Fernando Domínguez Reboiras, Viola Tenge-Wolf, Peter Walter (ed.) (Turnhout: Brepols Publishers, 2011), pp. 1-20.

<sup>28</sup> Catalan edition by Salvador Galmés in ORL XIX, pp. 261-324; Latin edition by Fernando Domínguez Reboiras in ROL XIX, pp. 326-406 (op. 87/88) and 457-504 (op. 91).

tualized the text (or delegated someone else to do so) while at the same time maintaining the basic ideas of the Catalan original.<sup>29</sup> In his own words:

Translatus est iste tractatus de uulgari in latinum *non tamen in pluribus de uerbo ad uerbum, sed ad sensum*, ut rationes multiplicarentur<sup>30</sup>

A similar statement can be found at the end of the *Llibre dels articles de la fe* (ROL op. 66):

Per que yo, Ramon, indigne, he fet aquest libre e e-ll fet posar en latí, emperó *no letra a letra, mas sen a sen*, per ço que cascun ne romanga en sa virtut e en sa rectoricha ...<sup>31</sup>

Its contemporary Latin translation, commissioned and authorized by Llull himself, was complemented by a dedicatory poem and assigned to pope Boniface VIII as *Liber de articulis fidei et Apostrophe ad summum pontificem*. In a similar way to the *Compendiosus tractatus*, the *Liber de articulis fidei* is the more intellectual version of the work when compared to the original *Llibre dels articles de la fe*.<sup>32</sup> And just as in the case of part IV of the *Disputatio*, Llull seems to have had a collaborator helping him to intellectualize his text and to make it match the academic and aesthetic demands of its addressee.<sup>33</sup>

As is clear from these examples, Ramon Llull did not regard his texts as unalterable once they were written down in their original language. The contents of a treatise composed in Catalan were neither sacred nor final, but open for revision, amendment or abbreviation in the course of their translation into

---

<sup>29</sup> Fernando Domínguez has observed this in his introduction: “La nueva versión latina, aunque conserva la intención y las ideas fundamentales del *Coment*, abrevia considerablemente el texto y le da un carácter más intelectual perdiendo mucho de su aspecto inicial práctico-homilético” (ROL XIX, p. 329).

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 504; italics mine.

<sup>31</sup> NEORL III, ed. Antoni Joan Pons i Pons, pp. 1-72, here p. 70; italics mine. See also *MOG* IV, ix, p. 25 (529): “... quare ego Raymundus indignus feci hunc Librum, et feci illum poni in Latino, verumtamen non litera ad literam, sed sensu ad sensum, ut quilibet inde remaneat in sua virtute et in sua Rhetorica” (italics by Salzinger). The Moguntina edition of the *Liber de articulis fidei* is interesting because *MOG* IV (edited by Franz Philipp Wolff but based on materials compiled and provided by Ivo Salzinger) contains two different Latin versions of the work: first, a new literal translation of the Catalan text, prepared by Salzinger (ix, pp. 1-26, [505-530]), second, the authentic translation *ad sensum* transmitted by the Latin manuscripts (ix A, pp. 27-57 [531-561]).

<sup>32</sup> See Fernando Domínguez in his chronological catalogue of Llull’s works (cited *supra*, n. 8), p. 170: “Of the two versions, the Latin one is to be preferred on account of its more elaborate style and its precision.”

<sup>33</sup> See Anthony Bonner, *The Art and Logic of Ramon Llull* (Leiden – Boston, Brill: 2007), p. 191, n. 5: “It was this translation which was to be presented to Pope Boniface VIII, and, as the wording of the passage quoted [see the quotation from the *Llibre dels articles de la fe* above] would seem to indicate, Llull had somebody else do the job, perhaps in the process ‘improving’ his simple Latin to make it more elegant and persuasive for the imperious Roman nobleman who had succeeded Celestine V. That the translator—probably working with Llull—adapted the form of the arguments to contemporary theological discourse could explain the recasting in syllogistic form of some of the looser arguments of the original Catalan.”



Latin. Some of Llull's writings remained *work in progress* for quite a long time, ready to be adjusted to the requirements of a different social milieu and a new audience. Part IV of the *Disputatio* supports this hypothesis.

So who was the Latin redactor of the ambitious theological treatise that replaced the original fourth part of the *Disputació de cinc savis*? Was he a disciple or collaborator of Llull's, working side by side with his master? Or should we dare to think of an authorized ghostwriter, commissioned by Llull but working largely on his own? And what about parts I-III? Would Llull have been able to translate these first three parts of the *Disputatio* all by himself? Or did he have another collaborator? And if so, why did this first collaborator interrupt his work after parts I-III had been finished? Finally, if part IV was indeed revised and translated for a different addressee, then who was this person?

At the current state of research, none of these questions can be answered with certitude. As to the addressee of part IV, we can be sure that it was *not* Celestine V because all references to him were extinguished when the *Petició de Ramon al papa Celestí V* was separated from the *Disputatio*. It may indeed have been his successor Boniface VIII, a nobleman and erudite canonist who would have been expected to appreciate a theological tract on a scholarly level and in elegant Latin. So maybe the translation of the *Disputatio* was interrupted because of Celestine's resignation and resumed later with the intent to customize part IV, at least, for Boniface. But this is little more than an educated guess. As far as the questions about Llull's Latin and the work of his Latin translators / collaborators are concerned, these are issues that ought to be investigated further. Even if it will not be possible to name the persons involved in the translation process, a detailed diachronic analysis of the Latin used in Llull's works is likely to point to stylistic similarities and linguistic concurrences. In the end, it might be possible to identify the characteristic features of several different collaborators who accompanied Llull for a certain period of time or in a certain place and who have left their traces in the Latin language of the works committed to them. But we are only at the very beginning of this investigation.

### 3. Ivo Salzinger's new redaction of part IV of the *Disputatio*

In establishing the Mainz edition of the *Disputatio quinque hominum sapientium*, Ivo Salzinger used manuscripts of both the Latin and the Catalan versions of the text. This can be shown without any doubt, for parts I-III as well as for part IV.

Right from the beginning of the work, Salzinger did not just stick to the text of the Latin manuscripts but collated the vernacular version all the way

through.<sup>34</sup> Even in the very first paragraphs of the prologue, the Mainz edition has several readings in common with the Catalan text and goes *against* the testimony of the Latin manuscripts:<sup>35</sup>

| CATALAN TEXT   | LATIN MANUSCRIPT TEXT  | SALZINGER'S TEXT  |
|--|--|---|
| <p>ATCA 5, pp. 23-24</p> <p>En vna gran selua, a om-bra d'un bel arbre, près d'una <b>gran</b> fontana, esta-uen quatre sauis, qui longamén auien estudiad en philosophia ...</p> <p>E parlauen de Déu. En là-gremes e-n plors estauen, car gran tristícia auien per raó del món, qui és en tan torbat estamén, e car Déus era tan poc conegut e amat per son poble ...</p> <p>Dementre que los quatre sauis enaxí de Déu <b>par-lauen</b>, éls veeren uenir un sarray, qui en la sciència de philosophia auia longament estudiad. E dix la un d'èls: «Ha! Con gran dampnatge és de crestians e gran deshonor pren Déus en est món en so que los sarayns, <b>qui són en error</b>, prenen nostres terres ...</p> | <p>ROL XXXV, pp. 275-276</p> <p>In quadam silua magna, sub umbra cuiusdam arboris pulcherrimae, iuxta fontem, <i>qui sub arbore pulcher (sic!) erat</i>, quatuor sapientes sedebant, qui longo tempore in philosophia studuerant ... qui omnes cum suspiriis et lacrimis de Deo inuicem loquebantur, dolentes quam plurimum de turbato et misero statu mundi; <i>non minus</i> etiam de hoc, quod Deus erat a suo populo ita parum cognitus et amatus ...</p> <p><i>Conferentibus</i> autem inuicem ipsis quattuor sic de Deo, <i>ecce</i> uiderunt quendam Saracenum uenientem, expertum in philosophica disciplina. Viso eo unus ipsorum incepit dicere: Heu, quantum damnum imminet Christianis, pro dolor, quantum dedecus ac uituperium Deus in hoc mundo recipit de hoc, uidelicet quod Saraceni <i>errantes et ueritate carentes</i> capiunt et occupant terras nostras ...</p> | <p>MOG V, iv, p. 1 (125)</p> <p>In quadam magna silua sub umbra cuiusdam pulchrae arboris iuxta <b>magnum</b> fontem sedebant quatuor Sapientes, qui longo tempore studuerant in Philosophia ...</p> <p>qui omnes cum suspiriis et lachrymis inuicem loquebantur de Deo, multum dolentes de perturbato et misero statu mundi, <b>et</b> etiam de hoc, quod Deus adeo parum cognosceretur et amaretur a suo populo ...</p> <p>Cum quatuor Sapientes sic inuicem <b>loquerentur</b> de Deo, uiderunt quendam Saracenum uenientem, qui erat peritus in Scientia Philosophiae; dum ipsum uidebant, unus ipsorum incepit dicere: heu! quantum damnum imminet Christianis, pro dolor, quantum dedecus et uituperium recipit Deus in hoc mundo, uidelicet in hoc, quod Saraceni, <b>qui sunt in errore</b>, capiant et occupent nostras terras ...</p> |

<sup>34</sup> Salzinger's Latin source was the seventeenth century codex Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm. 10594 (*M<sub>10</sub>*). He had several other Latin manuscripts at hand but does not seem to have made immediate use of them (see section 2.5. of my introduction in ROL XXXV, pp. 254-265, esp. pp. 258 and 262-264). For the Catalan version of the text, Salzinger drew on the ancient codex Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Hisp. 60 (xiv), as will be shown at a later point in this section.

<sup>35</sup> In the examples below the readings influenced by the Catalan version appear in bold print, whereas the modifications introduced by the Latin manuscript text (sometimes copied by Salzinger) are printed in italics.

While the similarities between the Catalan version and Salzinger's text are sporadic in parts I-III, they accumulate in part IV. For long stretches of text Salzinger let himself be guided by the vernacular instead of the Latin version, newly translating from Catalan rather than following his Latin manuscript source. On the other hand, several paragraphs considerably revised and extended in the Latin version were copied by Salzinger in their entirety, even though they have no direct equivalent in the Catalan text.<sup>36</sup> A complete synoptic comparison between the Catalan edition, the ROL edition, and the Mainz edition has shown that Salzinger's redaction of part IV of the *Disputatio* is an eclectic compilation of elements borrowed from both the vernacular and the Latin versions. In some sections of the text he alternates between his two sources from paragraph to paragraph, while elsewhere he switches from one version to the other in the middle of a sentence; at times he even combines two divergent readings derived from both his source texts. Although impossible here, it would certainly be interesting to examine the criteria Salzinger applied in order to compile his text, that is to say, the reasons which made him choose or dismiss a certain term or phrase.

Here is an example for his eclectic method (part IV.1.6: *Quod pluralitas sit in proprietatibus, ratio 4*):

| CATALAN TEXT  | LATIN MANUSCRIPT TEXT   | SALZINGER'S TEXT   |
|---|---|--|
| <p><i>ATCA</i> 5, pp. 135-136</p> <p>4. La maior egaltat que pot éser és de esencials egals personals, axí com egaltat en què són <b>egali-tiu</b>, egalable, egalar.</p> | <p>ROL XXXV, p. 375</p> <p>4. Maior aequalitas, quae possit esse, est aequalitas essentialium aequalium personalium, scilicet aequalitas, in qua sunt <i>aequans</i>, aequabilis et aequare <i>sic magni, quod maiores esse non ualent</i>.</p> | <p><i>MOG</i> V, iv, p. 39 (163)</p> <p>4. Major aequalitas, quae possit esse, est aequalitas essentialium aequalium personalium, scilicet aequalitas, in qua sunt <b>aequativus</b>, aequabilis et aequare <i>ita magni, quod non possint esse majores</i>:</p> |

<sup>36</sup> For examples, see my introduction in ROL XXXV, pp. 250-251, nn. 79 and 80.

|   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| <p><b>On</b>, enaxí com són maiors per egaltat <b>són</b> maiors per paternitat, filiatió e espiratió, car <b>lo egalitiu</b> més pot per paternitat egalar a ssi mateix <b>lo Fil</b> en granea de bontat, eternitat e les altres, que per neguna altra propietat</p> <p>e asò mateix de <b>Sant Espirit</b>, qui pot éser més egal per exir d'amdós <b>en espirant amdós aquél</b> que <b>sens spiratió e processió</b>.</p> <p>E, car en diuines <b>coué</b> éser la maior egaltat que <b>pot</b> éser, <b>couén-se</b> de necessitat que <b>en la esència</b> de Déu sia paternitat, filiatió e spiratió.</p> | <p><i>Et sicut per aequalitatem sunt maiores, sic per paternitatem, filiationem et spirationem maiores existunt, nam aequans plus potest per paternitatem sibimet aequare aequabilem in magnitudine bonitatis, aeternitatis etc. quam per quamcumque aliam proprietatem.</i></p> <p><i>Et ipse aequare amborum magis potest esse aequanti et aequabili aequalis per communem spirationem amborum quam per quamcumque aliam proprietatem.</i></p> <p>Sed cum in diuinis oportet esse maiorem aequalitatem, quae possit esse, sequitur necessario, quod sit in Deo paternitas, filiatio et spiratio.</p> | <p><b>unde</b> sicut per aequalitatem sunt maiores, sic per Paternitatem, Filiationem et Spirationem <b>sunt</b> maiores; nam <b>aequativus</b> per Paternitatem plus potest sibimet aequare <i>aequabilem</i>, <b>h.e. Filium</b>, in magnitudine bonitatis, aeternitatis etc., quam per quamcumque aliam proprietatem;</p> <p><i>et ipsum aequare amborum, h.e. Sanctus Spiritus</i>, potest esse magis aequabile aequativo et aequabili <i>per communem Spirationem amborum, cum ambo illum spirent, quam per quamcumque aliam proprietatem sine Spiratione et Processione</i>;</p> <p>sed cum <b>conveniat</b>, quod in Deo sit major aequalitas, quae <b>potest</b> esse, necessario <b>convenit</b>, quod <b>in Essentia</b> Dei sit Paternitas et Filiatio et Spiratio.</p> |
|---|--|--|

This section of the text is particularly interesting because it illustrates Salzinger's tendency to fuse and combine the readings of his Catalan and Latin sources. For instance, where Llull talks about the Son (*lo Fil*) and the Holy Spirit (*Sant Espirit*) in the vernacular version, these terms are replaced by *aequabilis* and *aequare* in the Latin manuscripts. Salzinger, however, combines both readings and calls God the Son "aequabilis, h.e. Filius", and the Holy Spirit "aequare, h.e. Sanctus Spiritus". Similarly, his "per communem Spirationem amborum, cum ambo illum spirent" as well as "quam per quamcumque aliam proprietatem sine Spiratione et Processione" are twin phrases consisting of two equivalent parts: the first goes back to the Latin version, and the second to the vernacular.

Only on the final pages of the *Disputatio*, that is to say, in part IV.2.2. *De*

*obiectionum solutionibus*,<sup>37</sup> did Salzinger abandon his strategy to collate both versions of the text. In this last chapter he put aside his Latin source and made exclusive use of the Catalan manuscript, literally translating from the original *Disputació de cinc savis*. He even copied a mistake from his Catalan source that would not have gone unnoticed if he had only glanced into the Latin text:

| CATALAN TEXT  | LATIN MANUSCRIPT TEXT  | SALZINGER'S TEXT  |
|---|--|---|
| <p>ATCA 5, p. 183</p> <p>Si tu dius que impossíbol coza és que Déus sia encarnat, car si era encarnat seria tot encarnat e Déus és infinit e la homanitat fenida enaxí és Déus estès <i>oltra el térmens</i> d'aquela homanitat, per lo qual es-tenimén defora no és encarnat, mal dius ...</p> | <p>ROL XXXV, p. 402</p> <p>Ad illud, quod obicitur, quod, cum persona Filii Dei sit sine parte, si fuit incarnata, tota habuerit incarnari, totam autem incarnari in limitata et quanta humanitate sit impossibile, cum ipsa sit <i>extra limites</i> humanitatis in immensum extensa, respondetur ...</p> | <p>MOG V, iv, p. 49 (173)</p> <p>Si tu dicis, quod sit impossibile, quod Deus sit incarnatus; quia si esset incarnatus, cum Deus sit infinitus et Humanitas finita, Deus esset extensus <i>ultra elementa</i> illius Humanitatis, propter quam extensionem extra non esset incarnatus: male dicis ...</p> |

First of all, the paragraph quoted provides evidence that Salzinger worked with the Catalan codex Munich, *Bayerische Staatsbibliothek*, Hisp. 60. Secondly, it shows that he did not consult a Latin witness to verify his translation. The crucial point is the expression printed above in italics. In the Munich codex, the words are abbreviated, not perfectly legible and also written closely together, such as “oltra eltermens” (f. 77<sup>th</sup>). Perarnau transcribes the expression as “oltra el termens” in ATCA 5 but suggests to read “oltra els termens” in a footnote.<sup>38</sup> This conjecture is certainly correct because it corresponds with the “extra limites” presented by the Latin manuscripts *and* makes perfect sense within the context. Salzinger, however, translated the expression as “ultra elementa”, which means that he must have misread the “oltra eltermens” of the manuscript as “oltra elements”—a likely (but unfortunate) mistake.

The most obvious feature of Salzinger's new redaction of the *Disputatio quinque hominum sapientium* is its return to the original connection with the *Petitio Raimundi pro conversione infidelium ad Coelestinum V papam*. Although none of the Latin manuscripts contain the *Petitio*, Salzinger retrieved it from his Catalan source, translated it into Latin and attached it to the final paragraphs of the *Disputatio*. This is certainly the reason why he decided to

<sup>37</sup> ROL XXXV, pp. 396-404.

<sup>38</sup> ATCA 5, p. 183.

follow the vernacular version in the entire final chapter (IV.2.2.). It must have seemed easier to just copy the setting of the Catalan version with its frame narrative leading over to the text of the *Petitio* than to retain the eclectic method Salzinger had employed before.

Thus it is clear that the *Disputatio quinque hominum sapientium*, as presented in the Mainz edition, is a fusion of elements derived from the original *Disputació de cinc savis* and the Latin version compiled by Ramon Llull and his collaborators. In view of the substantial differences between this pastiche text and the Latin manuscript version, the critical text newly edited in ROL XXXV may well be considered the first reliable edition of the original Latin *Disputatio*.

### **Key words**

*Disputatio quinque hominum sapientium*, Latin translations, Llull's collaborators, Ivo Salzinger

### **Paraules clau**

*Disputatio quinque hominum sapientium*, traduccions llatines, col·laboradors de Llull, Iu Salzinger

### **Abstract**

The Latin *Disputatio quinque hominum sapientium* is a translation of Ramon Llull's *Disputació de cinc savis*, written in Catalan in 1294. Part IV of the Latin text was translated and substantially revised by a person different from the translator of parts I-III, as can be demonstrated with regard to language as well as contents. The Latin redactor of part IV, being familiar with contemporary theological discourse and academic terminology, apparently tried to adapt his text for an erudite audience or addressee, possibly for pope Boniface VIII who had succeeded Celestine V in December 1294. The Latin text of the *Disputatio* as presented in the famous Mainz edition (MOG II, 1722) is an eclectic compilation of elements derived from the *Disputació de cinc savis* and the Latin version, containing large parts of text newly translated by Ivo Salzinger from the Catalan original.

### **Resum**

El text llatí de la *Disputatio quinque hominum sapientium* és la traducció de l'original català de Ramon Llull *Disputació de cinc savis*, datada el 1294. Tant pel que fa al llenguatge com als continguts és evident que la part IV de la versió llatina va ser traduïda i revisada a fons per una persona diferent de qui va tenir cura de les parts I-III. El redactor de la part IV, que tenia familiaritat amb el discurs teològic contemporani i dominava la terminologia acadèmica, sembla que va voler adaptar el seu text a una audiència o un destinatari cultivats, possiblement

el papa Bonifaci VIII, que el desembre de 1294 acabava de succeir Celestí V. El text llatí de la *Disputatio* tal com està recollit a la famosa edició de Mainz (MOG II, 1722) és una compilació eclèctica d'elements derivats de la *Disputació de cinc savis* i de la versió llatina, amb fragments extensos retraduïts de l'original català per Iu Salzinger.