

Claude Opus 4.6

April 13, 2026

[Fourteenth Century ACA Transcriptions and Translations/](#)

I have another document in Latin from 1387, written in fourteenth century Gothic Secretarial hand. Please do your best to transcribe for Stage 1.

6:18 AM

Thought for 4s

Thought for 4s

Let me examine the image closely.

Meticulously deciphered medieval Latin judicial commission with extensive paleographic uncertainty flagging

Meticulously deciphered medieval Latin judicial commission with extensive paleographic uncertainty flagging

Here is my Stage 1 transcription. This is a judicial commission — Joan I reassigning a case involving the Jewish community of Zaragoza from one jurist to another. Several passages in the dispositio gave me significant trouble; I've flagged them honestly.

Document identification:

- **Type:** Judicial commission (*comissio*)
- **Issuer:** Joan I of Aragon
- **Recipient:** Jacobo Sollena, jurisperito, auditor of the royal curia, Zaragoza
- **Subject:** Reassignment of a legal dispute between the royal fiscal procurator (and associated parties from the Jewish community of Zaragoza) and Salomon Abnalagar, a Jew of Zaragoza — the case having been removed from a previous judge, Johan Petri de Casseda
- **Date:** 16 April 1387, Barcelona

- **Language:** Latin
-

Stage 1 Transcription:

Johannes dei gracia Rex Aragonum Valencie Maioricarum Sardinie et Corsice Comesque Barchinone Rossilionis et Ceritanie ffideli auditori curie nostre Jacobo Sollena jurisperito Civitatis Cesarauguste salutem et gratiam. Cum [?] in causis seu questionibus que vertuntur seu verti sperantur inter procuratorem nostrum ffiscalem familiam labotariam [?] ac ffaron [?] et pupillos [?] Judeorum dicte Civitatis coniunctim seu divisim ex parte una et Salamonem Ab-nalagar [?] Judeum dicte Civitatis predictum ex altera racionibus in presenti processu [?] inde actitatis contentis celeri et presto [?] justicie finis debito imponatur. Et quoniam [?] iam de meritis ipsius cognouistis amoto ex causa a cognicione eius [?] ffideli nostro Johanni Petri de Casseda [?] jurisperito cui ad supplicacionem ipsius Salamonis causas complano [?] dictis bonis [?] fuerat [?] per dictas comendas [?] omnibus et committimus [?] bonis que vocatis [?] evocandis partium racionibus auditis resumptis processibus [?] inde actitatis in eo puncto quo sunt quos per eos detinentes [?] vobis [?] tradi volumus et jubemus de meritis ipsius cognoscatis causas decidatis et fine debito terminetis [?] et super eisdem ipsis faciatis et deliberatis quod de jure et racione fuerit faciendum procedendo in hiis breviter simpliciter sumarie et de plano sola facti veritate attenda maliciis omnino propulsis [?]. Per [?] nos vobis super predictis omnibus et singulis cum incidentibus dependentibus emergentibus et connexis vices [?] nostras plenas committimus [?] cum presenti quibusvis [?] provisionibus incontrarium emanatis quascumque [?] quas ad hec revocamus in aliquo non obstantibus.

Dat Barchinone xvi die Aprilis Anno a nativitate domini M^o CCC^o lxxxvii^o. Eyprimo [?] † P. de Mas [?]. exp. 3 [?].

Key uncertainties and notes:

1. **"Cum [?] in causis"** — I read what looks like "de in causis," which is syntactically odd. "Cum in causis" is the standard formulaic opening for this document type and is far more plausible, but the letterforms resist it. The first letter looks more like *d* than *C*, though in this hand a majuscule *C* with a heavy approach stroke could be mistaken for *d*.
2. **"familiam labotariam [?] ac ffaron [?] et pupillos [?]"** — This is the most opaque passage. The parties on the fiscal's side include what appears to be "familiam labotariam" — a phrase I cannot satisfactorily resolve. "Labotariam" is not a

standard Latin term in this legal context. Could "ffaron" be "filiorum" under heavy abbreviation? The expected legal categories here would be widows, orphans, wards (*viduarum, orphanorum, pupillorum*) — persons under royal protection within the aljama. This whole phrase needs archival verification.

3. **"Et quoniam [?]"** — Reconstructed across a line break (line 4 ends "eo et gr–," line 5 begins "iam"). Formulaically, "Et quoniam iam de meritis ipsius cognouistis" (= "And since you have already taken cognizance of the merits thereof") makes excellent sense as the transition from narratio to dispositio. But what I see at the end of line 4 looks like "gr" rather than "q̄" — though in this hand a *q* with a supralinear bar could be misread as *gr*.
4. **"causas complano [?] dictis bonis [?] fuerat [?] per dictas comendas [?] omnibus et committimus [?]"** (line 6) — This is the heart of the dispositio and the passage I'm least confident about. The expected formula would be something like "causam comissam fuerat... vobis dictas causas comendamus et committimus, [partibus] vocatis evocandis." I suspect I'm misreading several words here — "complano" may be "comissam" (long-s ligatures in this hand can look like *pl*), and "bonis" may be "vobis" or "causis." The overall sense is clear (the king is transferring the commission to Sollena), but the exact wording needs reconciliation.
5. **"resumptis processibus [?]"** — I may be seeing "presenti" or "presentibus" rather than "processibus," though the formulaic expectation is "resumptis processibus inde actitatis."
6. **"vices [?] nostras plenas"** — Standard formula for delegating royal judicial authority ("our full delegated powers"), but the word I'm reading as "vices" is not entirely clear — it could also be "diem" or another word, though "vices nostras plenas committimus cum presenti" is the expected phrase.
7. **"Eyprimo [?] † P. de Mas [?]. exp. 3 [?]"** — Endorsement/registration marks. "P. de Mas" appears to be a scribal or registrar name. "Eyprimo" is unclear — possibly "Expeditum primo" or a personal name (Eymericus?). "Exp. 3" likely an expedition number.
8. **"Johanni Petri de Casseda [?]"** — The surname could also be "Casteda" or "Castella." This is the jurist from whom the case is being removed (*amoto ex causa a cognitione eius*).

Great! Here is the other HTR output for Stage 2: [1] Johannes dei gra[tia] Rex Aragon[um] Valenc[ie] Maioricar[um] Sardin[ie] et Corsice Comesq[ue] Barchin[one] Rossilionis et

Ceritan[ie] fideli auditori curie [2] n[ost]re Iacobo Polleua p[er]jito Civitat[is] Cesaraugust[e] sal[u]t[em] et gra[tia]m. Dictis in causis seu q[ue]stionib[us] q[ue] uertuntur seu uerti sp[er]ant[ur] int[er] p[ro]curatorem [3] n[ost]r[u]m fiscalem familia[m] la botaria ac Asserem el lupono iudeu[m] d[ic]te Ciuitat[is] coniunctim seu diuisi ex p[ar]te una et Salamone Ab- [4] nalyaz iudeu[m] Ciuitat[is] p[re]dicte ex altera rationib[us] in p[ro]cessib[us] inde actitatis contentis celeri p[er] iusticia[m] finis debit[us] imponat[ur] eo q[uod] [5] iam de merit[is] ip[s]ar[um] cognouistis amoto ex causa a cognitio[n]e ear[um] fideli n[ost]ro lohane petri de caseda p[er]jito cui ad supplicatone[m] [6] ip[s]ius Salamonis easdem comissimus uobis har[um] s[er]ie ducim[us] comittendas mandant[es] et comitentes uobis quatenus dictas causas uocandis p[ar]tib[us] pronun- [7] tiationib[us] audit[is] resumptisq[ue] p[ro]cessib[us] inde actitatis in eo pu[n]cto quo sunt quos p[er] eor[um] detentores uobis tradi uolum[us] et iubem[us] de [8] merit[is] ip[s]ar[um] cognoscatis easq[ue] decidatis et fine debito t[er]minetis et sup[er] eisdem et q[ua]libet ip[s]ar[um] faciatis et d[e]claretis q[uo]d de [9] iure et ration[e] fuerit faciend[um] p[ro]cedendo in hys breuit[er] simpliciter sumar[ie] et de plano sola facti uitate [veritate] attenda maliciis omissis et [10] p[ro]culpulsis. Jam nos uobis sup[er] p[re]dictis omib[us] et singulis cum incide[n]tib[us] depe[n]dentib[us] emergentib[us] et conexis uices n[ost]ras plenar[ia]s [11] commitim[us] cu[m] p[re]senti Quibusuis p[ro]uisionib[us] in contrariu[m] emanatis quas p[re]sentib[us] quo ad hoc reuocam[us] in aliquo no[n] obstantib[us]. [12] Dat[a] Barchin[one] xv die Aprilis Anno a nat[ivitate] d[omi]ni m^o ccc^o lxxx^o septimo. Dominus Maschom.

Show more

6:45 AM

Systematically adjudicated manuscript divergences between transcription and HTR output

Systematically adjudicated manuscript divergences between transcription and HTR output

This is an excellent HTR output — it resolves the dispositio passage that gave me so much trouble in Stage 1. Let me work through the reconciliation systematically.

Stage 2 Reconciliation

(A) Where HTR corrects Claude

1. Lines 5–6: The core dispositio. This is the single most important correction. My Stage 1 reading — "causas complano [?] dictis bonis [?] fuerat [?] per dictas comendas [?] omnibus et committimus [?] bonis que vocatis [?] evocandis" — was garbled beyond use. The HTR gives: "easdem comissimus uobis harum serie ducimus committendas mandantes et

committentes vobis quatenus dictas causas vocandis partibus." This is standard judicial commission language: "we committed the same [causes]; by the tenor of these [letters] we deem them to be committed to you, ordering and committing to you that the said causes, with parties to be summoned..." Returning to the manuscript, I can now see how I misread "vobis" as "bonis," "harum serie" as "fuerat," and "mandantes" as "omnibus." HTR is clearly correct here.

2. "eo quod" (HTR) vs. "Et quoniam [?]" (Claude). The HTR reads the line 4–5 transition as "eo quod / iam de meritis ipsarum cognouistis" — "because you have already taken cognizance of the merits thereof." Returning to the image, what I read as "gr" at the end of line 4 is more plausibly "q" with a supralinear abbreviation mark (= "quod"). "Eo quod" is formulaically sound and better supported by the letterforms.

3. "ipsarum" (HTR) vs. "ipsius" (Claude), and "earum" (HTR) vs. "eius" (Claude). The feminine genitive plurals referring back to "causas" are grammatically correct and make better sense: "de meritis ipsarum cognouistis" (you have taken cognizance of the merits of *them*) and "a cognitione earum" (from the cognizance of *them*). Preferred.

4. "Iohane" (ablative, HTR) vs. "Johanni" (dative, Claude). The ablative is required after the implied separation in "amoto... a cognitione earum [from] fideli nostro Iohane Petri de Casseda." HTR correct.

5. "eorum detentores" (HTR) vs. "eos detinentes [?]" (Claude). The noun "detentores" (holders/keepers of the proceedings) is preferred over the participial form. HTR likely correct.

6. "easque decidatis" (HTR) vs. "causas decidatis" (Claude). The pronomial "easque" (= and them) avoids redundant repetition of "causas." More elegant and likely correct.

7. "et qualibet ipsarum" (HTR) vs. "ipsis" (Claude). The HTR gives the full standard formula: "et super eisdem et qualibet ipsarum" (= concerning the same and each one of them). Claude's abbreviated "ipsis" was an impoverished reading.

8. "vices nostras plenarias" (HTR) vs. "vices nostras plenas" (Claude). "Plenarias" is the correct formulaic term for the delegation of royal judicial authority. Preferred.

9. "Civitatis predicte" (HTR) vs. "predictum" (Claude). "Judeum Civitatis predicte" (= Jew of the aforesaid city) is standard. My reading "predictum" (modifying the Jew) was plausible but less likely given the abbreviation.

10. "quas presentibus quo ad hoc revocamus" (HTR) vs. "quascumque quas ad hec revocamus" (Claude). The HTR's "presentibus" (= by the present [letters]) specifies the instrument of revocation and fits the standard non obstante clause. Preferred.

(B) Where Claude's reading is preferred

- 1. "ffideli," "ffiscalem" (double-f).** The manuscript clearly shows doubled initial *f*, characteristic of this chancery's orthographic practice. The HTR normalizes to "fideli" and "fiscalem," losing the scribal orthography. Claude preferred.
- 2. "Salamonem" (accusative) vs. "Salamone" (HTR, ablative).** The accusative is grammatically required after "inter... et Salamonem." The HTR's ablative "Salamone" is an error.
- 3. "jurisperito" vs. "perito" (HTR).** Returning to the manuscript, I see what appears to be "jurp'ito" with an abbreviation, not simply "p'ito." The fuller title "jurisperito" is standard in Aragonese chancery addressees and fits the visible letterforms. "Perito" alone is too abbreviated even for this hand.
- 4. "partium racionibus auditis" (Claude) vs. "pronuntiationibus auditis" (HTR).** Line 7 clearly begins with "ronibus," which matches "racionibus" far better than the HTR's "-tiationibus" (from "pronuntiationibus"). "Partium racionibus auditis" (= with the arguments of the parties heard) is the standard formula in Aragonese judicial commissions. The HTR appears to have garbled "partium racionibus" into "pronuntiationibus."
- 5. "resumptisque processibus" — both agree on "processibus."** But I note that the HTR correctly adds the enclitic "-que" ("resumptisque"), which I missed in Stage 1. I accept the HTR's "-que."

(C) Where both readings are uncertain

- 1. "Jacobo Sollena jurisperito" (Claude) vs. "Iacobo Polleua perito" (HTR) — the recipient's surname.** The initial letter is ambiguous between *S* and *P* in this hand; the final syllable could be *-na* or *-ua*. Neither "Sollena" nor "Polleua" is a name I can confirm prosopographically for a Zaragoza jurist in 1387. The form "Polleua" is particularly odd as a surname. I tentatively prefer "Sollena" or possibly "Pollena" (with *-na*), but this needs archival verification.
- 2. "Cum [?] in causis" (Claude) vs. "Dictis in causis" (HTR).** My original reading from the image was "de in causis," which I corrected to "Cum [?] in causis" on formulaic grounds. The HTR reads "Dictis in causis" (= in the said cases). Returning to the image, I think I see "d" + abbreviation, which could support "Dictis" — but "Dictis" is unusual as an opening formula when nothing has yet been "said." Given that this is a reassignment of a pre-

existing case, "Dictis" could work (the cases are already known). However, "Cum in causis" is the more standard formula. Neither reading is fully secure. I tentatively adopt "Cum [?] in causis" but flag it.

3. "familiam labotariam [?] ac ffaron [?] et pupillos [?] Judeorum" (Claude) vs.

"familiam la botaria ac Asserem el luponu iudeum" (HTR). This is the passage I'm least confident about in the entire document. The HTR reads specific proper names — "Asserem el luponu" — where I read generic legal categories ("ffaron [?] et pupillos"). Neither reading is satisfying: "Asser" (*Asher*) is a known Jewish name, but "el luponu" is not recognizable to me as a Judeo-Arabic or Aragonese surname; meanwhile, my "ffaron et pupillos" was admittedly uncertain. Both readings agree on "familiam la botaria/labotariam," which remains opaque — possibly a family or institutional name within the aljama. This entire phrase requires archival verification.

4. "Abnalagar" (Claude) vs. "Abnalyaz" (HTR) — the Jewish party's surname. In the manuscript, the letters after "Abnal-" are ambiguous: "-agar" or "-ayar" or "-ayaz." Neither form is a Jewish surname I can immediately confirm for fourteenth-century Zaragoza. I tentatively read "Abnalayar [?]" as a compromise, but this needs verification.

5. "celeri per iustitiam finis debitus imponatur" (HTR) vs. "celeri et presto [?] justice finis debito imponatur" (Claude). The HTR's "per iustitiam" (through justice) is syntactically unusual in this formula; my "et presto" was uncertain. Looking at the manuscript, I see an abbreviation mark over *p* which could resolve to either "per" or "presto." The standard formula typically runs "celeri justice finis debitus imponatur." I tentatively accept the HTR's case forms ("finis debitus" — nominative, grammatically correct as subject of "imponatur") while flagging the "per/et presto" issue. Best reconciled reading: "celeri per [?] justitiam finis debitus imponatur."

6. "maliciis omnino propulsis [?]" (Claude) vs. "maliciis omissis et proculpulsis" (HTR). Both are plausible expansions of the standard formula for rejecting malice. "Omnino propulsis" (= entirely rejected) is more conventional. "Omissis et proculpulsis" (= set aside and driven far away) is pleonastic but not impossible in chancery style. The manuscript is hard to read here. I tentatively prefer "omnino" but cannot rule out "omissis et."

7. "Per [?] nos" (Claude) vs. "Iam nos" (HTR). The sentence introducing the delegation of royal authority — "Iam/Per nos vobis super predictis..." Looking at the manuscript, the initial letter appears to have a descender, which better supports *I* ("Iam") than *P* ("Per"). But "Iam nos" as a sentence opener is unusual in this formulaic context, where "Nos enim" or "Nos autem" would be expected. Tentatively accepting HTR's "Iam" but flagging.

8. "xvi die Aprilis" (Claude) vs. "xv die Aprilis" (HTR). The date differs by one day. Looking at the manuscript, I think I see a short stroke after "xv" that could be *i*, yielding "xvi" (16 April), but this is not certain. Needs verification.

9. "faciatis et deliberatis" (Claude) vs. "faciatis et declaretis" (HTR). Both verbs are attested in this formula. "Deliberetis" (= you shall deliberate/determine) is slightly more standard in Aragonese judicial commissions; "declaretis" (= you shall declare) is also possible. The letterforms are ambiguous between *-ber-* and *-clar-*. Tentatively retaining "deliberatis [?]" but flagging.

10. Endorsement: "Eyprimo [?] † P. de Mas [?]. exp. 3" (Claude) vs. "Dominus Maschom" (HTR). Radically different readings. Neither is fully satisfying. Looking at the manuscript, I suspect the endorsement contains a standard iussio formula — possibly "Dominus Rex mandavit [mihi]" abbreviated — followed by a scribal name. Both "P. de Mas" (Claude) and "Maschom" (HTR) may be garbled readings of the same name or phrase. What I read as "Eyprimo" might be an abbreviated "Dominus Rex" or "Expeditum primo." The entire endorsement needs archival verification.

(D) Reconciled Transcription

Johannes dei gracia Rex Aragonum Valencie Maioricarum Sardinie et Corsice Comesque Barchinone Rossilionis et Ceritanie. Ffidei auditori curie nostre Jacobo Sollena [?] jurisperito Civitatis Cesarauguste salutem et gratiam. Cum [?] in causis seu questionibus que vertuntur seu verti sperantur inter procuratorem nostrum ffiscalem familiam la botaria [?] ac Asserem [?] el lupono [?] Judeum [?] dicte Civitatis coniunctim seu divisim ex parte una et Salamonem Abnalayar [?] Judeum Civitatis predicte ex altera racionibus in processibus inde actitatis contentis celeri per [?] justitiam finis debitus imponatur eo quod iam de meritis ipsarum cognouistis amoto ex causa a cognicione earum ffideli nostro Johane [?] Petri de Casseda jurisperito cui ad supplicacionem ipsius Salamonis easdem comissimus vobis harum serie ducimus committendas mandantes et committentes vobis quatenus dictas causas vocandis partibus partium [?] racionibus auditis resumptisque processibus inde actitatis in eo puncto quo sunt quos per eorum detentores vobis tradi volumus et jubemus de meritis ipsarum cognoscatis easque decidatis et fine debito terminetis et super eisdem et qualibet ipsarum faciatis et deliberatis [?] quod de jure et racione fuerit faciendum procedendo in hiis breviter simpliciter sumarie et de plano sola facti veritate attenda maliciis omnino [?] propulsis [?]. Iam [?] nos vobis super predictis omnibus et singulis cum incidentibus dependentibus emergentibus et connexis vices

nostras plenarias committimus cum presenti quibusvis provisionibus in contrarium emanatis quas presentibus quo ad hoc revocamus in aliquo non obstantibus.

Dat Barchinone xv [?] die Aprilis Anno a nativitate domini M^o CCC^o lxxx^o septimo.

[Endorsement marks uncertain: Dominus [?] Rex [?] mandavit [?]. P. de Mas [?]. Exp. 3 [?].]

Ready for your corrections before I proceed to Stage 3.

This is an editorial summary of the document: Letter from King John I to the auditor of the royal court, Jaime Solleva, also a judge of the city of Zaragoza, asking him to intervene in the lawsuit between Jamila La Botarra and Hazan el Juponero, on the one hand; and Salomón Abnalazar, on the other, all Jews from Zaragoza. The personal names in the summary should help you reconcile many of the uncertain readings. Please proceed to Stage 3.

6:54 AM

Reconciled manuscript readings using editorial summary identifications

Reconciled manuscript readings using editorial summary identifications

The editorial summary resolves several critical readings. "Familiam" was "Jamilam" all along — brilliant. And "ffaron et pupillos" was "ffaçon el Juponero." Let me produce the Stage 3 edition.

Identified historical document context and prepared for transcription analysis

Identified historical document context and prepared for transcription analysis

The editorial summary was transformative — especially "Jamilam"/"familiam," which is essentially a paleographic trap in this hand. A few things worth flagging beyond what's in the file:

The case dynamics are interesting. Salomon Abnalazar originally petitioned for Casseda's appointment, and now the case is being pulled from Casseda and reassigned to Solleva. The document is silent on the grounds for removal (*amoto ex causa* but no cause specified), which raises the question of who petitioned for the reassignment — the fiscal? Jamila and Haçon? The involvement of the fiscal procurator alongside two private Jewish litigants suggests a case with both private and royal-fiscal dimensions, possibly debts or communal assessments where the crown has a direct interest.

The trade surname "el Juponero" is a nice detail for material culture — a doublet-maker active in Zaragoza's Jewish community in 1387.

Aca joani judicialcommission zaragoza jews 1387 04 15

Document · MD

You've used 90% of your session limit [Get more usage](#)

[Claude is AI and can make mistakes. Please double-check responses.](#)