

## Claude Opus 4.6 High

June 16, 2026

Copy/pasted during Claude's work process (which lasted until 6:46 when the usage limit was hit):

6:22 AM

Examined medieval Latin manuscript and prepared transcription analysis

Examined medieval Latin manuscript and prepared transcription analysis

Let me start by examining the manuscript image closely, then produce targeted crops of the denser passages.

Wrestled with illegible Gothic script and fragmented Latin phrases

Wrestled with illegible Gothic script and fragmented Latin phrases

Now let me make targeted crops of specific difficult passages:

Deciphered ambiguous medieval Latin paleography and reconstructed fragmentary text

Deciphered ambiguous medieval Latin paleography and reconstructed fragmentary text

Create targeted high-magnification crops of difficult passages

Script

Let me view each of these crux crops carefully.

View crux: lines 1-2, opening formula

OK now I can see lines 1-3 much more clearly. Let me re-read:

Line 1: "salutem et gratiam. Clamosa insinuacione facta nobis reddunt [or "reddidit"?] pro [or "per"?] Venerabili [or "Venerabile"?] et Religiosum [or "Religioso?"]"

Actually wait — looking at the magnified text:

- "salutem et gratiam" — yes, clear
- "Clamosa insinuacione" — yes
- "facta" — yes

- "nobis" — I'm second-guessing myself here. It could be "nos" without abbreviation or "nobis" with a nasal bar, but the letter count suggests "nos"
- The next word after that is harder to parse — it starts with "r-e-d-d" and I'm trying to determine if it's "reddunt," "reddidit," or "rendunt"

Looking at the full phrase, "clamosa insinuacione facta nos reddunt" would work as an ablative absolute construction meaning something like "by clamorous insinuation made, they render/make us aware," though the exact sense is still unclear to me. I'm reconsidering whether "reddidunt" might fit better here, or if there's another reading I'm missing. Maybe "nos" is the accusative after all, making "reddidit" the main verb — "the clamorous insinuation made [something] report us" or "rendered us [as something]." I'm trying to figure out whether this is "nos" or "nobis" and what the full predicate structure actually is, since the grammar keeps shifting depending on how I parse it. n-t" ending could actually be "i-d-i-t" with the minims creating ambiguity. I'm settling on "nos reddidit" as the most grammatically sensible reading — "the clamorous insinuation made has reported to us." Now I'm checking the case agreement in the next phrase with "pro Venerabili et Religioso," since "pro" requires the ablative, though I'm seeing what might be "Religiosum" in the accusative instead.

I'm wondering if the preposition might actually be "per" rather than "pro," which would make the accusative "Religiosum" correct — "by the Venerable and Religious [man]" — though the abbreviation mark through the letter makes it difficult to distinguish.

If that's the case, the phrase reads as "A clamorous insinuation having been made, [it] has made known to us through the Venerable and Religious [person]," though the grammar feels slightly off since an insinuation doesn't typically "report through" someone in that way.

Moving to the second line, I see "ac dilectum nostrum fratrem" followed by what looks like a name beginning with "a" — possibly "Azobaclem" or something similar, which is quite an unusual name. Let me keep working through this. Maybe the "a" is just a preposition and the actual name starts after it — so I'm looking at something like "fratrem a [name] de Pedro," meaning a friar from a particular place. The letters could spell "Iohaclem" or a corrupted version of "Iochim" (Joaquim), which would make sense in a medieval Latin context where that name had various spellings. Maybe I'm overcomplicating the name itself — what if it's simply a misreading on my part and the structure is "[Name], de [Place], abbatem monasterii..."? Let me set aside the exact name for now and focus on what comes after: "de Padro" or "de Pedro" appears to be a place or origin marker, followed by

"abbatem" (the abbot in accusative case) and "monasterii" (of the monastery), with more text following that I need to parse.

Looking at line 3, I can see references to the Cistercian order (spelled non-standardly as "Cisterciacy"), a diocese that looks like it might be Caesaraugusta, and titles like "capellanum" and "maiore prelati" — so this is describing someone's religious position and affiliation.

The phrase "capellanum maiore" seems to be part of a longer title structure: the person is an abbot of a monastery in the Cistercian order, from the diocese of Zaragoza, and serves as a major chaplain to some Infante — but I'm still uncertain about which Infante is being referenced here.

Given the 1387 date and Joan I's reign, the Infante could be Martin (Joan's brother), but "ayarini" doesn't match that name. I'm wondering if I'm misreading the text entirely — could "ayarini" be a place name, or am I misidentifying what "prelati" or "Infantis" actually says? The handwriting might be obscuring something like "predicti" or even "Infantissae" (referring to an Infanta instead). artini could work if there's a scribal error, but the letter shapes don't quite align. I'm considering whether "Infantis" might be correct and "ayarini" is some kind of cognomen or title I'm not recognizing, or whether I'm misreading the word entirely. For now I'll mark this section as uncertain and continue with the rest of the document.

Show more

View crux: lines 3-5, monastery identification and Berga context

Now I can see lines 3-5 more clearly at high magnification. Let me read:

Line 3: "ordinis Ciperciacy [or Cisterciaci?] dioc[esis] Cesaraugust[ane] capellanum maiore predicti [or "prelati"?] Infantis a[?]arini [or "ayarini"?"

Wait, I can see better now: "ordinis" — yes. Then "Ciperciacy" — hmm, actually I see "C-i-p-e-r-c-i-a-c-y" or "C-i-s-t-e-r-c-i-a-c-y"? In Gothic, "s" and "p" can look similar.

I think this is meant to be "Cisterciacei" or "Cisterciaci" — the Cistercian order. Then "dioc" with an abbreviation mark for "diocesis," followed by what looks like "Cesaraugi" or "Cesaragust" with its own abbreviation. I'm still working through the magnified text to pin down the exact letters.

Looking more carefully now, I see "dioc[esis]" abbreviated, then "Cesaragust" or "Caesaraugust" — likely referring to "Caesaraugustanae" (of Zaragoza). The phrase "capellanum maiore" follows, though the ending might be "maiozem" in the accusative

rather than "maiore." Then comes what appears to be "predicti" — meaning "of the aforesaid" — which would give us "capellanus maiorem predicti Infantis" (the major chaplain of the aforesaid Infante). But I need to verify this reading against the grammar.

Actually, looking even more closely, I wonder if the word might be "incliti" instead — "illustrious" — which would make "capellanus maiorem incliti Infantis" (the major chaplain of the illustrious Infante). That's a much more common formula in documents like this, and it would fit the letter shapes I'm seeing. "Incliti" seems like the most likely reading given the context of an Infante's chaplain in Aragonese documents. But now I'm wondering if what follows "Infantis" might actually be "Infantissae" instead, indicating an Infanta rather than an Infante, and I'm trying to parse what looks like either "ayarini" or "agarini" as the name. Maybe "Martini" is the answer — if the Infante is Martin, then "Infantis Martini" would fit perfectly, though the letters I'm seeing don't quite match up with that reading. I'm wondering if what looks like "y" could be a Gothic "M" with a descender, or if there's a false start with a preposition before the actual name.

Let me think about who the Infantes actually were in 1387 when Joan I took the throne — his brother Martin would be the obvious candidate, but I should also consider whether this could refer to Joan's son Jaume, or if the phrase is structured differently than I'm assuming, like "Infantis domini nostri" meaning "of the Infante, our lord." I'm struggling to parse the Latin here—"suo nos accepimus" doesn't make grammatical sense, and I'm not sure if I'm reading "suo" or "suc" or something else entirely. The phrase should mean something like "we have received/learned," but the word order is throwing me off. Let me look at this section again more carefully to see if I can make out what comes after "carissimi."

Wait—what if this isn't a new clause at all, but rather the continuation of the title itself? The standard formula for these documents typically ends with something like "major chaplain of the illustrious Infante [Name], our most dear brother." If that's the case, then after "carissimi" I should be seeing "fratris nostri"—"of our most dear brother." Let me check if that matches what I'm actually seeing in the text. I'm trying to parse the abbreviations here — "fratris nostri" might be shortened to something like "fris nri" in the manuscript, which would fit between "carissimi" and "accepimus." The structure seems to be building toward "of our most dear brother. We have learned that..." but I need to account for whatever text sits between those phrases. Looking at the magnified crop more carefully, I think I can make out "nos" before "accepimus," which would give us the emphatic construction "fratris nostri, nos accepimus quod" — we ourselves have learned that. The rest of the line seems to show "pridem mortuo fratre" with what might be a name starting with "Ber" following after. "mortuo" makes more sense than "moracio" — the letter forms in Gothic secretarial script can be deceptive, with "tu" potentially looking like "cio" or "aco" depending on how

they're written. So the phrase reads "upon the death of friar Berengario," where "Bng" is the abbreviated form of Berengario with a superscript mark.

Now I'm parsing what comes after — "Rull" as a surname, then "abbate" (abbot in the ablative), which might be abbreviated as "abb" with a mark, followed by "dicti" or "dicto" meaning "the said" or "of the said."

This looks like an ablative absolute construction: "mortuo fratre Berengario Rull, abbate dicti monasterii" — "with brother Berengario Rull, abbot of the said monastery, dead." So line 4 should read something like "carissimi fratris nostri accepimus quod pridem mortuo fratre Berengario Rull abbate dicti" and line 5 continues with "monasterii pro fidei predecessore in exponencis" — though "pro fidei" is confusing me. It could be "pro fide" (for the faith), or maybe "pro" is actually a different preposition, or the word breaks differently than I'm reading it. — "abbate dicti monasterii, predecessore suo in exponencis [exponendis]" — "abbot of the said monastery, his predecessor in what is to be set forth." So the structure is becoming clearer: Berenguer Rull was the abbot of this monastery, and he's being described as the predecessor of someone in relation to what's about to be explained in the text.

Now I'm trying to pin down exactly whose predecessor he was — the current abbot Azohaclem de Pedro seems to be the petitioner, so "suo" (his) would logically refer to him, making Berenguer Rull his predecessor. But I need to verify whether "suo" actually appears in the original text or if I'm inferring it from context. The phrase "pro fidei predecessore" is still puzzling — could "pro fidei" be a corruption or variant of something else entirely? I'm circling back on the phrase "pro fide" — maybe it means "in faith" or "as a faithful" predecessor, though the grammar feels off. Another angle: what if "profidei" is actually a corruption of "predicti," a scribal error rather than intentional wording? At this point, I think the best approach is to transcribe exactly what I see and mark the uncertain passage, since the exact meaning remains elusive. I need to stop second-guessing myself and just transcribe what I'm seeing, marking uncertain readings with [?]. The context is clear enough—Berenguer Rull was the previous abbot who died, creating a vacancy that someone exploited. Looking further down, I see what appears to be another person named Rull mentioned: "/ Bndy Rull de Berga" followed by what might be "fraude" or "frats," though the handwriting makes it difficult to be certain.

Wait—"Bndy" could be an abbreviation for Bernadus or Berengarius, but I already have Berengario Rull as the dead abbot. So this "Bndy Rull de Berga" might be a different person entirely, possibly a relative. Reading the full passage more carefully: "mortuo fratre Berengario Rull abbate dicti monasterii predecessore in exponencis / Bndy Rull de Berga fratu[s?] dicti abbatis"—this suggests a second Rull from Berga. If "fratu" is "frater," then

this would be "Bernat [?] Rull de Berga, brother of the said abbot," which would explain why there are two Rulls mentioned.

But the abbreviation is tricky—it could be "frats" or "fratu" or even "fratr" for "frater." If it's "fratris" (genitive), then the phrase would read "of Bernat [?] Rull de Berga, brother of the said abbot," which would fit if this is introducing the wrongdoer in a larger construction.

Looking at line 6, I can see the continuation: "abbatis / qui eodem abbate [or "absente"?] convente [or "conventum"?] dicti monasterii regebat / quidam." The structure seems to be describing someone who was governing the convent of the said monastery while the abbot was absent.

Now I'm noticing the tension in the text — if the abbot is already described as "mortuo" (dead), then saying "absente" (absent) seems redundant. Either "eodem" refers to a different person, or the text structure is different than I'm reading it. Let me reconsider whether "pro fidei predecessore in exponencis" might have a different meaning that would clarify this.

Looking at the rest of the passage, I'm seeing what might be "amonasterium" in line 6 — possibly a Catalan or vernacular form of "monasterium" with a prothetic "a," or perhaps "a" is functioning as a separate word here.

Reconsidering the full phrase across the different magnifications: "qui eodem absente conventum dicti monasterii regebat" would translate to "who, in his absence, was governing the convent of the said monastery" — though I'm still working through whether this reading holds up against what I'm actually seeing in the manuscript.

The alternative reading "qui eo defuncto conventum dicti monasterii regebat" — "who, upon his death, was governing the convent" — would suggest Bndy Rull took over after the abbot died, but I'm fairly certain the text says "eodem" rather than "eo defuncto."

I need to push forward and examine the remaining crops to resolve this.

Show more

View crux: lines 5-7, Bndy Rull and the break-in

Now I can see lines 6-9 (or 5-8) more clearly. Let me re-read:

Line: "abbatis / qui eo dem [eodem] abbate [or "absente"?] convente [conventum?] dictum a monasterium regebat / quidam"

OK at this magnification, I see: "abbatis" — clear. Then "/" (punctuation mark). Then "qui" — clear. Then "eo dem" or "eodem" — I think it's "eo dem" as two words, or "eodem" as one. Then "absente" or "abbate" — hmm.

Looking more closely at the letter forms, I'm fairly confident it reads "abbate" — meaning "the abbot." The phrase seems to be saying something like "who, during the same abbot, was governing the convent of the said monastery," though the grammar feels a bit strained.

Actually, I think I've got it — "eodem abbate" works as an ablative absolute construction meaning "under the same abbot," so the sentence reads "who, under the same abbot, was governing the convent of the said monastery." That would mean Bndy Rull was handling the day-to-day management while the abbot was still alive. Then when the abbot died, Rull kept control and apparently abused that power. The ablative absolute could also be interpreted differently — "the same [dead] abbot" — but I'm working through which reading makes the most sense contextually. So this reading makes sense — Bndy Rull was the abbot who succeeded Berenguer Rull and governed the convent, but then was replaced by the current abbot Azohaclem de Pedro, who's now accusing him of theft. The complaint is directed against Bndy Rull, who was the brother of the previous abbot, making him a successor who apparently mismanaged or embezzled from the monastery before being removed.

But I'm uncertain about the exact Latin abbreviation — whether "frau" or "frats" is short for "frater" (meaning either sibling or religious brother) or if it could be something else entirely.

Looking more carefully at the crop, I can now make out "Bndy Rull de Berga frater dicti abbatis" — so "frater" meaning "brother of the said abbot," though this could refer to either a biological brother or a fellow friar. The text then describes how this person, setting aside fear of God and disregarding correction, broke into something at night. If this might be a Catalan-influenced form meaning "small amount," or possibly "pecunia" for money instead. The word is hard to make out at this magnification, so I'll mark it uncertain and move forward—whatever goods are being described get listed after "videlicet." Now looking at line 9, which begins with "unam"...

I'm parsing what comes next: "one piece of tawed leather" (if "aludam" is indeed a variant of "aluda"), followed by what might be cups or goblets, and then silver items that are gilded. The exact parsing is tricky—whether these are separate items or grouped together—and some of the Latin forms look non-standard, but I'm working through what the text actually shows rather than what proper Latin would expect. So "tassea" and "tacea" might be variant spellings of the same word for cup, which would make the list redundant if both are separate items. I'm wondering if "unam aludam tasseam" could be a single item—a leather

cup—rather than two separate things, though that seems grammatically awkward. The inventory continues beyond what I can see, so I need to look at the rest of the list to understand the structure better. I'm uncertain about some of the word readings here—"aliudam" could be "aludam" or possibly "lludam"—but I'll proceed with my best interpretation and note where the text is ambiguous. Now let me look at what remains of the inventory list.

Show more

View crux: lines 7-9, tapias and beginning of goods list

Now I can see the goods list more clearly. Let me read:

Line 9: "unam aludam [or "aliudam"?] tasseam [or "tasceam"?] duas taulas [or "tabolas"?] taceas [or "tacees"?] argenti deauratas ponde-

Wait, looking more carefully at this magnification, I think I see:

- "una" or "unam"
- "aliudam" — at this magnification I can see the letters more clearly: "a-l-i-u-d-a-m" — yes, that's what it says. Could "aliudam" be a form of "aliud" (neuter "another")? But "aliudam" doesn't exist as a Latin form.

Unless the scribe treated it as feminine, in which case "aliam" would be the correct form. Or perhaps "aliudam" is actually "aludam"—a piece of aluda, tawed leather, which is documented in medieval Latin, with the extra "i" being a scribal error or dialectal variation.

For "tasseam," at this magnification I can make out "t-a-s-c-e-a-m" or "t-a-s-s-e-a-m"—a cup, from Catalan "tassa." I'll read it as "tasseam."

"Duas" is clearly two, and then the text continues with what looks like more items in the list. Or maybe there's a word I'm missing between "duas" and "taceas" — perhaps "duas tabulas taceas" meaning two flat cups, or the text could read differently altogether. I'm struggling to parse this sequence clearly because "taceas" without a preceding number seems grammatically incomplete, so either I'm misreading the letters or there's a word I'm not catching. I'm wondering if "taulas" and "taceas" might actually form a single phrase together—perhaps "duas taulas taceas" meaning "two flat cups"—rather than two separate items. Let me just transcribe exactly what I'm seeing in the manuscript: "duas taulas [?] taceas argenti deauratas ponderantes tres [?] marchas," and continue from there.

Looking at the next line, I see "ponderantes tres marchas" clearly means "weighing three marks," then a new item begins with "tres taceas argenti albus." The adjective agreement seems off—"albus" is nominative but should match the genitive "argenti," so it should be

"albi," though the scribe may have simply made an error. After that I'm seeing what looks like "unam corrigiam" starting another item. The minims in Gothic script could easily obscure the letters, making "coclearia" appear as "clogaria." But "unum" doesn't match the plural form, so maybe it's "unum coclear" (one spoon) or "unum par coclearium" (one pair of spoons). I'm also wondering if I'm reading "unum" correctly—it might be "ung," a Catalan numeral for "one," which would suggest this text might be in Catalan rather than Latin, though "clogaria" still doesn't match any Catalan word I can identify. "coclearia" (spoons) makes more sense as a scribal variant of "clogaria" through metathesis. So this could be "one pair of silver spoons." I'm considering other possibilities like a bell-tower or a cloak pin, but I'll move forward with the spoon interpretation. After that I see "two gilded silver chalices" clearly marked, followed by a weight measurement of five marks.

Now I'm looking at the books listed next—law and medicine texts—and trying to parse the Bible entry and what appears to be "florum" (flowers) in another book title, though the exact wording is still unclear at this magnification. I need to examine the section covering the textiles and precious stones more carefully.

Show more

View crux: lines 14-16, textiles and precious stone

Wait, this isn't the textiles — this is the part about the grain and weapons and the flight. Let me re-read:

Line 17: "etiam pecie [?] quantitate [or "quantitare"?] de blado dicti monasterii / quod vendiderat duas"

At this magnification, I can see: "e-t-i-a-m" — yes, "etiam" (also). Then "p-e-c-i-e" or "p-e-t-i-e" [?] — hmm. Then "q-u-a-n-t-i-t-a-t-e" [?] or "q-u-a-n-t-i-t-a-r-e" [?]. Then "d-e" (of).

Then "b-l-a-d-o" (grain). Then "d-i-c-t-i" (of the said). Then "m-o-n-a-s-t-e-r-i-i" [?] or something abbreviated. Actually, looking at it again, I think "pecie" might be a variant of "pecia" (a piece), and "quantitare" could be the ablative "quantitate" (quantity).

So the phrase reads: "etiam pecie quantitate de blado dicti monasterii" — also a [?] quantity of grain of the said monastery. But having two nouns in sequence like "pecie quantitate" is strange. Could "pecie" be a corruption of "certe" (certain)? That would give "certe quantitate de blado" — a certain quantity of grain, which makes more sense. Or maybe "pecie" is actually "petie" or something else entirely. I'm also wondering if "pecie" could somehow relate to "pecunia" (money), though the forms don't match well. Another possibility: "pecie" as in "a piece of," though that still leaves the construction awkward.

The most sensible reading seems to be treating "pecie quantitate" as an apposition — "a piece, [namely a] quantity, of grain" — or perhaps "pecie quantitate" is meant as "peciae quantitatem" in the accusative. Either way, the grain was sold, as indicated by "quod vendiderat" — which he had sold.

Now I'm looking at line 18: "duas ballistas et duos enses" — two crossbows and two swords.

The tricky part is whether "quod vendiderat" applies only to the grain or extends to the crossbows and swords as well. The structure could be "he took also a certain quantity of grain of the said monastery, which he had sold, [as well as] two crossbows and two swords" — meaning the grain was sold but the weapons are just listed as additional items taken. Or "quod vendiderat duas ballistas" could mean he had sold the crossbows themselves. The most likely reading is that the grain was the item sold, with the crossbows and swords listed separately as other things he took.

Now looking at the next part: the text mentions all those goods and a certain mule belonging to the monastery, and then describes how they were taken secretly. I'm trying to parse the verb — it looks like "abduxerunt," which would mean "they carried off" or "they led away," fitting perfectly with the sense that these items were stolen covertly from the monastery. I'm seeing two parallel clauses here — they secretly took goods from the monastery, and then fled from it. But "corruerunt" (they fell/collapsed) doesn't quite fit the context. I'm wondering if it might be "corruperunt" (they destroyed) or "corripuerunt" (they seized) instead, though the manuscript is ambiguous at this point. then "dicto mulo" — the said mule — followed by what might be "per vim" or "pede," and then "duxit" or "duxut," though the exact letters are hard to make out at this magnification. I'm marking the uncertain portions and moving forward.

The next section reads "et adhuc tenet occupata indebite et iniuste" — and still holds them occupied unlawfully and unjustly. So the full narrative emerges: someone, likely Bndy Rull or his associates, broke into the monastery under cover of night, seized goods, silver, books, textiles, grain, weapons, and a mule, carried them away in secret, and continues to hold them in violation of law and justice. Now I need to examine the dispositio section.

Show more

View crux: lines 21-24, the dispositio

Now I can see the dispositio more clearly. Let me read:

Line 23: "supplicatores [or "supplicaciones"?] benigne admissa / vobis [?] cuylibet [?] cum [or "vestrum"?] dicimus et [?] deputare [or "deprecare"?] que [or "quatenus"?]"

At this magnification:

- "supplicatores" or "supplicaciones" — I think I see "supplicaciones" or "supplicatonem" [?] — actually, I now see "supplicatoe" with abbreviation marks, which could be "supplicacione" (ablative singular).

The phrase "supplicacione benigne admissa" marks the standard transition from the narrative section into the dispositio, with the petition having been graciously received. Following that, I'm parsing through the abbreviated text letter by letter: "vobis" is clear, then what appears to be "cuilibet" (to each), "vestrum" (of you), "dicimus" (we say), and "et" — the sentence structure is becoming clearer as I work through these abbreviated forms.

After "dicimus et," I'm trying to identify the main verb. The standard royal formula would be "mandamus" (we command), but what I'm seeing in the manuscript is harder to parse — it could be "deprecare," "deputare," or something else entirely. The context suggests it should be a command verb rather than "deprecare" (to petition), since a king would issue commands, not petitions. I need to look more carefully at what follows to determine which verb this actually is. I'm wrestling with the exact phrasing here — it looks like "vobis et cuilibet vestrum dicimus et mandamus quatenus" for the opening, then "precipiendo mandamus expresse" as a reinforcing clause. The repetition of "mandamus" is throwing me off, but it might be a stylistic intensification of the command, followed by what seems to be "sub ira et indignacionis nostre" — under our wrath and displeasure. you?] under our anger and displeasure..." The sentence structure seems to involve "vobis et cuilibet vestrum" followed by commands and conditions about the penalty incurred. Moving to line 25, I'm parsing "incursu" as the incurrence of the penalty, and "de dicto Bndo Rull" referring to a person—possibly Bernardo or Berengario Rull—with the text discussing securing something and his goods.

Now I'm working through the verb forms: "donec asecuretis" appears to mean "until you secure" or "until you apprehend," suggesting the command is to take the said Bndo Rull into custody or make him secure, though the exact object and construction remain slightly ambiguous. I'm second-guessing the word before "donec" — it could be "eos" rather than "vos," which would shift the meaning to "them, until you secure [them]." The phrase might be part of a larger construction involving capture or apprehension.

Looking at the full clause structure, it seems the king is issuing a compound order: first to secure or apprehend Bndo Rull, and second to inventory and sequester all his goods — the grammar is awkward but the intent is becoming clearer.

Now examining line 26 more carefully, "inventarietis" appears to be the second person plural future form meaning "you shall inventory," followed by "vel" (or), and then a

problematic word that looks like "quydeavte" or possibly "guideavte" — I'm trying to parse whether this comes from "guia" (to guide/ensure) or another verb entirely, and the handwriting at this magnification is making it difficult to pin down the exact letters. "Cuydeavte" might be a dialectal variant of "cuydeatis," or possibly a corrupted form of "caveatis" or "curetis" — all conveying the sense of ensuring or taking care. Looking at "ne abscondant," that's "lest they hide," and "vel distrahi valeant" means "or can be dispersed" — so the full phrase is saying the goods must be inventoried or safeguarded so they cannot be hidden or scattered away. The "ne" negates the entire construction, so "ne abscondi vel distrahi valeant" means "so that they may not be able to be hidden or dispersed" — with the passive infinitives governed by "valeant" in the subjunctive. This reading makes grammatical sense for the legal clause.

Now I need to look at the remaining lines to see the full context and check whether "abscondant" might actually be a different form like "abscondi ut" or some variant that's hard to parse given the abbreviations and medieval letter forms.

Show more

View crux: final lines

Now I can see the final lines. Let me read:

Line 28: "alibi de bonis proprius [or "propriis"?] exprioretis [or "expropriatis"?] [or "exprioriatis"?] ut aliis que fuerint [or "fuerunt"?] dicti [?] abbatis [or "abbatis"?]"

Hmm, at this magnification: "alibi" = "elsewhere." Then "de bonis" = "concerning goods." Then "proprius" or "propriis" — I see "p-r-o-p-r-i-u-s" or "p-r-o-p-r-i-i-s." Then "exprioretis" [?] — I see "e-x-p-r-i-o-r-e-t-i-s" or "e-x-p-r-o-p-r-i-e-t-i-s" [?].

This is really unclear. Could "exprioriatis" be a verb? Let me think about what verbs would fit: "expriorare"? "Expropriare"? Neither is standard classical Latin, but in medieval legal Latin, "expropriare" (to expropriate) is known. Or could this be "exprimoretis" [?]? No. What about "exploretis" (you shall explore/investigate)? "Ex proprius exploretis" — "from [their] own [goods] you shall investigate." That doesn't quite work either. Wait — I'm seeing it differently now. What if "de bonis proprius" is actually...

Let me try reading the letters again more carefully: "e-x-p" — then... "r-o-p-r-i-e-t-i-s" or "r-i-o-r-e-t-i-s." If it's "expropriatis" from "expropriare" — "you shall expropriate [from his own goods]" — that's possible but unusual. I'm still working through what this word actually is.

Actually, looking at the broader context of the passage, the king's commands seem to be: first, to inventory the goods or ensure they can't be hidden or dispersed, and then something about "if elsewhere from his own goods [seized/expropriated?]" — the full

sentence structure might become clearer if I examine how these clauses connect to what follows about the abbot's possessions. *retis / ad hoc ut...*"

I'm working through the full phrase now. It seems to say "And if you should find elsewhere, from [Bndo Rull's] own goods that have been seized or from other goods that belonged to the said abbot or to his monastery, seize them and sequester them / so that..." The word "expropriatis" is still giving me trouble—I wonder if I'm misreading it entirely, or if it's actually part of a different construction like "de bonis propriis" meaning "from his own goods" followed by something else I'm not parsing correctly.

Actually, what if "expropriatis" is the right reading—an ablative plural participle meaning "from goods that have been expropriated"? That would suggest the king is referring to stolen goods mixed in with his personal property. So the instruction would be: find any of these goods whether they're among his personal property (including expropriated items) or among goods that belonged to the abbot or monastery, and seize them all. But I'm still seeing "exproretis" in the text, not "expropriatis," so I need to figure out what that actually says. Now I'm working through the Latin translation more carefully. "Reperiat" means "you shall find," "ea" is "them," and "emparietis" comes from the Catalan term for seizing or impounding. "Sequestretis" means "you shall sequester," and "ad hoc ut" sets up the purpose clause. I'm parsing line 30 now, which has several uncertain readings—"constricti" or "constrictum," questions about whether it's "eius" or "et eius," and whether "de" or "a" precedes "monasterio." The phrase seems to continue into the next page with "valeant prout decet," so I need to see the full construction to make sense of it. The text continues with "valeant prout decet." I'm noticing the grammar is problematic — "tu constricti" doesn't work since "tu" is singular but "constricti" is plural. It's more likely "ita" (thus) or "in" (in), which would make "constricta ea" agree with the neuter plural goods. But even then, the sense is awkward — goods being "constrained" doesn't quite fit the context of a petition for restitution.

I'm now thinking "constricti" might refer to the officials being bound or ordered by the mandate, so "vos constricti" would mean "you, being bound [by this order]." The overall meaning seems to be that the wrongdoers are constrained and the goods may be restored to the petitioner and his monastery as is fitting.

Now I need to compile the full transcription and double-check a few key words I haven't examined closely yet, particularly in the goods-list section that needs better magnification.