

Stage 2 Reconciliation: ACA Register, ff. 66v–67r

Document Identification

- **Type:** Royal mandate (*littera mandata*) protecting an export privilege
 - **Issuer:** King Joan I of Aragon
 - **Addressed to:** The *gerens vices gubernatoris* in Catalonia *ultra Saxonam*, *baiuli*, and other royal officials
 - **Subject:** Protection of an ancient privilege held by the *universitates* and Saracen *aljamas* of certain places (in western Catalonia, within Infante Martin's domains) permitting free export of livestock and grain without license
 - **Date:** Barcelona, [9 or 10] March 1387
 - **Subscription:** Francesc Ça Costa, vice-chancellor
-

(a) Where the HTR Corrects the Initial Reading

1. **"universitatum" (lines 4–5):** My initial reading "co[m]missitarii / co[m]missitarium" was incorrect. Both the HTR ("univ[er]situdu[m] et aliamaru[m]") and Jonathan's correction confirm these are **universitatum et aliamarem**. The confusion arose from the similarity of initial *u* and *c* in this hand, and the heavy abbreviation of *universitatum*.
2. **"triticum" (line 8/9):** My uncertain reading "trinam" should be **triticum** (wheat), as the HTR reads. This is the standard pairing in grain export privileges: *annonam triticum et alia blada* (provisions, wheat, and other grains).
3. **"a pauco citra tempore" (lines 10–11):** My garbled reading "a pauo arsa" is clarified by the HTR's **a pauco citra tempore** ("from a short time ago"), a standard temporal phrase indicating the officials have recently begun obstructing the privilege.
4. **"et permissu" (line 13):** My "z gru[?]ssit" should be **et permissu** ("and permission"), paralleling "absque vestra licencia et permissu" — "without your license and permission." The HTR is clearly correct here.
5. **"conantur ... nisi fuisset" (line 13):** The HTR's "et hoc conantur in nisi fuisset" helps clarify my "et hoc conantium z nisi fueris" — the sense is "and you attempt this ... as if it were not [already established]" or similar. The HTR reading is closer to grammatical sense, though neither reading is fully satisfactory. See section (c) below.
6. **"iustis" (line 19):** The HTR reads "iustis" where I had "iuris." In the formula *supplicacionibus ut pote iustis et racioni consonis* ("petitions, being just and consonant with reason"), **iustis** is clearly correct and formulaically standard.

7. **Date — year confirmed as 1387:** The HTR reads "lxxxvii^o" which, combined with Jonathan's confirmation, resolves my uncertain "lce viij^o" as **lxxxvij^o** = 1387. The dating by the Nativity style means this is 9/10 March 1387.
-

(b) Where the Initial Reading Is Preferred

1. **Address clause (line 1):** The HTR reads "dilecto co[n]siliario et guv[er]natori insul[arum] Maioricar[u]m" — completely wrong. This is not addressed to the governor of Mallorca. Jonathan's correction confirms the reading as **Gerent[i]vices Gubernatoris ... ultra / Saxonam** — the lieutenant governor for western Catalonia beyond the Segre.
 2. **"Salutem et dileccionem. Noveritis" (line 3):** My reading of "Noveritis" (or similar) as the verb introducing the *narratio* is preferable to the HTR's "Presenciam nram nuper adivierunt," which appears to be a confabulation from a different document type. The standard formula for this type of mandate would use *Noveritis* or *Ad nostram pervenit noticiam*.
 3. **"exposuerunt reverenter" (line 5):** My reading "exposuerunt reverenter" is grammatically and formulaically superior to the HTR's "exposuit tenerentur," which makes no sense in context. The plural *exposuerunt* agrees with *nuncii* (messengers).
 4. **"Infante Martin" (lines 15–16):** My reading "infant[is] Martin[i] frat[ris] n[ost]ri carissimi" is correct. The HTR's "generoso iacobi fratris nostri carissimi" is wrong on both name and title. In 1387, the relevant royal brother holding western Catalan domains is Infante Martin (the future Martin I), not anyone named Jacobus.
 5. **"supplicarunt" (line 17):** My reading "supplicar[unt]" makes better grammatical sense than the HTR's "postulatum" — the active plural agrees with the messengers (*nuncii*) as subject.
 6. **"quinimo illud ipsis observetis" (line 22):** My reading "quinimo illud ipsis obs[er]ue[n]s" (i.e., *quinimo illud ipsis observetis*) is closer to the standard mandate formula than the HTR's "inimmo illud prebit obsvens." The correct sense is *quinimo* ("but rather") followed by the positive command to observe the privilege.
 7. **"condigna pena punire" (line 26):** My reading "condignu pena punpe" (i.e., *condigna pena punire*) captures the warning formula better than the HTR's "condigna pena punire per singularis." The standard sense is: "lest we be compelled to punish [you] with condign punishment."
-

(c) Where Both Readings Remain Uncertain

1. **Place name(s) of the *universitates* and *aljamas* (line 4):** I read "Praenore [?] del pe [?] et de Caualler [?];" the HTR reads only "de Cavalleriz." Neither resolves the toponym(s). These are places in western

Catalonia *ultra Saxonam* within Infante Martin's seigneurial domain. The second element likely involves "Cavaller-" but the first element remains opaque. **Jonathan's identification of the place names is needed.**

2. **Words between "Gubernatoris" and "ultra" (line 1):** The standard formula predicts something like *nostri in Cathalonia* or *generalis in Cathalonia*, but neither my reading nor the HTR provides a clean resolution. I tentatively reconstruct *n[ost]ri* or *in Cathalonia* but this remains uncertain.
3. **"consuetum fuit et assuetum ... posse ipsa ante licencia" (line 7):** The general sense is clear — the privilege was customary and established, allowing them to act without anyone's license — but the exact word forms are disputed. My reading "ser [?] fuit et assurt [?] posse ipsa anore licenna cuspia minime" vs. the HTR's "set sunt et assueti tempore ipsa ante licentia aliqua minime." The HTR's *tempore* for my *anore* and *aliqua* for my *cuspia* are plausible, but neither transcription is fully satisfying. The expected formula would be something like: *consuetum fuit et assuetum posse ipsa absque licencia alicuius/cuiuspam minime...* I tentatively reconstruct with the HTR's readings as closer, but flag the passage as needing verification.
4. **"sub hore coloris penas" (line 13) / "sub hore coloris prias" (HTR):** Both readings struggle here. The expected sense is "under this pretext/color [you impose] penalties" — i.e., *sub huius coloris pretextu penas*. Neither transcription cleanly yields this. I tentatively read **sub huius colore penas** but this remains uncertain.
5. **f. 67r, line 14 opening — "a p[re]missis xp[ist]ianis et ffratribus" (HTR) vs. my "a privatis xpianis et fracenis":** The HTR's reading "christianis" (*xpianis*) makes better sense than my "xpianis." But the second word is problematic: HTR reads "ffratribus" (brothers), which is unexpected in this context. Given that the document concerns both *universitates* (Christian communities) and *aljamas sarracenorum*, one might expect "a ... christianis et sarracenis" here, but the letter forms may not support *sarracenis*. **This word needs verification against the manuscript.**
6. **"per suis [?] ulla/ultra nobis audiamus ultra conquerentes" (lines 25–26):** Both readings struggle with this warning clause. The expected sense is: "lest concerning these matters we hear [them] complaining further to us, so that we would be compelled to punish you with condign punishment." Neither transcription cleanly resolves the intervening words. The HTR's "per hys coram nobis audiamus ulterius conquerentis" is plausible but not certain.
7. **"die nona marcii" (HTR) vs. "x die marcii" (my reading):** The HTR gives 9 March; I read 10 March. The letter forms could support either. The difference is minor but should be resolved against the manuscript. The numeral in the manuscript appears to be a single character, which could be a Roman *x* (10) or an abbreviation of *nona* (9th).
8. **"sub nostro sigillo secreto" (HTR, line 27):** The HTR includes the clause "under our secret seal" before the date. I did not read this in the manuscript. If present, it would be a standard authenticating formula for letters issued under the *sigillum secretum* rather than the great seal. Needs verification.

(d) Reconciled Transcription

f. 66v

Johannes dei gra[tia]. Dilecto gerentivices [?] Gubernatoris n[ost]ri [?] ultra
Saxonam baiulis et aliis offic[ialibus] nostris vel eor[um] locatenentibus presentibus et futu[r]is quibus
infrascripta
spectare quomodolibet dinoscantur. Salutem et dileccionem. Noveritis p[er] [?] nostram [?]
nuncii universitatum et aliamarem [PLACE NAME] del pe[?] et de Cavaller[?] sua humili
supplicacione nobis exposuerunt reverenter. Quod singulares universitatum
et aliamarem serracenorem predictarum hab[uer]unt privilegium eis ab antiquo concessum et indultum co[n]-
suetum [?] fuit et assuet[um] [?] t[em]p[or]e [?] ipsa ante [?] licencia aliq[ui]a [?] minime e[t]
pecora / [bestias?] ext[ra]here a d[ic]tis locis / et extrahi p[er] mare sive p[er] t[er]ram annonam
triticum et alia blada et ea defferre vende[re] seu portari face[re] ad quascu[m]q[ue]
p[ar]tes inf[r]a domin[ii] ad eor[um] libitum voluntat[is]. Quo[d] q[ue] vos aut aliq[ui] ex
vobis v[est]ra ipsa ante a pauco citra t[em]p[or]e in[de] [?] p[re]sentis [?] et p[ro]hibent[is] [?] suppli-
cantibus p[re]d[ic]tis ne memorata blada a d[ic]tis locis ext[ra]ha[n]t absq[ue] v[est]ra licen[ci]a
et permissu et hoc conantur [?] nisi fuisset [?] agere adeo ut sub hui[us] [?] colore [?] penas

f. 67r

a p[re]missis xp[ist]ianis et [sarracenis? / ffratribus?] valeant exhigere et habere. Quod q[ui] in damn[um]
d[ic]tar[um] universitatum et aliamarem et det[ri]men[tum] p[ri]uil[egii] et redituum [?] i[n]d[ic]ti [?] in-
fant[is] Martin[i] frat[ris] n[ost]ri carissimi / cui[us] d[ic]ta loca et redditus sunt p[er] nos p[er]petue [?] /
dubio redundare. Quobrem eisdem nunciis a nobis humilit[er] supplicar[unt]
ut et sup[er] hiis p[ro]vide de nostra solita clemencia deberemus. Ei[us] itaq[ue] sup-
plicacio[ni]b[us] ut pote iustis et racio[n]i co[n]sonis benigne favent[ibus] / vob[is] et cuiusq[ue]
v[est]rum dici[m]us et manda[m]us [?] de certa [?] [?] d[ic]ta [?] iussio[ni]b[us] q[uo]d contra [?] vobis d[ic]to
p[ri]uilegio memora[to]
[iuxta?] contra ip[s]i[us] forma[m] supplicant[es] p[re]d[ic]tos ulterius moleste[ti]s et inquietari p[er]
aliquos facatis aut p[er]mittatis quomodo / quinimo illud ip[s]is obs[er]ue[ti]s et
teneri facatis iuxta eius serie[m] plenior[m] ac p[er] eos melius pos[s]it hacte-
nus exple[ue]runt. Cauent[es] attente ne p[re]fatos supplicant[es] quos respectu d[ic]ti n[ost]ri
carissimi frat[ris] n[ost]ri tractare deben[s] fauorabilit[er] et benigne p[er] hiis [?] cora[m] [?] nobis audia-
m[us] ultr[a] co[n]querent[es] / quoq[ue] ne suis [?] condigna pena punire p[er] [?] q[uo]d nobis
d[ic]ta ma[n]dato[rie]. Dat[um] Barc[hinone] [sub nostro sigillo secreto?]. [x? / nona?] die marcii. Anno a
Nat[iuitate] d[omi]ni M° CCC°
LXXXVIJ°. Ff[ranciscu]s ça Costa.

Summary of Key Unresolved Issues

1. **Place name(s):** The toponym(s) identifying the *universitates* and *aljamas* remain partially illegible. The second element appears to involve "Cavaller-"; the first element is unresolved. These should be identifiable places in western Catalonia *ultra Saxonam* within Infante Martin's lordship.
2. **"christianis et [?]" (f. 67r, line 1):** The word after *christianis* is critical for confirming whether the penalty clause names both religious communities. If *sarracenis*, it parallels the *universitates et aljamas sarracenorum* structure of the document. If *ffratribus*, the reference is unclear.
3. **Precise date:** 9 March (*die nona marcii*) or 10 March (*x die marcii*) — to be verified against the manuscript.
4. **Lines 7 and 10–13 (grievance clause):** Several individual word forms in the passage describing the officials' recent obstruction remain uncertain, though the overall legal sense is clear: officials have been requiring licenses for grain export in contravention of the ancient privilege.
5. **"sub nostro sigillo secreto":** Presence of this authenticating clause in the date formula is uncertain; if present, it specifies the document was issued under the secret seal.
6. **Mandate formula (lines 20–21):** The exact wording between *mandamus* and the operative clause (*quod contra ... privilegio memorato*) contains several uncertain words. The standard formula would predict something like *de certa sciencia et expresse* or *per presentes*, but the manuscript forms are not fully legible.