

Claude Project, Opus 4.6

March 7, 2026

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

I have another letter in Catalan from 1387, written in fourteenth century Gothic Secretarial hand. The lines below the main letter are written in Latin. Please do your best to transcribe.

5:19 AM

Examined medieval Catalan manuscript with Latin annotations

Examined medieval Catalan manuscript with Latin annotations

Here is my Stage 1 transcription:

Document type: Royal mandate/letter from the Queen (Violant de Bar) to financial officials concerning matters of the chamber (*cambra*).

Date: March 16 [?], 1387, Barcelona.

Principal actors: The Queen (*La Reyna*); mossèn Jac[me] [?] d'Estua [?], procurador general in the kingdom of Aragon; Anthon Rosàs [?], of the treasury (*tresoreria*); mossèn Sar[?] and Anthon Olzin [?].

Transcription

Main text (Catalan):

La Reyna

Nos havem comandada recerica al amat e feels nostres moss Jac[me] [?] estua [?] pcurador [procurador] gonal [general] nostre en a[quest] [?] regne p[er] a t'Anthon Rosar [?] de la nostra tresoreria, sobre alstuns [?] fets tocants los emoluments d[e] nostra cambra. P[er] q[ue] p[er] pregam volom [?] e mana[m] q[ue] q[ua]ls [?] dits despu[x]ats [?] moss[èn] Sar [?] e Anthon olzin [?]. Ills [?] vos diran sobre aq[ue]sts fets donets plena fe e creença axi co si nos p[er]sonalment vos ho dehiem, e allo p[er] esguart nostre compli[r]ats p[er] obra,

car [?] fins [?] nos en farets g[ran] grahu[t] [?] e [?]. Dada en Barchn [Barcelona] p[er]s [?]
nostre segell secret [?] a xvj dies d[e] Març dl'any M CCC lxxxvij. Vd [Vidit] de ponte[?].

Latin subscriptions:

P[redict]e alic[ui] iiii [?]. p[rese]nte fuerunt f[a]c[te] sub eisdem dat[is] [?] signo n[ostro]
mandato e tradite sine sup[er]scripcionibu[s] [?]

Idem

[Right-hand notation:] Barth[olomeus] [?] p[ro]cur[ator] ma[ndato] d[omi]ne [several lines
of abbreviated text, very difficult to read] ff[?]. p[er] Reymu[n]t [?] T[h]es[aurarius] [?]
civit[at]is [?] e f[ui]t p[re]sentata P. d[e] lar [?] p[er] f[?].

Paleographic Notes

1. **"moss Jac estua pcurador gonal"** — The name after *mossèn* is difficult. The abbreviation mark over what I'm reading as *Jac* could yield *Jacme* or another name. *Estua* is uncertain; this could be a toponymic surname.
2. **"Anthon Rosar de la nostra tresoreria"** — The surname is unclear. The final letter could be *-r* or *-s*. *Rosàs* or *Rosar* are both possible.
3. **"alstuns"** — Likely *alcuns* or *alguns*, with possible *c/t* confusion in the reading; the word means "some/certain."
4. **"moss Sar e Anthon olzin"** — Both names are very uncertain. The first could be a truncated form of a longer name. *Olzin* could also be *Olzina* or similar.
5. **"Vd de ponte"** — This appears to be a *vidit* notation, likely the signature of a chancery official who reviewed the letter. The name *de Ponte* would identify the reviewer.
6. **Lines 6–7** are particularly compressed and abbreviated, making the transition from the body to the closing formula difficult. The reading of *segell secret* is uncertain — it could be *per nostre sagell* or similar.
7. The **right-hand Latin notation** is in a different, more cursive hand and heavily abbreviated. I can make out what appears to be a name beginning *Barth-* (Bartholomeus?) and references to a mandate and presentation, but much of it remains opaque at this resolution.

8. **"dl'any M CCC lxxxvij"** — The date is clear: 1387. Combined with *xvj dies de Març*, this gives **16 March 1387**.
-

Ready for Stage 2 whenever you have HTR output or corrections.

The other HTR looks like it did better overall with this letter, although you made a more extensive attempt for the bottom right-hand notation. Here is the output for Stage 2:
[Header] La Reyna [Main Text - Catalan] Nos hauem comanada credença al amat e feel nostre moss(en) Ja(ume) Estiua prouador general nostre en aquest regne e a n'Antoni Rosar dela nostra tresoreria sobre alguns fets tocants los emoluments de nostra cambra per que us preguam volem e manam qu'en ço que los dits moss(en) Ja(ume) e Antoni o l'un dells vos diran sobre aquests fets doneus plena fe e creença axi com si nos personalment vos ho dehiem e allo per esguart nostre complireu per obra car en açò nos en farets que grat hajam. Dada en Barchelona sota nostre segell secret a xvij dies de Març del any MCCC lxxxvij. V. de Ponte. [Bottom Left Notes - Latin] lte(m) alie .iiij. l(itte)re fuerunt f(a)c(t)e sub eisdem datis signo et mandato et tradite sine superscriptionibus. (Idem) [Right Side - Scribe/Notary validation] Barth(olomeu)s [Piquer?] p(ro) Regine ma(iesta)te...

Show more

5:22 AM

Reconciled transcription discrepancies against manuscript source material

Reconciled transcription discrepancies against manuscript source material

Stage 2: Reconciliation

(A) Where HTR corrects the initial reading

1. **"comanada credença"** vs. my **"comandada recerica"** — HTR is clearly correct. The word is *crença* (credence/trust), not *recerica*. This is a standard credence letter formula: *havem comanada credença*. My misreading of *crença* as *recerica* was a significant error. *Comanada* (without the *-d-*) also looks right on re-inspection; the scribe likely wrote the simplified form.
2. **"feel nostre"** vs. my **"feels nostres"** — HTR singular is correct. The formula here is *al amat e feel nostre*, referring to a single recipient (mossèn Jaume), not plural.
3. **"moss(en) Ja(ume) Estiua"** vs. my **"moss Jac estua"** — HTR's *Jaume Estiua* is clearly preferable. The abbreviation resolves as *Jaume*, and *Estiua* is a plausible

Catalan surname (related to *estiu*, summer). My *Jac[me]* was groping toward the same name but the surname reading was inferior.

4. **"prouador general"** vs. my **"pcurador gonat"** — HTR reads *prouador* rather than *procurador*. Returning to the image, this is a difficult call — *prouador* is not a standard chancery title, while *procurador general* absolutely is. However, looking again, the letter forms could support *prouador* as a variant or abbreviation. I suspect the underlying word is still *procurador* but the HTR may be rendering what's physically on the page more faithfully. I'll flag this — see section (C).
5. **"e a n'Antoni Rosar"** vs. my **"a t'Anthon Rosar"** — HTR's *n'Antoni* is correct. The Catalan article *n'* before a personal name is standard. *Antoni* rather than *Anthon* is also more likely for the full expansion.
6. **"alcuns"** vs. my **"alstuns"** — HTR correct. Standard Catalan *alcuns*.
7. **"qu'en ço que los dits"** vs. my **"quals dits despu[x]ats"** — HTR is vastly superior here. The formula *qu'en ço que los dits mossèn Jaume e Antoni o l'un d'ells vos diran* makes perfect grammatical and formulaic sense. My reading was garbled.
8. **"moss(en) Ja(ume) e Antoni o l'un dells vos diran"** vs. my **"moss Sar e Anthon olzin lls vos diran"** — HTR correct. The letter is naming the same two individuals again (Jaume Estiua and Antoni Rosar), with the phrase *o l'un d'ells* ("or one of them") — a standard credence letter formula authorizing either envoy to speak for the queen.
9. **"doneus"** vs. my **"donets"** — HTR's *doneus* (give them / give to them) fits the subjunctive construction better here.
10. **"complireu per obra"** vs. my **"complirats per obra"** — HTR's *complireu* (future 2nd person plural) is the more standard form in this formulaic context.
11. **"car en açò nos en farets que grat hajam"** vs. my **"car fins nos en farets gran grahut"** — HTR is clearly right. *Car en açò nos en farets que grat hajam* is a well-attested closing formula: "for in this you will do us a thing for which we shall be grateful."
12. **"sota nostre segell secret"** vs. my **"pers nostre segell secret"** — HTR's *sota* (under) is the standard formula: *dada... sota nostre segell secret*.
13. **"xvij"** vs. my **"xvj"** — This is a close call. Returning to the image, I think the HTR's *xvij* (17) may be correct, though the numeral is compressed. I'll flag as uncertain.

14. **"Barchelona"** vs. my **"Barchn"** — Both point to the same city; HTR gives the fuller form, which may reflect what the scribe actually wrote rather than my heavy abbreviation.
15. **Latin subscription: "l(itte)re"** vs. my omission — HTR correctly expands to *littere*, clarifying that four additional letters were produced under the same date.
16. **"signo et mandato et tradite sine superscriptionibus"** — HTR reads *signo et mandato* where I had *signo n[ostro] mandato*. HTR's reading with two *et* conjunctions is grammatically cleaner.

(B) Where the initial reading is preferred or adds value

1. **Right-hand notation** — My transcription attempted this in more detail than the HTR, which only offers *Barth(olomeu)s [Piquer?] p(ro) Regine ma(iesta)te*. My readings of fragments like *ff. p[er] Reymu[n]t* and *P. d[e] lar* remain very uncertain, but at least document what can be partially discerned. The HTR's *Piquer* for the surname after *Bartholomeus* is plausible but unverifiable at this resolution.
2. **"V. de Ponte"** — Both readings agree. This is the *vidit* of a chancery reviewer.

(C) Where both remain uncertain

1. **"prouador general" / "procurador general"** — The expected title is *procurador general*. HTR's *prouador* could be a faithful rendering of an unusual abbreviation or a misread. The image is ambiguous. I'll retain *procurador general* as the intended meaning but flag the surface form.
2. **"Rosar"** — Both readings agree on this surname, but it remains uncertain whether the final letter is *-r* or *-s* (*Rosàs? Rosar?*). Neither reading is independently confirmable.
3. **"xvij" vs. "xvj"** — The date numeral is compressed. I lean toward HTR's *xvij* but cannot confirm with certainty.
4. **Right-hand notation** — Remains largely opaque. *Barth(olomeu)s* is probable. The surname and the subsequent lines of abbreviated text need archival context or higher-resolution imaging to resolve.

(D) Reconciled Transcription

Header: La Reyna

Main text (Catalan): Nos havem comanada creença al amat e feel nostre mossèn Jaume Estiua procurador [?] general nostre en aquest regne e a n'Antoni Rosar [?] de la nostra

tresoreria, sobre alguns fets tocants los emoluments de nostra cambra. Per que us preguam, volem e manam qu'en ço que los dits mossèn Jaume e Antoni o l'un d'ells vos diran sobre aquests fets, doneus plena fe e creença axí com si nos personalment vos ho dehiem, e allò per esguart nostre complireu per obra, car en açò nos en farets que grat hajam. Dada en Barchelona sota nostre segell secret a xvij [?] dies de Març del any MCCC lxxxvij. V. de Ponte.

Latin subscription (bottom left): Item alie iiii littere fuerunt facte sub eisdem datis signo et mandato et tradite sine superscriptionibus. Idem.

Right-hand notation (scribal/notarial validation): Barth[olome]us [Piquer?] pro Regine ma[iestat]e [?] [remaining lines too heavily abbreviated to transcribe with confidence]

Confidence levels:

- Main Catalan text: **High** (HTR substantially confirmed and improved the reading; the formulaic language is consistent throughout)
- Latin subscription: **High**
- Right-hand notation: **Low** (only the opening name and title are partially legible)
- Date: **Medium-high** (*xvij* probable but not certain; *xvj* remains possible)

Ready for Stage 3 whenever you'd like, or if you have corrections first.

You were correct to settle on "procurador" at the end of Line 1. Here is my best effort at the full transcription for the bottom right-hand notation: "Bartholomeo Sirvent mandavit domine Regina fuit per Regenter Treseroria eiusdem es fuit tradite in hac fora." Please now proceed to Stage 3.

5:27 AM

Incorporated corrections and prepared final scholarly markdown deliverable

Incorporated corrections and prepared final scholarly markdown deliverable

Thank you for the correction on *procurador* and for the right-hand notation — that clarifies a great deal. Let me produce the Stage 3 deliverable now.

Acknowledged transcription and advanced to next stage

Acknowledged transcription and advanced to next stage

Here's the completed edition. A few notes on choices I made:

The scribal validation note is the most interesting interpretive challenge here. Your reading of *Bartholomeo Sirvent mandavit domine Regina* clarifies the issuing chain nicely. I treated *fora* as a contracted *forma* in the translation but flagged it explicitly in the ambiguities section, along with the grammatical looseness of *tradite* (which doesn't quite agree with a singular *littera*).

For the main Catalan text, the HTR did excellent work on this one — the credence letter formula is clean and complete. The only substantive question mark that survives into the final edition is the surname *Rosar* and the date numeral.

Aca violant credença estiua rosar 1387 03 17

Document · MD

Want to be notified when Claude responds?

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