

Claude Project, Opus 4.6

March 8, 2026

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

I have another letter in Latin from 1387, written in fourteenth century Gothic Secretarial hand. It is in two parts, the first part in the image file titled f5v and the second part in the image file titled f6r. Please do your best to transcribe.

5:41 AM

Examined manuscript images to transcribe Latin document

Examined manuscript images to transcribe Latin document

Here is my Stage 1 transcription of this document, which appears to be a notarial appointment (*creatio notarii*) issued by Joan I.

Document type: Royal grant of notarial authority (*creatio tabellionatus*)

Principal actors: Johannes (Joan I), King of Aragon; Raimundus (Ramon) de Bisanya [?] / Bannudum [?] — the appointee

Date: 1 April, regnal year 1 (i.e., 1387)

Transcription:

[f. 5v]

Nos Johannes dei gracia rex et cetera. Attendentes te ffdalem [?] nostrum Raimundum [?] de bza [?] loca de [?] posse esse ydoneum et sufficientem ad tabellionatus officium exercendum presertim per te in cancellaria nostra juramento quod bene et legali te habebis in exercendo officio memorato · Ideo confirmamus et creamus te dictum Raimundum [?] in notarium publicum per totam [?] Regnorum nostrorum Regon [?] · ita quod in omnibus et singulis locis dictorum [?] regni possis recipere et conficere

testamenta acta instrumenta [?] fines [?] et quaslibet alia jura [?] quoscumque contractum fuerint et quaslibet alias scripturas auctencas [?] et publicas et ea scribere ac scribi facere per substitutum aut substitutos a te juratos tamen de quibus secundo [?] provella [?] sunt [?] rapi [?] /

[f. 6r]

brevia fanas [?] notulasque ut eterne memorie commendentur · Nos enim ipsis testamentis actibus testationibus [?] censerimus [?] justiciis [?] et aliis premissis tuis publicis et auctenticis pro te bene et legali reputibus [?] conficiendis et tradendis ac scribi faciendis per juratos et substitutos a te auctoritatem nostram imponimus pura [?] et decretum · ita quod eisdem in judicio et extra judicium fides plenaria habeatur et omnimodam obtineat roboris firmitatem tanquam publica manu facta [?] · Iniungimus [?] tamen subscripcione tua et signi appositione [?] et eisdem qua et [?] autem [?] manu [?] nostri et ipsis notariis [?] mercassent [?] [?] confirmaris [?] · mandantes per presentem cartam nostram Gubirnatoribus [?] nostro [?] generalibus [?] cunctis quoque vicegerentibus aut [?] no [?] locumque [?] baiulis justiciis curiis supra juratariis [?] Calmedinis [?] açerimus [?] Consiliariis juratis et cunctis aliis officialibus et subditis nostris presentibus et futuris vel eorum locatenentibus · quod te per notario publico habeant et teneant per totum Regnum Aragonum et [?] impetris [?] ac scriptis tuis publicis adhibeant plena fidem · In cuius rei testimonium presentem cartam nostram fieri et sigillo nostro appendicio jussimus comuniri · Data Barchinone vicesima prima die Marcii anno a nativitate domini Millesimo ccc^o lxxx^o septimo · Regnorum nostrorum primo · + dominicus [?] Mascho [?]

[authentication clause:] Dominus [?] episcopus [?] vidit [?] domino [?] As [?] ff [?] per cancellarius [?] Valençie [?]

Key uncertainties and observations:

The appointee's name is difficult. I read *Raimundum* for the personal name, but the surname/locative is very uncertain — it could be *de bisanya*, *de bza* as an abbreviation, or something else. The minims in this passage are compressed.

The word I've tentatively read as *provella* near the end of f. 5v is problematic; this may be a form related to *protocol* or *prothocollum* (i.e., the notarial register from which engrossed instruments are drawn). The entire final clause of f. 5v running into f. 6r deals with the notary's obligation to keep abbreviated notes (*brevia*, *notulas*) that can be committed to permanent record.

The authentication block at the bottom of f. 6r is partly formulaic but the specific names/titles are hard to resolve. The *Dominus...* line likely identifies the chancellor or vice-chancellor who authorized the document.

The date reads clearly as 21 March 1387, regnal year 1 — consistent with Joan I's accession (January 1387). I initially noted April above but on re-reading the date clause, *die Marcii* is clear: this is **21 March 1387**.

Shall I proceed to Stage 2 when you have the HTR, or would you like to flag specific passages for me to re-examine first?

The name of the subject of this letter is Raimundum Diebra. The other HTR did even worse with the name on line one, but I think there might be places the other HTR's transcription was better. Here is the HTR output for Stage 2: Transcription: mar-21-transcribe-f5v.jpg 1. Nos Johanes dei gra[cia] rex Aragonum tc' . Attendentes te fidelem n[ost]ru[m] Samuelem dictra loci 2. de iaxar esse ydoneum et sufficiente[m] ad tabellionatus officiu[m] exercendu[m] p[re]stito per 3. te in cancellaria n[ost]ra juramento q[uod] bene et legalit[er] te habebis in exercendo officio memo/ 4. rato . Ideo constituimus et creamus te dictu[m] Samuelem i[n] notariu[m] publicu[m] per totu[m] Regnu[m] 5. Aragonum . Ita q[uod] in univ[er]sis et singulis locis dicti regni possis recipere et conficere testamenta 6. ultima arrestaciones su[m]as et quelibet alia jura quoru[m]cu[m]q[ue] contractuu[m] fuerint et 7. quilibet alias scripturas autenticas et publicas et ea scribere et scribi facere per 8. substituere aut substitutos a te juratos t[ame]n de quibus siquide[m] protocolla sive capi/ Transcription: mar-21-transcribe-f6r.jpg 1. tula facias notulari ut eterne memorie comendentur . Nos enim ipis [ipsis] testamentis actis 2. attestationibus sententiis inscriptis et aliis scriptis tuis publicis et autenticis per te bene et 3. legalit[er] recipiendis conficiendis et scribendis ac scribi faciendis per juratos et substitutos 4. a te auctoritate[m] n[ost]ram i[m]pendimus p[ar]iter et decretu[m] . Ita q[uod] eisdem in iudicio et extra iudiciu[m] 5. fides plenaria habeatur et o[mn]imodam obtineat roboris firmitate[m] tanqu[am] publica manu 6. fact[is] . Dum tame[n] subscriptione tua et signo appositis i[n] eisdem qua te auct[orit]e n[ost]ra not[arium] 7. et ipis contractib[us] i[n]terfuisse confitearis . Ma[n]dantes per p[rese]ntem carta[m] vicarijs subve/ 8. gatorib[us] n[ost]ris gen[er]ali curie curijs conservatorib[us] ne no[n] locarie[nten]tib[us] baiulijs justitijs curijs sup[er]/ 9. junctarijs zalmedinis alguazirijs Consiliarijs juratis et univ[er]sis alijs officialib[us] et 10. subditis n[ost]ris p[rese]ntib[us] et futuris / vel eoru[m] locatene[n]tib[us] q[uod] te p[ro] notario publico habeant 11. et teneant per totu[m] Regnu[m] Aragonu[m] et i[n]strumentis ac scriptis tuis publicis adhibeant plena[m] 12. fide[m] . In cuius rei testimoniu[m] p[rese]ntem carta[m] n[ost]ram fieri et sigillo n[ost]ro appendicio 13. jussimus co[m]mu[n]iri . Dat' Barch[inone] vicesima p[ri]ma die marcii anno

a nativitate d[omi]ni mill[esim]o ccc° 14. lxxxvii° . Regni n[ost]ri p[ri]mo . + Do[minu]s rex
ma[n]da[v]it 15. [Signature] Johanes m[artin]jiz

Show more

5:46 AM

Reconciled manuscript transcription against HTR output, adjudicating divergences systematically

Reconciled manuscript transcription against HTR output, adjudicating divergences systematically

Stage 2: Reconciliation

This is a notarial creation (*creatio tabellionatus*) for Raimundus Diebra (Ramon Diebra) of Híjar, granting him authority as public notary throughout the Kingdom of Aragon. The HTR performed significantly better than my initial reading on several key passages, though it badly mangled the appointee's name. Here is the systematic comparison.

(A) Where the HTR corrects the initial reading

f. 5v, line 1–2: Locative identifier. The HTR reads *loci de ixar*, which — combined with your correction of the name to *Raimundum Diebra* — gives us *Raimundum Diebra loci de Ixar*: Ramon Diebra of Híjar. My reading was garbled here. The HTR's locative is clearly correct.

f. 5v, line 2: *prestito* vs. *presertim*. The HTR's *prestito* is unambiguously right. *Prestito per te in cancellaria nostra juramento* ("the oath having been taken by you in our chancery") is the standard formula for notarial appointments. My *presertim* makes no sense in this context.

f. 5v, line 4: *constituimus* vs. *confirmamus*; *per totum Regnum Aragonum*. The HTR's *constituimus et creamus* is the correct doublet for a new notarial creation. My reading *confirmamus* would imply ratification of an existing appointment. The HTR's *per totum Regnum Aragonum* is clearly correct against my garbled *per totam Regnorum nostrorum Regon*.

f. 5v, line 5: *universis* vs. *omnibus*; *dicti* vs. *dictorum*. The HTR's *in universis et singulis locis dicti regni* is the standard formula and grammatically correct (genitive singular *dicti* matching singular *regni*). My *omnibus* and *dictorum* were errors.

f. 5v, line 6: *contractuum* vs. *contractum*. The HTR's genitive plural *contractuum* is grammatically required here.

f. 5v, line 8: *protocolla sive capi-* [continuing f. 6r] *-tula*. The HTR correctly reads *protocolla sive capitula facias notulari*, the standard clause requiring the notary to keep protocols. My *provella* was a misreading.

f. 6r, line 1: *capitula facias notulari*. Continues from above. The HTR is correct; my *brevia fanas notulasque* was wrong.

f. 6r, line 2: *attestationibus sententiis*. The HTR's reading of standard document types is clearly preferable to my *testationibus censerimus*.

f. 6r, line 4: *impendimus pariter et decretum*. The HTR's *pariter* is correct against my *pura*. The verb may be *impartimur* or *impendimus* — both occur in these formulae; the HTR's reading is plausible.

f. 6r, line 6: *Dum tamen*. Correct against my *Iniungimus tamen*. This is the standard proviso clause: "Provided, however, that..."

f. 6r, line 7: *interfuisse confitearis*. The standard notarial validation formula — "you declare yourself to have been present at the said contracts." My reading was garbled here.

f. 6r, lines 7–9: Officials list. The HTR's list of Aragonese officials is substantially better than mine: *superjunctariis* (sobrejunteros), *zalmedinis* (çalmedines), *alguaziriis* (alguaciles) are all standard Aragonese office-holders. My readings were badly garbled in this section.

f. 6r, line 11: *instrumentis*. Correct against my *impetris*.

f. 6r, lines 14–15: Authentication. *Dominus rex mandavit* is the standard warrant formula. The scribe is identified as *Johannes Martiniz* (Joan Martínez). My reading of the authentication block was largely wrong.

(B) Where the initial reading is preferred or the HTR errs

f. 5v, line 1: The appointee's name. The HTR reads *Samuelem dictra*, which is clearly wrong. Per your correction, this is *Raimundum Diebra*. My reading of *Raimundum* was correct for the personal name, though I could not resolve the surname.

f. 5v, line 1: *rex Aragonum et cetera* vs. *rex et cetera*. Looking at the manuscript again, there does appear to be an abbreviation after *rex* that could expand to *Aragonum*. The HTR's *rex Aragonum tc'* may be right, but standard practice in these registers is often simply *rex et cetera*. I'd tentatively accept the HTR here but flag it as minor.

f. 6r, line 6: *signo appositis in eisdem*. The HTR reads *appositis*, which is grammatically correct (ablative absolute with *subscriptione...et signo*). My *apposicione* was wrong.

(C) Passages where both readings remain uncertain

f. 5v, line 6: The list of instrument types after *testamenta*. The HTR reads *ultima arrestaciones sumas*, and I had *acta instrumenta fines*. Neither is fully convincing. The standard formula typically includes items like *codicillos, inventaria, instrumenta*, etc. The HTR's *ultima* modifying *testamenta* ("last testaments") is plausible. But *arrestaciones* is unusual in this context — perhaps *actus rationes* or similar? I'd read *testamenta ultima* as likely correct, but the next word(s) remain uncertain. The HTR's *sumas* could be *summas* (financial accounts?). This line needs further review against the manuscript.

f. 6r, line 2: *inscriptis* or *instrumentis*? The HTR reads *inscriptis*, but the standard formula would favor *instrumentis*. Looking at the manuscript, the word could be either. I'd tentatively prefer *instrumentis* on formulaic grounds but flag this.

f. 6r, lines 7–8: The beginning of the officials list. The HTR reads *vicarijs subve/gatoribus*, which would yield *subvegatoribus* — not a real word. This may be *vicariis subvicariis* (a standard Catalan pair) or possibly the manuscript has *Gubernatoribus* as I initially read. Since the grant is specifically for the *Regnum Aragonum*, the expected officials would be Aragonese (gubernator, justicia, sobrejunteros, etc.) rather than Catalan (*vicarii, subvicarii*). The HTR's reading here is likely garbled; I suspect *Gubernatoribus* or possibly *vicariis subvicariis* followed by *nostris generalibus*. This passage needs careful re-examination.

(D) Reconciled Transcription

[f. 5v]

Nos Johanes dei gracia rex Aragonum et cetera. Attendentes te fidelem nostrum Raimundum Diebra loci de Ixar esse ydoneum et sufficientem ad tabellionatus officium exercendum prestito per te in cancellaria nostra juramento quod bene et legaliter te habebis in exercendo officio memorato · Ideo constituimus et creamus te dictum Raimundum in notarium publicum per totum Regnum Aragonum · Ita quod in universis et singulis locis dicti regni possis recipere et conficere testamenta ultima [?] arrestaciones [?] sumas [?] et quelibet alia jura quorumcumque contractuum fuerint et quaslibet alias scripturas autenticas et publicas et ea scribere et scribi facere per substitutum aut substitutos a te juratos tamen de quibus siquidem protocolla sive capi-

[f. 6r]

-tula facias notulari ut eterne memorie commendentur · Nos enim ipsis testamentis actis
attestationibus sententiis instrumentis [?] et aliis scriptis tuis publicis et autenticis per te
bene et legaliter recipiendis conficiendis et scribendis ac scribi faciendis per juratos et
substitutos a te auctoritatem nostram impendimus pariter et decretum · Ita quod eisdem in
judicio et extra iudicium fides plenaria habeatur et omnimodam obtineat roboris firmitatem
tanquam publica manu factis · Dum tamen subscriptione tua et signo apposis in eisdem
qua te auctoritate nostra notarium et ipsis contractibus interfuisse confitearis · Mandantes
per presentem cartam nostram [?] Gubernatoribus [?] / vicariis [?] subvicariis [?] nostris
generalibus cunctis quoque vicegerentibus [?] nec non locatenentibus baiulis iusticiis
curiis superjunctariis zalmedinis alguaziriis Consiliariis juratis et universis aliis officialibus
et subditis nostris presentibus et futuris vel eorum locatenentibus · quod te pro notario
publico habeant et teneant per totum Regnum Aragonum et instrumentis ac scriptis tuis
publicis adhibeant plenam fidem · In cuius rei testimonium presentem cartam nostram
fieri et sigillo nostro appendicio jussimus communiri · Data Barchinone vicesima prima die
Marcii anno a nativitate domini Millesimo ccc^o lxxxvii^o · Regni nostri primo · + Dominus rex
mandavit

Johannes Martiniz

Summary of key unresolved issues:

The instrument types in f. 5v line 6 (*ultima arrestaciones sumas?*) remain the most problematic passage. The beginning of the officials list (f. 6r lines 7–8) is also uncertain — specifically whether this reads *Gubernatoribus* or *vicariis subvicariis*. And the word I've tentatively reconciled as *instrumentis* on f. 6r line 2 could be *inscriptis* per the HTR.

The date (21 March 1387) and core content are secure. Ready to proceed to Stage 3 whenever you are, or I can re-examine any of the flagged passages if you want to take another look at specific sections of the manuscript.

for f.5v, end of line 5 into line 6, I read "et conficere testamentam acta atestaciones

6:02 AM

Validated textual correction and confirmed document typology pattern

Validated textual correction and confirmed document typology pattern

That's a much better reading and it makes immediate sense as a standard enumeration of notarial document types: *testamenta, acta, atestaciones* — testaments, legal acts, and

attestations. My initial *acta* was right for that second word, and the HTR's *attestationibus* later in the document (f. 6r line 2) already showed the scribe using that term, which supports *atestationes* here.

That also likely resolves the next word — the HTR's *sumas* is probably *summas* or possibly *finas* (i.e., *fines*, quittances/releases). Looking again at the manuscript with your correction anchoring the sequence, the clause would read something like:

...possis recipere et conficere testamenta acta atestationes fines [?] et quelibet alia jura quorumcumque contractuum fuerint...

Does that track with what you see for the rest of that line, or do you have a reading for the word(s) between *atestationes* and *et quelibet*?

I hit the return key by accident. I meant to give you more feedback. For f.5v, end of line 5 into line 6, I read "et conficere testamentam acta atestaciones" and then the next work has a few possibilities such as, "sumas," "sinams," "sumias," "simnas," and I know that some of those are not Latin words. I am leaning toward reading the first two letters as "s" and "m" but the abbreviation macron often replaces an "m" and less commonly replaces a "u." For f.6r, I prefer your transcription of *instrumentis*. Starting from the end of line 7, here is my reading, "certam nostram Guber-natori nostro generali, cuiusque vicesgerentibus necnon vicariis baiulis justiciis Curiis super-..." Line 9 reads, "-unitariis Calmedinis Mermis. Consiliariis..." With these corrections in mind, please now proceed to Stage 3.

6:13 AM

Prepared markdown file delivery per project specifications

Prepared markdown file delivery per project specifications

Given that the project convention is markdown deliverables, let me produce the Stage 3 file now.

Acknowledged corrections and prepared to advance transcription work

Acknowledged corrections and prepared to advance transcription work

Here's your Stage 3 deliverable. A straightforward notarial creation — formulaic but useful for mapping Joan I's early patronage activity in the first months of the reign. Híjar is a notable location given the importance of the lordship there.

Three items flagged as unresolved: the document type *sumas* [?] in the enumeration, the pronoun before *vicesgerentibus*, and *mermis* [?] which I've tentatively glossed as *merinos*. That last one fits the administrative context well — it belongs in exactly this position in the

Aragonese officials list — but the paleography isn't fully secure. Let me know if you want to revisit any of these against the manuscript.

Aca joan i creatio notarii raimundus diebra 1387 03 21

Document · MD

Want to be notified when Claude responds?

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