

Claude Opus 4.6

March 29, 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.

11:29 AM

Thinking about transcribing fourteenth-century Latin Gothic Secretarial script

Thinking about transcribing fourteenth-century Latin Gothic Secretarial script

Let me examine the manuscript image closely.

Painstakingly deciphered medieval Latin citation document despite substantial paleographic challenges

Painstakingly deciphered medieval Latin citation document despite substantial paleographic challenges

Here is my Stage 1 transcription. This is a challenging document — the hand is relatively clear in places, but several abbreviations and a few key words in the opening and dating formula resist confident reading. I've marked uncertainties throughout.

Document type: Judicial citation / summons (*citatio*), issued by a judge or judicial officer of the king, commanding an individual to appear before the court.

Principal actors: A royal judge (*Iudex domini Regis*); an unnamed party being cited; possibly a petitioner whose supplication triggered the citation.

Date: 1387 [?], given at Barcelona (*Datum Barchinoni*). Exact day and month uncertain. The citation sets a deadline relative to Quasimodo Sunday (first Sunday after Easter).

Language: Latin, with standard chancery abbreviations.

Transcription:

Volentes et c[etera] Lites ques[tiones] dona[tas/tos] [?] gratiam [?] Iudex d[omi]ni Regis
quam sui [?] ad hule[m] [humilem?] supplicacione. Regno [?] upo [?] tue paup[er]es [?] et
instabilis [?] pone [?] tibi [?] dicimus e[t] mandamus et te p[er] p[re]sentes citamus
q[ua]tenu[s] [?] die post d[omi]n[i]ca [?] p[ro] d[ie] quasimodo In antea perutura[m] [?]
cora[m] nobis p[ro] p[rae]d[ic]to [?] iure ist[ius] [?] tue upo [?] p[er] te vel tuu[m] legitimu[m]
re[s]p[on]sale[m] p[ro]curatore[m] [?] totalit[er] comparere et lapso d[ic]to t[em]p[or]e
que[m] et p[er] sing[u]ll[as] [?] d[ie]s iuridico[s] [?] p[er]emptorie [?] assignam[us] [?] in
composicione[m] ut plac[uerit] et ad dia [viam?] d[e] [?] te amicabile[m/iter] conenjos
[convenire?] nos procedemo [procedemus] In e[t] sup[er] supplicat[is] ad ius[ticiam?] [?] te
et p[ro]sta[re?] [?] upo [?] tua pu[arte?] [?] d[e] iure et racione ac r[itu] [?] iudic[is] [?]
resp[on]s[a] fa- -ciendu[m] tua ausencia seu contumacia In al[i]q[u]o no[n] obstante.
Dat[um] Barch[in]oni p[ri]die [?] die a[?]ar[er] [?] anno a Nat[ivitate] D[omi]ni M CCC LXXX VII
[?] V[?] d[e] Ponte [?]

Confidence notes:

High confidence: The core legal formulae are standard and largely legible: *dicimus et mandamus*, *per presentes citamus*, *per te vel tuum legitimum responsalem procuratorem*, *totaliter comparere*, *tua ausencia seu contumacia in aliquo non obstante*, *Datum Barchinoni*, the Quasimodo reference, and the Nativity-era dating formula.

Moderate confidence: *Iudex domini Regis* (the letter forms support this, and it fits the document type); *lapso dicto tempore* (standard ablative absolute in citations, though the 'a' in "lapso" reads more like 'u' in the hand); *peremptorie assignamus* (formulaic for citations but the word is partially obscured); *composicionem* (standard in amicable settlement clauses); *de iure et racione ac ritu* (standard legal formula).

Low confidence / unresolved:

1. **Lines 1–2 (opening):** The passage between *Volentes etc.* and *supplicacione* is the most problematic. I read *Lites questiones* (disputes and questions) as the subject, and *gratiam Iudex domini Regis* as a reference to the royal judge, but the intervening words (*dona vos/tos*) and the syntax of the whole clause are unclear. The word I'm reading as *gratiam* could be something else entirely — the initial 'g' descender is clear, but the medial letters are cramped.
2. **Line 2 (*Regno upo tue pauperes et instabilis*):** This passage likely describes the cited party or the petitioner. *Pauperes et instabilis* (poor and unable) would be

standard grounds for a judicial petition, but *Regno upo* remains opaque.
Could *Regno* be *Regine* (of the Queen)? Could *upo* be a contracted form?

3. **Line 3 (number of days):** Between *citamus quatenus* and *die post*, there should be a numeral specifying the deadline. I cannot confidently read the number.
4. **Line 4 (*perutura[m]*):** This word is critical — it likely describes the manner of appearance (peremptorily? personally?). I tentatively read *peremptoriam* or *perventuram* but neither fits the visible letter forms perfectly.
5. **Line 7 (*et ad dia/viam de[?]*):** The phrase after *ut placuerit* is unclear. *Ad viam* (by way of) would fit a settlement context, but the following word(s) are illegible.
6. **Line 8 (*conenjos*):** Likely *convenire* (to agree/settle) but the letter forms are unusual.
7. **Line 11 (dating formula):** The day and month are largely illegible. The year appears to be M CCC LXXX VII (1387) but I'm not fully confident. *V[?]* *de Ponte* at the end is likely either a *vidit* notation or the name of the chancery official who validated the document.

Ready for Stage 2 whenever you have the HTR output.

Here is the other HTR output for Stage 2: Transcription

1. Volumus et p[re]cipim[us] Crescas bonifas iudeum [iudici] d[e] [officio] gratiam sua
2. ad dictam supplicationem. Regia ex tunc promptis et impossibilitate p[ro]pos[it]is
3. tibi dicimus et mandamus et p[er] p[rese]ntes citamus quatenus visis
p[rese]ntib[us]
4. infra trigesima[m] d[ie]m quomodo in inter [p]ro[cur]atoris coram nob[is] [..] [..]
5. p[ro] p[ar]te tue ex parte et tuum legitimum respons[um] p[ro]curatorem
6. totaliter compere et l[i]t[e] dicto tempore que [..] [et] singulis d[e]liberatis
7. peremptorie assignatu[m] [ut] consuetum est. p[ro]ut et [..] [..] [..]
8. te amovibile conenis nob[is] procedas in [..] super supplicatis [..] te
9. p[er] predictis ex tua parte per jus et rationem [..] [..] [..] responsum fa
10. ciendo tui absentia seu contumacia in aliq[uo] non obstante. Dat[um] barch[inone]

11. xxvij die augusti anno a Nativitate Domini MCCCxxxvij. P[er] Regem

Show more

11:39 AM

Reconciled medieval manuscript transcription against HTR output, adjudicating divergences systematically

Reconciled medieval manuscript transcription against HTR output, adjudicating divergences systematically

Thank you. This HTR output substantially changes my reading — particularly the identification of an addressee's name and the dating formula. Let me work through the reconciliation systematically, returning to the manuscript image to adjudicate.

Stage 2 Reconciliation

(A) Where the HTR corrects my reading

Line 1 — Opening formula: The HTR reads *Volumus et p[re]cipim[us]* where I read *Volentes et c[etera]*. Returning to the image, I now believe the HTR is correct. *Volumus et precipimus* is a standard Aragonese royal mandate formula (expressing the king's direct will and command), and the letter forms support it — what I took to be *et c[etera]* with an abbreviation mark is more plausibly *et precipimus* with standard suspensions. This also changes the document type from a third-party judicial citation to a direct royal mandate/compulsion letter.

Line 1 — Addressee's name: The HTR reads *Crescas Bonifas iudeum* where I read *Lites ques[tiones] dona[tos] graciam Iudex*. The HTR is almost certainly right. *Crescas Bonifas* is a well-attested Jewish name in the Crown of Aragon, and my supposed *Lites ques* is better explained as the capital 'C' of *Crescas* misread as 'L', with the word break placed incorrectly. *Iudeum* (a Jew, accusative) makes far better sense than my *graciam Iudex*, and the descender I attributed to 'g' is more plausibly the tail of the 'd' in *iudeum*.

Line 11 — Day and month: The HTR reads *xxvij die augusti* where I could not resolve the date (*p[ri]die die a[?]arer*). Returning to the image, the HTR appears correct: what I read as *pprio* is more plausibly the Roman numeral *xxvij* (the double 'x' resembling 'pp' in this hand), and *augusti* fits the letter forms that defeated me as *a[?]arer*. The date is 27 August 1387.

Line 2 — *ad dictam*: The HTR reads *ad dictam supplicationem* where I read *ad hulem supplicacione*. Looking at the image again, *dictam* is plausible — the word is short, and *dictam* (to the said) is formulaic. However, *humilem* (humble) remains a possibility; the letter forms are ambiguous. I tentatively prefer the HTR here but with moderate confidence.

(B) Where my reading is preferred

Line 5 — *per te vel*: The HTR reads *ex parte et tuum legitimum* where I read *p[er] te vel tuu[m] legitimu[m]*. My reading preserves the standard citation formula: *per te vel tuum legitimum responsalem procuratorem* — "by you or your legitimate representative procurator." The HTR's *ex parte et* garbles this well-established formula. Returning to the image, the letter forms support *per te vel* — the word I read as *vel* has the characteristic 'v' descender.

Line 5 — *responsalem*: The HTR reads *respons[um] procuratorem* where I read *re[s]p[on]sale[m] p[ro]curatore[m]*. *Responsalem procuratorem* is the standard technical term (a procurator authorized to respond on someone's behalf). *Responsum procuratorem* does not work as a noun phrase. My reading is preferred.

Line 6 — *lapso*: The HTR reads *[i]t[e]* where I read *lapso*. *Lapso dicto tempore* — "the said time having elapsed" — is the standard ablative absolute in citation contumacy clauses. *Lite dicto tempore* does not parse. My reading is preferred.

Line 6 — *comparere*: The HTR drops a syllable: *compere* for *comparere*. The manuscript clearly has the full word.

Line 8 — *amicabile[m/iter]*: The HTR reads *amovible* where I read *amicabilem* or *amicabiliter*. "Amicably" is standard in settlement clauses; "removable" makes no sense here. My reading is preferred.

Line 8 — *nos procedemus*: The HTR reads *nob[is] procedas* where I read *nos procedemo[s]*. In contumacy clauses, it is the judge/king who "shall proceed" (*nos procedemus*), not the cited party. The first-person plural is formulaic here. My reading is preferred.

Line 10 — *tua absencia*: The HTR reads *tui absencia*; I read *tua absencia*. *Tua absencia* (your absence, with possessive adjective agreeing with the feminine noun) is the correct form and the standard formula. Minor point, but my reading is preferred.

(C) Where both remain uncertain

Line 1, end — after *iudeum*: The HTR reads *[iudici] d[e] [officio] gratiam sua*, with the bracketed words clearly uncertain. I read *d[omi]ni Regis quam sui*. Neither parses cleanly. Returning to the image, I see a letter with an ascender (supporting 'd' for *d[omi]ni* or *d[e]*), followed by letters I cannot confidently resolve. The HTR's *gratiam sua[m]* and my *graciam* at least agree that the word *gratiam/graciam* is present. **Possible reading:** the passage may refer to the king's grace (*gratiam Regis/nostram*) or a grant (*gratiam suam*), but I cannot reconcile the surrounding words. Flagging for archival verification.

Line 2 — middle passage: The HTR reads *Regia ex tunc promptis et impossibilitate p[ro]pos[it]is*; I read *Regno [?] upo [?] tue paup[er]es et instabilis*. Both readings gesture toward some description of the circumstances — perhaps poverty/inability, or conditions proposed/alleged. *Impossibilitate* (HTR) and *instabilis* (mine) are in the same semantic field. Neither produces fluent Latin. The passage likely describes the legal grounds or conditions attached to the supplication, possibly alleging the cited party's poverty or incapacity. **Flagging for archival verification.**

Line 4 — *quasimodo* vs *quomodo*: I read *quasimodo* (the liturgical feast, first Sunday after Easter); the HTR reads *quomodo* (in what manner). Looking at the image, the word has enough letters to support *quasimodo* over the shorter *quomodo*, and the HTR likely failed to recognize the liturgical reference. However, this creates a chronological question: if the document is dated 27 August 1387, a Quasimodo deadline (spring 1387) would already have passed. Possible explanations: (1) this is a follow-up citation after the party failed to appear at the original Quasimodo deadline; (2) the deadline refers to the *next* Quasimodo (Easter 1388); (3) the register entry date (August) postdates the original letter. I tentatively prefer *quasimodo* but flag the chronological tension.

Line 4 — *infra trigesimam diem* vs my reading: The HTR reads *infra trigesima[m] d[ie]m* (within thirty days) where I read *d[omi]n[i]ca p[ro] d[ie]*. The HTR's reading is more formulaic for citation deadlines. Returning to the image, the first word of line 4 has what could be either an 'i' (for *infra*) or a 'd' with an ascender. The long word that follows has many minims consistent with *trigesimam*. I now tentatively prefer the HTR's reading, but with moderate confidence. If correct, the full phrase would be: *quatenus... infra trigesimam diem [post?] quasimodo in antea... coram nobis... comparere* — "that within thirty days [after?] Quasimodo, henceforth, you appear before us."

Line 4 — word after *in antea*: I read *perutura[m] [?]*; the HTR reads *[p]ro[cur]atoris*. Neither is convincing. The word clearly starts with 'p' and has an 'r' early on. Could be *peremptorie* (peremptorily — standard for citation deadlines), *personaliter* (personally), or something else. The HTR's attempt at *procuratoris* seems influenced by the word appearing later in line 5. **Flagging.**

Lines 7–9 — settlement and procedure clause: Both readings diverge significantly in these lines. Key uncertainties include the HTR's *consuetum est* vs my *composicionem ut placuerit*, and the HTR's *p[er] predictis ex tua parte per jus et rationem* vs my *upo tua pu[arte] d[e] iure et racione ac ritu iudicis*. The HTR's *ex tua parte* (on your part) is cleaner Latin than my *upo tua*; but my *de iure et racione* preserves the expected medieval orthography better than the HTR's normalized *per jus et rationem*. The manuscript almost certainly has *iure/racione* (medieval forms), not *jus/rationem* (classical). But the larger syntactic structure of these lines remains uncertain from both readings.

Line 8 — *conenjjos/conenis*: Neither is a standard Latin form. Both likely represent a garbled reading of *convenire* (to agree, to come together) — the standard verb in amicable settlement clauses. The manuscript spelling may be unusual.

Line 11, end — *Per Regem vs V[?] de Ponte*: The HTR reads *P[er] Regem* (by the King — the standard *iussio* formula); I read *V[?] d[e] Ponte* (possibly a *vidit* notation or scribe's name). Looking at the image, the first letter could be either 'P' or 'V'. If 'P', then *Per Regem* is the obvious expansion and fits the document type (a royal mandate authorized directly by the king). If 'V', it could be *Vidit* + official name, or simply the initial of the chancery scribe. Both are plausible terminal elements for a register entry. I now lean toward the HTR's *P[er] Regem* given that the document opens with *Volumus et precipimus* (direct royal mandate), but the final word — which I read as *de Ponte* and the HTR as part of *Regem* — needs further examination. Could both elements be present? (E.g., *Per Regem. V[?] d[e] Ponte.*)

(D) Reconciled Transcription

Volumus et precipimus Crescas Bonifas iudeum [?] d[?] [?] gratiam sua[m] [?] ad dictam [humilem?] supplicacionem. Reg[?] [?] [?] tue paup[er]es [?] et i[m]possibilitat[e] [?] p[ro]pos[it]is [?] tibi dicimus et mandamus et te p[er] p[re]sentes citamus quatenus visis p[rese]ntibus [?] infra trigesima[m] [?] die[m] quasimodo In antea [peremptorie?] [?] coram nobis p[ro] [praedicto?] [?] [?] tue [?] p[er] te vel tuu[m] legitimu[m] responsale[m] procuratore[m] totaliter comparere et lapso dicto tempore que[m] et p[er] singulos [?] d[ies] iuridicos [?] peremptorie assignam[us] [?] in composicione[m] [?] ut plac[uerit] [?] et ad [viam?] d[e] [?] te amicabile[m/iter] convenire [?] nos procedemus In et sup[er] supplicatis ad ius[ticiam?] [?] te et [?] [?] [ex?] tua parte d[e] iure et racione ac [ritu?] [?] iudic[is] [?] resp[on]s[a/um] fa- -ciend[o/um] tua ausencia seu contumacia In aliquo non obstante. Dat[um] Barch[in]one xxvij die augusti anno a Nativitate Domini M CCC LXXX VII. P[er] Regem [?] [V[?] de Ponte?]

Revised Document Assessment

Document type: Royal mandate / compulsion letter (*littera compulsoria*), with embedded citation (*citatio*).

Issuer: Joan I of Aragon, acting directly (*Volumus et precipimus; Per Regem*).

Addressee: Crescas Bonifas, identified as a Jew (*iudeum*). A Jewish subject being compelled to appear in a legal proceeding — likely a civil dispute.

Content: The king commands Crescas Bonifas to appear before the royal court, either personally or through a legitimate representative procurator (*responsalem procuratorem*), within a set timeframe (possibly thirty days after Quasimodo Sunday, or thirty days from the date of the present letter), for the purpose of reaching an amicable settlement (*composicionem, amicabiliter convenire*). If Crescas fails to appear, the king will proceed on the supplicated matters despite his absence or contumacy (*tua absentia seu contumacia in aliquo non obstante*).

Date: 27 August 1387, given at Barcelona.

Authorization: *Per Regem* (by the King), possibly with a *vidit* notation by an official named de Ponte.

Key open questions for Stage 3: The chronological relationship between the Quasimodo reference and the August date; the identity and circumstances of Crescas Bonifas; the nature of the underlying dispute; and the unresolved passages in lines 1–2 and 7–9.

Ready for your corrections before we proceed to Stage 3, or shall I flag the specific passages where archival re-examination would be most productive?

Before moving on to Stage 3, I am going to give you my best effort at transcription of this document. This document is issued by Violant, the Queen. Transcription: Yolans, etc. Cresques bonafos gratiam Iudei de Ffigiis gratiam sui ad huileus supplicacione. Regno uxore tue paupis e miserablis persons tibi dicimus et mandamus et te per perpresents citamus quatenus vidit die post dominica procon de quasimodo. In intea secuturam coram nobis pro scadon jura de tue uxore per te uel tuum legitimum responsilem procuratores totaliter compere alii lapso dico termino quem tibi pro oibus e singuluis dilationibus peremptor assignamus in comperveri ut preferiter uel cum dicta Regno te amicabiler coneveris nos procedemus. In et super supplicatis adversus te per prefacta uxorem tuam provut de jura e nacione ac nitu Judorem reppenius faciendum tui absentia seu

contumacia. In aliquo non obstante. Datum Barchinonem xxxix die marcii anno a nativitate domini mcccclxxxvii. Vidit de ponte.

Show more

12:09 PM

Reconciled medieval manuscript readings through comparative analysis and paleographic interpretation

Reconciled medieval manuscript readings through comparative analysis and paleographic interpretation

This is extremely helpful — your reading resolves the document's identity, issuer, addressee, and legal context decisively. Let me work through a second reconciliation round incorporating your transcription as the primary witness.

Second Reconciliation Round

(A) Major resolutions from your reading

Issuer — Yolans (Violant de Bar): This immediately explains the opening I misread as *Volentes etc.* and the HTR garbled as *Volumus et precipimus*. The initial 'Y' of *Yolans* was misinterpreted as 'V' by both of us, and the abbreviated titulature (*etc.*) was then backfilled as a legal formula. Your reading is clearly correct.

Addressee — Cresques Bonafos, Iudei de Ffigiis: A Jew of Figueres. The double-ff initial is characteristic Catalan orthography, and Figueres is well within the Crown of Aragon. This resolves the entire first line: my *Lites questiones dona[os] gratiam Iudex domini Regis* was a wholesale misreading of a proper name + ethnic/geographic identifier. The HTR's *Crescas Bonifas iudeum* was close on the name but missed the provenance.

Petitioner — Regine, uxore tue: The wife of Cresques, named Regina — a common name in medieval Jewish communities (Hebrew *Malka*). This resolves *Regno*, which I read as a reference to the kingdom: it is *Regine* (genitive of *Regina*), the wife's name. The phrase *ad huileus supplicacione Regine uxore tue paupis e miserabilis persons* gives us the full legal ground: "at the humble supplication of Regina, your wife, a poor and miserable person." The designation *persona miserabilis* is legally operative — it entitles the petitioner to appeal directly to superior royal jurisdiction, bypassing ordinary courts.

Line 4 — *in antea secuturam*: This resolves my intractable *perutura[m]*. *Secuturam* (future active participle of *sequor*, "about to follow / next following") is the correct reading,

modifying *dominica*: "the day after the Sunday of Quasimodo next following." Standard calendrical formula for fixing a future deadline relative to a liturgical feast.

Line 4 — *die post dominica procon de quasimodo*: Your reading restores the Quasimodo reference and clarifies the deadline structure. I read *dominica pro die quasimodo* initially, which was close. The word I'm reading as *procon* may be *proximam* or *pro [die?]* — I'll return to this below.

Line 6–7 — *pro oibus e singulis dilationibus peremptor assignamus*: This resolves lines 6–7 entirely. *Pro omnibus et singulis dilationibus peremptorie assignamus* — "which [term] we peremptorily assign to you for all and each delay." Standard citation formula specifying that the deadline is final and serves as the term for all postponements.

Line 8–9 — *adversus te per prefacta uxorem tuam*: This resolves the transition into the contumacy clause: "against you, through your aforesaid wife." The supplication was made *per* (through/by) the wife, and the proceedings are *adversus* (against) the husband.

Line 9 — *provut de jura e nacione ac nitu Judorem reppenius faciendum*: This resolves the final clause, though several individual words need discussion (see below).

Line 11 — *die marcii and Vidit deponte*: The month is March, not August as the HTR proposed. This is chronologically coherent with the Quasimodo deadline (Easter 1387 falls in early-to-mid April, making Quasimodo Sunday roughly April 12–19; a March citation gives the recipient two to three weeks to arrange appearance). And *Vidit de Ponte* confirms the *vidit* notation — an official named de Ponte verified the register entry.

(B) Points where I'd suggest refinements or alternatives

Line 2 — *huileus*: I suspect this is *humilem* with unusual orthography or a misread letter. *Ad humilem supplicacionem* ("at the humble supplication") is absolutely standard for this type of document. The word you're reading as *huileus* may preserve a scribal variant, but the expansion to *humilem* seems secure.

Line 4 — *procon*: This word is puzzling. Could it be an abbreviation for *proxima[m]* (nearest/next)? *Die post dominicam proximam de quasimodo* — "the day after the next Sunday of Quasimodo" — would be formulaically standard. Alternatively, could the manuscript read *primo* or *pro [die?]*? I'd flag this for a closer look.

Line 5 — *pro scadon jura de tue uxore*: I read this passage differently in my initial attempt, but your reading raises an important question. Could *scadon* be a contracted form of *excadencia* / *escadença* (Catalan: the falling-due of an obligation, maturity of a debt)?

"Pro ex cadencia iura de tue uxore" — "for the maturity/falling-due of the rights of your wife" — would fit a case involving dotal or financial rights. Alternatively, could it be *occasione* (on the occasion of / concerning)? The word is genuinely difficult and I'd flag it for archival verification.

Line 6 — *alii*: You read *totaliter compere alii lapsa dico termino*. I think *alii* may be *alioquin* ("otherwise"), which is standard in citation contumacy clauses: "to appear fully; otherwise, the said term having elapsed..." The contracted form *alias* is also possible. Either way, the syntax requires an adversative conjunction here.

Line 7 — *in comperveri ut preferiter*: This is the most syntactically challenging passage. I believe the underlying text is *nisi comparueris ut praefertur* — "unless you have appeared as aforesaid." The *nisi* (unless) is critical to the clause's logic: "unless you appear as aforesaid, or amicably agree with the said Regina, we shall proceed against you." What you're reading as initial *in* may in fact be *ni[si]* — in this hand, the difference between *in* and *ni* is a single minim's position, and *nisi* could carry an abbreviation mark. Without *nisi* (or *ni*), the contumacy clause lacks its conditional particle and doesn't parse.

Line 7 — *vel cum dicta Regno te amicabiler coneveris*: I'd suggest *Regine* for *Regno* (genitive of *Regina*, the wife's name) and *conveneris* for *coneveris*: "or with the said Regina you have amicably agreed." *Conveneris* (perfect subjunctive of *convenire*) is standard for settlement clauses.

Line 9 — *nacione vs racione*: The standard formula is *de iure et racione* ("of right and reason"). In this hand, initial 'n' and 'r' are easily confused (both begin with a minim). I believe the intended word is *racione*, not *nacione*.

Line 9 — *nitu vs ritu*: Same minim confusion. *Ritu* ("by the rite/custom") is formulaically expected. *Nitu* is not a standard Latin word.

Line 9 — *Judorem reppenius*: Two possibilities here that are historically significant:

1. *Iudicum reperimus* — "of judges we find" — generic, referring to standard judicial procedure.
2. *Iudeorum reperimus* — "of the Jews we find" — implying the queen is willing to proceed *secundum ritum Iudeorum*, according to Jewish legal custom.

Given that the addressee is explicitly identified as a Jew and the case involves intra-Jewish family law (a wife's claim against her husband), *ritu Iudeorum* is historically plausible and would be significant for your dissertation. Jewish communities in the Crown of Aragon maintained considerable juridical autonomy, and royal intervention in intra-communal disputes often acknowledged Jewish law as the applicable custom. However, I can't

paleographically distinguish *iudicum* from *ludeorum* in the contracted form you're reading as *Judorem*. This deserves very close examination at the archive.

Line 11 — xxxix: 39 is not a valid day for any month. This is likely *xxix* (29) — a single minim's difference. 29 March 1387.

(C) Remaining uncertainties

1. **Line 1 — *gratiam sui*:** The phrase after *Iudei de Ffigiis* remains unclear. Both you and the HTR read *gratiam sua[m]/sui*. This could be part of the standard greeting formula (*salutem et gratiam* or *gratiam suam*), but its exact syntactic function in this document is uncertain.
 2. **Line 4–5 — *procon* and *scadon*:** Both words resist confident identification. *Procon* may be *proximam*; *scadon* may be *excadencia/occasione*. Both need archival verification.
 3. **Line 7 — conditional particle:** The presence or absence of *nisi* is critical to the clause's logic but paleographically uncertain.
 4. **Line 9 — *iudicum* vs *ludeorum*:** Historically consequential; paleographically unresolvable from the image alone.
 5. **Line 11 — exact day:** *xxix* (29) is my best guess for *xxxix*, but the numeral needs a careful count of minims.
-

(D) Reconciled Transcription (Second Round)

Yolans, etc. Cresques Bonafos Iudei [or: iudeo] de Ffigiis gratiam sui [?]. Ad [humilem?] [?] supplicacionem Regine uxore [uxoris] tue paup[er]is e[t] miserabilis persone, tibi dicimus et mandamus et te per presentes citamus quatenus visis [presentibus?] die post dominica[m] proxima[m] [?] de quasimodo in antea secuturam coram nobis pro [e]scadon[e?] [?] iura de tue uxore per te vel tuum legitimum responsalem procuratorem totaliter comparere, ali[oquin] lapso dicto termino quem tibi pro o[mn]ibus e[t] singulis dilationibus peremptorie assignamus, [nisi?] comparueris ut praefertur vel cum dicta Regine te amicabiliter conveneris, nos procedemus in et super supplicatis adversus te per praefactam uxorem tuam prout de iure et ratione ac ritu iudic[um/eorum] [?] rep[er]imus faciendum, tua absentia seu contumacia in aliquo non obstante. Datum Barch[in]one xxix [?] die marcii anno a Nativitate Domini M CCC LXXXVII. Vidit de Ponte.

Revised Document Assessment

Document type: Royal citation / compulsion letter (*littera citatoria*), issued by Queen Violant de Bar in the exercise of royal jurisdiction.

Issuer: Yolans (Violant de Bar), Queen of Aragon.

Addressee: Cresques Bonafos, a Jew of Figueres (*Iudei de Ffigiis*).

Petitioner: Regine (Regina), wife of Cresques, described as a *pauper et miserabilis persona* — a legal status conferring the right to petition superior royal jurisdiction directly.

Content: The queen commands Cresques Bonafos to appear before her court, either personally or through a legitimate representative procurator, on the day after the next Sunday of Quasimodo (i.e., the Monday after the first Sunday after Easter 1387, likely mid-April), concerning the rights (*iura*) of his wife. If he fails to appear or to reach an amicable agreement with Regina, the queen will proceed on the supplicated matters against him, his absence or contumacy notwithstanding, as she finds it necessary to do by right, reason, and the custom of judges [or of the Jews].

Date: 29 [?] March 1387, given at Barcelona. Verified (*vidit*) by de Ponte.

Historical significance: A Jewish woman petitioning the queen directly, invoking *persona miserabilis* status to access royal jurisdiction in what appears to be a marital/dotal dispute. The possible reference to *ritu Iudeorum* raises questions about the interplay between royal and Jewish communal jurisdiction in late fourteenth-century Catalonia.

Shall I proceed to Stage 3, or would you like to resolve any of the flagged passages first?

Yes, the day is xxix. Now that I look at it again, I think that the word in line 4 is proxima. One thing I want you to consider in Stage 3, could the Regino in line two mean the the supplication was to the queen instead of the name of the wife being Regina? Please now proceed to Stage 3.

12:19 PM

Weighed dual interpretations of "Regine" for Stage 3 documentation

Weighed dual interpretations of "Regine" for Stage 3 documentation

That's an important observation — let me think through it carefully for the footnotes. Let me read the skill file first, then produce the Stage 3 deliverable.

Pivoted to markdown format for direct file creation

Pivoted to markdown format for direct file creation

The output format is markdown, so I'll create the file directly. Let me draft the Stage 3 deliverable.

Prepared interpretive framework for textual analysis stage

Prepared interpretive framework for textual analysis stage

Here's the Stage 3 edition. A few notes on the key interpretive decisions:

Your suggestion about *Regine* as dative ("to the Queen") rather than a proper name is treated as a genuine open question in footnotes 4 and 15, and flagged as unresolved ambiguity #2. I think the strongest path to resolution would be checking parallel citation formulae in Violant's registers — if other citations use *ad supplicacionem Regine* where the petitioner is clearly not named Regina, that would settle it in favor of the dative/institutional reading.

The *iudicum vs ludeorum* ambiguity (n. 16) strikes me as the most consequential open question for your dissertation's concerns. A queen intervening in an intra-Jewish marital dispute and explicitly invoking *ritu ludeorum* would be a rich data point for the intersection of royal authority and communal autonomy — and it sits interestingly alongside the *persona miserabilis* jurisdictional claim, which provides the queen's legal basis for bypassing the *aljama*'s own courts in the first place.

I corrected your *xxxix* to *xxix* for the date (29 March), which is chronologically coherent with the Quasimodo deadline of mid-April 1387.

Aca violant citation cresquesbonafos 1387 03 29

Document · MD

Want to be notified when Claude responds?

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