

Claude Opus 4.6

April 18, 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.

12:01 PM

Wrestled with medieval Latin paleography and document structure analysis

Wrestled with medieval Latin paleography and document structure analysis

I'll work through this carefully. The hand is quite compressed in places and there's significant abbreviation, so this one has a fair number of genuinely uncertain readings.

Stage 1: Initial Transcription

Document identification:

- **Type:** Royal mandate of inquisition/investigation
- **Issuer:** Joan I of Aragon
- **Addressee:** Bailiff of a city (name abbreviated, uncertain) and possibly a named individual or locumtenens
- **Date:** Barcelona, 20 July 1387
- **Subject:** Forced capture and baptism of Jewish person(s); order to investigate under penalty of 500 florins
- **Iussio:** Francischus ça Costa (vice-chancellor)
- **Language:** Latin

Transcription:

Johannes etcetera ffideli nostro baiulo Civde [?] et eiu[s] Laurencij [?] saluç [?] et graciam nostram.

D[omi]n[u]s [?] Penna Galamo paleta [?] iudex d[i]c[t]e Cujustad [?] nob[is] lacrimabile[m]
querelam exposuit [?]

q[uo]d p[re]d[i]c[t]i filij d[i]c[t]i Capdell d'ey [?] puglendi [?] d'ey [?] palta et Juda filius

Bartholomeu [?] tener [?] Cujusd[am] [?] Jude[os] [?] violend[os] [?] corp[ore] p[re]cia a[n]te
rapuerunt [?]

quondam eiu[s] filiu[m] ciats [?] capte aue[m] [?] et jam illi[s] et illu[m] abscondun[t] [?]

q[ue] aliquos d[ie]s tondun[t] [?] et p[er]gia [?] q[ue] o[mn]i ut diat [?] baptizari fecerint

et nu[n]c tra [?] illu[m] donant [?] dom[us] q[ue] tanto t[em]p[or]e diaz [?] et mandamus sub

pena Quingento[rum] flor[enorum] a[ur]i n[ost]ro ciano [?] si contrafeceri[n]t ip[s]o f[a]c[t]o

applicando[rum] q[uo]d de p[re]d[i]c[t]os diligentissime inquiratis et si q[ue] d[i]c[t]ar[um]

p[ro]uisione[m] d[i]c[t]os delatos [?] reperieritis [?] p[re]d[i]c[t]os deliquisse de corp[ore]
p[er]so[n]is

appretare [?] d[i]c[t]os tres personas d[i]c[t]os p[ro]curacio[n]s [?] ac in p[ri]ore[m] [?]
sup[er] serare [?]

et jutelacionis [?] remeteros [?] aut eiu[s] copia[m] clausa[m] et sigillata[m] nobis

p[er] fide[m] transmittatis ut ea recepta Galuaz [?] nos [?] de justicia p[ro]uide

jud[ic] vos [?] p[ro]uidatis tunc q[ue] d[i]c[t]os jude[os] baptizari f[er]i teneat [?] p[er]

q[ue]os [?] bone fame et condicionis tale q[ue] oculatos [?] requeat [?] subis[s]i [?]

et f[u]tur[os] [?] absfordi [?] vale [?] in hiis d[i]c[t]os bondo [?] q[ue] sediligencia [?] salvatis
[?]

n[ost]ro comodo [?]. Dat[a] Barchi[none] xxo die me[n]s[is] julij anno a nat[ivitate]

d[omi]ni MoCCCoLxxxo vijo. :: ffrancischus [?] ça costa.

Registration note (below main text):

Alia similis duo [?] p[ro] registrata fuit sub dat[a]

Barce[lone] de d[i]c[t]o Julij a[nn]o p[re]d[i]c[t]o signata et mandat[a]

p[re]d[i]c[t]a fuit expedita

Right margin / notarial subscription:

Andreas Paulli [?] etc p[ro] se [?]

[additional notations, partially illegible]

Notes on uncertain readings and key difficulties:

1. **Line 1, "Civde":** The place name after "baiulo" is heavily abbreviated. It could be a specific city name or an abbreviation for "Civitatis/Civitate." I cannot confidently resolve it.
2. **Line 1, "Laurencij ... saluç":** Unclear whether "Laurencij" is a proper name (Laurentius/Llorenç) designating a specific individual addressed alongside the bailiff, or whether I am misreading a heavily abbreviated "locumtenenti." The word I'm reading as "saluç" could be a Catalan-influenced rendering of "salutem," but the initial letter could also be a 'G' (yielding a surname "Galuçi").
3. **Line 2, end:** The formula after "lacrimabilem" is very compressed. I'm reading "querelam exposuit" as the standard formulaic completion, but the letter forms are far from clear — what I see on the page looks more like "zeraupt" or similar. Both "querelam exposuit" and "querelam proposuit" are formulaically standard.
4. **Line 3, "d'ey puglendi d'ey palta":** These appear to be personal names or patronymics, possibly with Catalan "d'en" constructions rendered in a Latinized form. The readings of both names are very uncertain.
5. **Lines 4–7, the narrative core:** This passage is the most difficult in the document. The gist is clear — certain named individuals captured a Jewish person (possibly a child, given "filium"), hid them, shaved/altered their appearance ("tondunt"), and had them baptized ("baptizari fecerint"). But many individual word readings are uncertain, and I'm not confident of the grammatical parsing at several points.
6. **Line 8, "ciano":** The word following "nostro" in the penalty clause is unclear. I'd expect "erario" (treasury) or "fisco," but the letter forms don't obviously match either. Could "ciano" be an alternative form I'm not recognizing?
7. **Lines 13–16:** The dispositio section ordering specific procedural steps (investigation, remission of documents, provision regarding baptism by persons "bone fame et condicionis") is heavily abbreviated and I am uncertain of many readings here. The sense seems to be that the bailiff should investigate, send sealed copies of proceedings to the king, and ensure that any baptisms of Jews follow proper legal procedure with suitable sponsors.

8. **Date:** "xxo die mensis julii" — the numeral looks like "xxo" (20th), but could be "xxvo" (25th). I'm reading 20 July 1387.
9. **"ffrancischus ça costa":** The final 'h' in "ffrancischus" is uncertain — it could be "ffranciscus" or "ffrancisch." This is Francesc ça Costa, the vice-chancellor, whose iussio we've seen in other documents from this period.

Ready for HTR output whenever you have it for Stage 2.

Here is the other HTR output for Stage 2: Johannes rex Aragonu[m] dilecto n[ost]ro baiulo G[er]unde et ei[us] locumtene[n]ti Saler[n]e [et] gr[aci]am n[ost]ram.

- Ad nos p[er]venit p[er] ferna[n]du[m] Salerno p[ro]curatore[m] iudeo[rum] d[i]c[t]e civitatis n[ost]ra lacrimabili querela,
- q[uod] quida[m] filii d[i]c[t]i Capelli dei puiglo[n]det dei paltra [et] quida[m] filiu[s]
- Bartholomei Bener civitatis p[re]dicte viole[n]t[er] corp[or]e p[ro]prio amore capuerunt
- quenda[m] ei[us] filiu[m] etatis septe[m] annoru[m] et paucu[m] plus et illu[m] abduxeru[n]t
- p[er] aliquos dies tenueru[n]t [et] p[er] p[ro]p[ri]u[m] p[er] vim ut dicit baptizare feceru[n]t
- [et] nu[n]c i[n]tra(?) illu[m] tenent donec p[er] tanto[m] nob[is] dicit [et] manda[m] vob[is]
- pena qui[n]gentoru[m] flor[enorum] aur[i] mo[n]eta n[ost]ra curiam q[uod] co[n]tra fecerint ip[s]o f[act]o
- applicandoru[m] quapropter de p[re]missis diligentissime inquiratis [et] si p[er] d[i]c[t]am
- inquisicione[m] vob[is] delat[ur] rep[er]eritis d[i]c[t]u[m] delinquente[m] de corp[or]e p[ro]prio
- arrestari vob[is] te[n]e[re] p[os]sitis d[i]c[t]am inquisicione[m] cu[m] p[er] que[m] fuit factu[m]
- [et] i[n]terlocutorie testimoni[u]m aut ei[us] copia clausa [et] sigillata nob[is]
- plico t[ra]nsmittatis ut ea recognita valeat in Curia de iusticia p[ro]vide

- iudiciu[m] ad iudicare tunc q[uod] d[i]c[t]u[m] puer[u]m baptizatu[m] facia[tis] teneri p[er]
- xp[ist]ianos b[on]e fame [et] co[n]v[er]sac[i]onis talis q[uod] occultari nequat sub p[re]textu
- [et] fine[m] abduci valeat In cuius rei testi[moniu]m p[re]s[er]vantes vob[is] fieri
- iussim[us] comu[n]iu[m]. Dat[um] Barch[inone] VIII die menses aprilis anno a nat[ivitat]e
- d[omi]ni mcccclxxx septimo. p[er] f[ra]nc[iscu]m Canet.

Show more

12:12 PM

Reconciled competing manuscript readings through systematic textual analysis

Reconciled competing manuscript readings through systematic textual analysis

This is a very productive reconciliation — the HTR provides a dramatically more coherent reading of several passages where my transcription was badly wrong, particularly in the narrative core and the closing formulae. But the HTR also has some clear errors, and there are a few genuine cruxes. Let me work through this systematically.

Stage 2: Reconciliation

(A) Where HTR corrects Claude

Line 1 — Place name and addressee formula: My "Civde [?] et eiu[s] Laurencij [?] saluꝝ" was garbled. The HTR's "**Gerunde et eius locumtenenti salutem**" is almost certainly correct. "Baiulo Gerunde et eius locumtenenti" is a perfectly standard address formula, and "Gerunde" (Girona) resolves the abbreviated place name I couldn't parse. What I read as a personal name "Laurencij" was "locumtenenti" — the many minims misled me. **HTR preferred.**

However, the HTR's rendering of "salutem" as "Salerne" is itself an error — it appears to have projected the name "Salerno" from line 2 into the salutatio. The formula requires "**salutem et gratiam nostram,**" and what the scribe wrote is almost certainly an abbreviated form of "salutem."

Line 2 — The complainant and formula: My reading ("Dominus Penna Galamo paleta judex dicte Cujstad nobis lacrimabilem querelam exposuit") was badly wrong in structure.

The HTR's **"Ad nos pervenit per Fernandum Salerno procuratorem iudeorum dicte civitatis nostra lacrimabili querela"** yields a far more coherent clause: "A tearful complaint has reached us through Fernandus Salerno, procurator of the Jews of the said city." The formula "Ad nos pervenit... querela" is well attested, and "procuratorem iudeorum" is a recognized office in Aragonese Jewish community administration. Where I read "judex," the HTR reads "iudeorum" — these are paleographically close and the HTR's reading makes better syntactic sense. **HTR preferred**, though the personal name "Fernandum Salerno" needs archival verification (see section C).

Line 3 — "quidam" vs. "predicti": The HTR's **"quidam filii"** (certain sons) is more plausible than my "predicti filii" (the aforesaid sons), since these individuals have not been previously mentioned in the document. The perpetrators are introduced for the first time here. **HTR preferred.**

Line 3 — Surname: HTR reads **"Capelli"** where I read "Capdell." Both are plausible Catalan surnames. "Capdell" is perhaps more recognizable (cf. Catalan *capdell* = captain/leader), but "Capelli" cannot be ruled out. **Uncertain — flagged for verification.**

Line 3 — Place names: HTR gives **"dei puiglodet dei paltra"** where I had "d'ey puglendi d'ey palta." The HTR's "Puiglodet" is recognizable as a Catalan toponym (*puig* = hill + diminutive). "Paltra" vs. "palta" is a minor variant. **HTR preferred for "Puiglodet"; both uncertain for the second name.**

Line 3–4 — "quidam filius" vs. "Juda filius": This is significant. The HTR reads **"et quidam filius Bartholomei Bener"** — making this a *fourth* perpetrator ("a certain son of Bartholomeus Bener"), not a Jewish victim named Juda. This makes far better sense of the passage: the subject of "capuerunt" is the group of perpetrators (sons of Capelli + son of Bener), not a mix of perpetrators and victims. My reading of "Juda" was almost certainly wrong. **HTR preferred.**

Line 4 — "Bener" and "civitatis predicte": What I read as "tener Cujusdam" the HTR reads as **"Bener civitatis predicte"** — the perpetrator's surname followed by "of the aforesaid city." Much more coherent. **HTR preferred.**

Line 4 — "violenter corpore proprio": My garbled "violendos corpore precia" is corrected by the HTR to **"violenter corpore proprio"** — "violently, in person / with their own bodies." This is a standard legal intensifier indicating the perpetrators acted personally rather than through agents. **HTR preferred**, though "amore" at the end of the HTR's line 4 is itself suspect (see section C).

Line 5 — The victim's age: My "ciats capte auem" was entirely wrong. The HTR's **"etatis septem annorum et paucum plus"** (of the age of seven years and a little more) is

dramatically more coherent and gives us a critical detail: the victim was a seven-year-old Jewish boy. "Quendam eius filium etatis septem annorum" = "a certain son of his, aged seven years." **HTR preferred.**

Line 5 — "abduxerunt": HTR's "**abduxerunt**" (they abducted) is preferable to my "abscondunt" (they hide). Both fit contextually, but "abduxerunt" (perfect tense) maintains consistent narrative tense with "capuerunt." **HTR preferred.**

Line 6 — "tenuerunt" and "per vim ut dicit": My "tondunt et pergia" was wrong. The HTR's "**per aliquos dies tenuerunt et per proprium per vim ut dicit baptizare fecerunt**" is far more coherent: "they held [him] for some days and by their own [authority], by force, as he says, they had [him] baptized." The phrase "per vim" (by force) is a key legal qualifier, and "ut dicit" (as he says) is standard formulaic hedging in reported complaints. **HTR preferred**, though "per proprium" is slightly awkward (see section C).

Line 7 — "intra illum tenent": HTR's reading "**et nunc intra illum tenent**" (and now they hold him within/inside) is more plausible than my "tra illum donant." The perpetrators are still holding the child. **HTR preferred**, though the HTR itself marks "intra" with a question mark.

Line 9 — "quapropter de premissis": HTR's "**quapropter de premissis**" (wherefore, concerning the premises) is standard transitional language in chancery mandates, far superior to my "quod de predictos" (which also has a case error). **HTR preferred.**

Line 10 — "inquisicionem ... dictum delinquentem": HTR's "**si per dictam inquisicionem vobis delatum repereritis dictum delinquentem de corpore proprio**" is much more coherent than my garbled reading. "If through the said investigation you find the said delinquent [to be] reported to you in person..." **HTR preferred.**

Line 11 — "arrestari vobis tenere possitis": HTR's reading, while still somewhat rough, yields: "**you may arrest and hold [them].**" More coherent than my "appretare dictos tres personas." **HTR preferred**, though both readings are uncertain in detail.

Line 12 — "interlocutorie testimonium": My "jutelacionis remeteros" was garbled. The HTR's "**interlocutorie testimonium**" (interlocutory testimony — a preliminary judicial finding) is a standard legal term and clearly correct. **HTR preferred.**

Line 13 — "plico transmittatis ut ea recognita valeat in Curia": The HTR's reading is far more coherent than my "per fidem transmittatis ut ea recepta Galuaz nos de justicia." "**Plico transmittatis**" (transmit by sealed packet) and "**ut ea recognita valeat in Curia de iusticia provide**" (so that, once reviewed, it may serve for a just ruling in the Court) are standard procedural language. **HTR preferred.**

Line 14 — "dictum puerum baptizatum faciatis teneri": This is a crucial correction. My reading "dictos judeos baptizari fieri teneat" implied the king was ordering Jews to be baptized. The HTR's "**dictum puerum baptizatum faciatis teneri per**" means "you shall cause the said baptized boy to be kept by [suitable Christians]." This makes far better historical sense: the baptism, though illegal and forced, would have been considered canonically valid, so the mandate addresses the boy's custody going forward. **HTR preferred.**

Line 15 — "christianos bone fame et conversacionis": HTR's "**christianos bone fame et conversacionis talis quod occultari nequat sub pretextu**" (Christians of good fame and conduct, such that [the child] cannot be hidden under pretext) replaces my garbled reading and is clearly superior. The specification of guardians "bone fame et conversacionis" is standard for custody provisions. **HTR preferred.**

Line 16 — "In cuius rei testimonium": My reading of this line was almost entirely wrong. The HTR's "**et finem abduci valeat. In cuius rei testimonium presentes vobis fieri**" provides the standard testimonial clause. **HTR preferred.**

Line 17 — "iussimus comunium": My "nostro comodo" was wrong. The HTR's "**iussimus comunium**" is the tail of the standard formula: "presentes vobis fieri iussimus [sigillo nostro] comuniri/munitam." **HTR preferred**, though "comunium" is slightly irregular (perhaps for "comuniri" or "comunitas").

(B) Where Claude's reading is preferred

Line 1 — "etcetera" vs. "rex Aragonum": The HTR reads "Johannes rex Aragonum." Standard chancery practice in these registers is to abbreviate the full intitulation as "**Johannes etcetera**" (or "Johannes etc."), with the complete title expanded only in the most formal instruments. A mandate to a local bailiff would normally use the abbreviated form. Looking at the manuscript, I see what appears to be an abbreviation mark consistent with "etc." rather than "rex Aragonum." **Claude's "etcetera" preferred**, though this is a minor point since both convey the same authority.

Line 1 — "ffideli nostro" vs. "dilecto nostro": Both are standard address formulae. Looking at the manuscript, I see what appears to be a double-f initial ("ff-"), characteristic of this chancery's orthography, supporting "**ffideli**" over "dilecto." **Claude preferred**, though both are formulaically correct.

Date — Month: July vs. April: The HTR reads "**VIII die menses aprilis**" (8 April), while I read "xxo die mensis julij" (20 July). The registration note below the main text reads "de

dicto Julij" — "of the said July" — which appears to confirm that the month in the main document is July, not April. The HTR's "menses" (accusative plural) is also grammatically irregular; the standard formula uses "mensis" (genitive singular). I believe the HTR has misread the month name. **Claude's "julij" preferred**, supported by the registration note, though the day numeral remains uncertain (see section C).

Registration note — not transcribed by HTR: The HTR omits the registration note entirely. My reading — "Alia similis duo [?] pro registrata fuit sub data Barchinone de dicto Julij anno predicto signata et mandata predicta fuit expedita" — is rough but captures the essential content: a similar letter was registered under the same date. The mention of "Julij" here is important for dating the main document.

(C) Where both are uncertain or neither is satisfactory

Line 2 — "Fernandum Salerno" (personal name): The HTR's coherent reading gives us a named individual, Fernandus Salerno, as procurator of the Jews. However, my reading of those same letter forms as "Penna Galamo" is very different. The HTR's reading yields far superior sense, but the divergence in the name is large enough that I cannot confirm it from the image alone. **Flagged for archival verification.** The name "Salerno" is also somewhat unusual for this context — it could indicate Italian origin.

Line 4 — "amore capuerunt": The HTR ends line 4 with "amore capuerunt" — "they captured out of love [?]." This is contextually odd for a violent abduction. I had read something like "ante rapuerunt/capuerunt." Could "amore" be a misreading of something else — perhaps an abbreviation for "a more" (by custom?), or is the manuscript reading actually "vi et armata manu" or similar? The standard legal formula for describing a forcible seizure would not typically include "amore." **Both uncertain — flagged for verification.**

Line 7 — "donec per tantom nobis dicit": The HTR's reading of the middle portion of this line is rough: "donec per tantom nobis dicit" doesn't fully parse. My own reading ("que tanto tempore diaz") is equally unclear. The transition from the narrative ("nunc intra illum tenent") to the dispositio ("et mandamus vobis") must involve some connecting phrase, but neither transcription captures it cleanly. **Both uncertain.**

Line 8 — "nostro erario/fisco" area: Between "florenorum auri" and "si contrafecerint," both readings struggle. The HTR has "moneta nostra curiam" while I had "nostro ciano." The standard formula calls for "nostro erario applicandorum" or "nostro fisco applicandorum." Neither reading matches the expected formula. **Both uncertain — flagged for verification.**

Day numeral in the date: I read "xxo" (20th) where the HTR reads "VIII" (8th). The numeral is difficult to parse in this hand. **Flagged for verification.**

Line 17–18 — iussio: "ça Costa" vs. "Canet": I read "**ffrancischus ça Costa**" where the HTR reads "**per Franciscum Canet.**" Franciscus ça Costa is the well-documented vice-chancellor whose iussio appears in multiple documents from this period that we've already worked on. "Canet" would need to be independently attested in the chancery at this date. The double-f initial I see in the manuscript ("ffrancisch-") is consistent with the nominative form used in iussio notations. However, the HTR's "per + accusative" construction is also a standard iussio format. **Claude's reading tentatively preferred** on prosopographical grounds (ça Costa is a known figure in this chancery), but flagged for verification.

(D) Reconciled Transcription

Johannes etcetera [?] ffdeli nostro baiulo Gerunde et eius locumtenenti salutem et gratiam nostram.

Ad nos pervenit per Fernandum Salerno [?] procuratorem iudeorum dicte civitatis nostra lacrimabili querela

quod quidam filii dicti Capelli [?] dei Puiglodet [?] dei Paltra [?] et quidam filius

Bartholomei Bener civitatis predicte violenter corpore proprio amore [?] capuerunt

quendam eius filium etatis septem annorum et paucum plus et illum abduxerunt

per aliquos dies tenuerunt et per proprium [?] per vim ut dicit baptizare fecerunt

et nunc intra [?] illum tenent donec per tanto [?] nobis dicit [?] et mandamus vobis [?] sub

pena quingentorum florenorum auri nostro [erario?/fisco?] [?] si contrafecerint ipso facto

applicandorum quapropter de premissis diligentissime inquiratis et si per dictam

inquisitionem vobis delatum repereritis dictum delinquentem de corpore proprio

arrestari vobis tenere possitis [?] dictam inquisitionem cum per quem fuit factum [?]

et interlocutorie testimonium aut eius copiam clausam et sigillatam nobis

plico transmittatis ut ea recognita valeat in Curia de iusticia provide

iudicium adiudicare tunc quod dictum puerum baptizatum faciatis teneri per

christianos bone fame et conversacionis talis quod occultari nequat sub pretextu

et finem abduci valeat. In cuius rei testimonium presentes vobis fieri
iussimus comunium [?]. Datum Barchinone [xx?/viii?] die mensis julij anno a nativitate
domini millesimo CCCo LXXXo septimo. :: ffrancischus [?] ça Costa [?].

Registration note:

Alia similis [?] pro registrata fuit sub data Barchinone de dicto Julij anno predicto signata et
mandata predicta fuit expedita.

Right margin:

Andreas Paulli [?] [additional notations, partially illegible]

Ready for your corrections and adjudications before I move to Stage 3.

I am going to do my best to transcribe lines 2 and 3: "adinos Presencia Salamon Scaleta
iudeus dicte Civitatis nobis lacrimabiliter recitavit quod pridem filii den Castell den
pingeleuder den Peralta et quidam filius..." Please consider this as you judge how to revise
your transcription for Stage 3. Please proceed to Stage 3.

12:28 PM

Reconciled manuscript readings and prepared comprehensive scholarly edition with
translations

Reconciled manuscript readings and prepared comprehensive scholarly edition with
translations

Your readings for lines 2–3 are extremely clarifying — they resolve several of the worst
cruxes in the document. Let me note the key corrections before proceeding:

- **"Ad nos presencia Salamon Scaleta iudeus"** — not "per Fernandum Salerno procuratorem iudeorum" (HTR) or my garbled reading. The complainant is **Salamon Scaleta**, a Jew who appeared personally before the king.
- **"lacrimabiliter recitavit"** — adverb + verb, not the HTR's "lacrimabili querela" noun phrase. This also explains the compressed ending of line 2 that neither the HTR nor I could parse.
- **"pridem"** (recently) — not "predicti" or "quidam," a temporal marker situating the abduction.

- **"den Castell den Pingeleuder den Peralta"** — Catalan "d'en" patronymics, not the garbled readings both the HTR and I produced. "Peralta" especially is a well-known Aragonese/Catalan surname that neither of us caught.

Let me produce the Stage 3 edition now.

Discarded unnecessary tool, proceeded directly to task

Discarded unnecessary tool, proceeded directly to task

Now let me create the Stage 3 edition.

Acknowledged transcription notes and prepared for revision stage

Acknowledged transcription notes and prepared for revision stage

A remarkable document. The canonical-legal paradox at its center — punish the perpetrators, but treat the sacrament as irreversible — is the crux of footnote 18, and this is exactly the kind of case that illuminates Joan I's posture toward the Jewish communities in his first months on the throne.

A few things I'd flag beyond what's in the edition:

The **HTR's fabrication of "Fernandum Salerno procuratorem iudeorum"** is worth noting methodologically — it turned a named Jewish complainant appearing in person into a gentile-sounding procurator acting on behalf of the community, which would have been a different kind of document entirely. Your reading of "Salamon Scaleta iudeus" recovers the personal, individual character of the complaint.

The **"per proprium" / "per presbyterum" crux** in line 6 is potentially the most historically significant unresolved reading. If the manuscript actually says *per presbyterum*, it documents clerical complicity in a forced baptism — the perpetrators didn't just seize the child, they procured a priest to administer the sacrament. That would bear directly on the question of how these incidents were logistically possible and whether the Church bore institutional responsibility.

The **"alia similis"** in the registration note is also worth pursuing — a second letter on the same matter to a different jurisdiction could provide additional details about the perpetrators or the child's location.

Aca joani forcedbaptism girona 1387 07

Document · MD

Want to be notified when Claude responds?

Claude is AI and can make mistakes. Please double-check responses.