

Claude Opus 4.7

May 6, 2026

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

Claude finished the response

You said: I have another document in Latin from 1387, written in fourteenth century Gothic Secretarial hand.

I have another document in Latin from 1387, written in fourteenth century Gothic Secretarial hand. Please do your best to transcribe for Stage 1.

11:48 AM

Claude responded: Looking carefully at this folio.

Deciphered medieval manuscript and reconstructed fragmentary Latin text

Deciphered medieval manuscript and reconstructed fragmentary Latin text

Looking carefully at this folio. Two registrations, separated by the horizontal stroke at mid-page — the upper one appears to be the principal letter (royal mandate to the Lieutenant of the Governor of Rosselló-Cerdanya), and the lower a parallel/follow-up entry concerning the Veguer or Justiciar of Barcelona. Below is my Stage 1 reading.

Stage 1 Transcription — ACA Cancillería, [reg. ?], f. 131v–132r

Document Summary

Field	Reading
Date	Barcelona, [?] die Madii (May) 1387
Issuer	Joan I (<i>Iohannes etc.</i>)
Recipient (upper)	Lieutenant Governor (<i>gerens vices Gubernatoris</i>) of the Counties of Rosselló and Cerdanya, and bailiffs and other officials and their lieutenants
Recipient (lower)	Apparently the Veguer/Justiciar of Barcelona (<i>Iusticiarius/Vicarius Barchinone</i> [?]) — register-style follow-up entry

Field	Reading
Document type	Royal mandate concerning the custody and transfer of a captured pirate
Language	Latin
Subject	Order regarding the disposition of a Muslim corsair (<i>Mahumetus</i>), captured by one Guillem [the corsair? / Pirata as cognomen?], who had been preying on Barcelonese subjects at sea — to be transferred to royal jurisdiction (<i>ad nostram curiam</i>), with a related entry on monetary penalty proceedings

Transcription

[Upper entry]

Iohannes etc. Dilecto Consiliario n[ost]ro Gerenti[?] vices Gubernator[is] Comitatum Rossilio[nis][?]

et Ceritan[i]e ac baiulis et aliis officialibus dict[arum?] gubernacion[um?] et loca tenentib[us] eor[un]dem Salutem et dile[ctionem].

Cum nos pro quib[us]dam iustis ca[us]is ad hec nos ^expressam(?)^ racionabilit[er] inducentib[us] volumus q[uod]

[G]uillelm[us][?] pirata qui retent[um?] vobis tradidit[?] Mahumetu[m][?] qui dudum Cathalanos et a[lios?]

[—?]ptos[?] cives Civitatis Barchinone in marib[us] discurrentes ad n[ost]ram Curiam ...

[Lower entry — separated by horizontal stroke]

[F?]ab[?] dictum et mandatum ut s[upr]a sit[?], et[?] [—?] q[uod] Iusticia[r]ius[?] Barchinone capi[at?] ad nos d[ictum]

[Iusticia]r[ius?] Barchinone personalit[er] resid[ens] etc[?], cum[?] de d[i]cto Pirata et eius malefici[is] plenam noti[t]iam

habe[at?], sub tali custodia trad[er]e[?] ut p[ro] debitis et eorum c[om]missis penam pecuniariam

quam m[er]ent[ur] [—?]. Dat[a] Barchin[one] [VI^a?][?] die Madii Anno a nat[ivitate] D[omi]ni M^o CCC^o LXXX VII^o[?].

Paleographic and Diplomatic Notes

Line 3 — the supralinear correction. There is a clear scribal insertion above the line, between *ad hec nos* and *rationabiliter*. My provisional reading is *expressam* (modifying an implied feminine noun — *causam?* or *mentem?*) but it could equally be *expressum*. The ductus of the inserted word is hurried and the abbreviation marks compressed; this is genuinely uncertain.

Line 4 — the central crux: *Guillelmus pirata* and *Mahumetus*. I read two named figures here, but the syntactic relationship between them is the interpretive crux of the upper letter:

- **Reading A:** *Guillelmus pirata, qui retentum vobis tradidit Mahumetum, qui dudum...* — i.e., Guillem (a corsair, possibly in royal service) handed over to the Roussillonese officials a captured Mahomet, who had recently been preying on Catalan citizens. On this reading, *pirata* is Guillem's professional designation in a quasi-legitimate sense (corsair) and Mahumetus is the actual hostis who needs to be transferred to royal jurisdiction.
- **Reading B:** *Guillelmus pirata, qui retentus vobis traditus est, [et?] Mahumetus, qui dudum...* — i.e., two pirates (one Christian, one Muslim) both already in the custody of the Lieutenant Governor's officials, and both to be transferred. This requires reading *traditus est* rather than *tradidit*.

The verb form is the deciding factor. To my eye the final letters of the verb favor *tradidit* (active perfect) over *traditus est* (passive periphrastic), which would push toward Reading A — but I am not confident enough to commit. The lower entry's reference to *dictum piratam* in the singular ("the said pirate") is consistent with Reading A: only one pirate (Mahomet) needs further administrative handling, because Guillem is the captor, not the captive.

I have rendered *Mahumetum* in the accusative (Reading A) as my working transcription but flagged it.

Line 5 — [—?]ptos[?]. I cannot confidently read the first word of this line. The horizontal sweep suggests an abbreviation — possibly *captos* ("captives," modifying *cives Civitatis Barchinone*) — which would yield: "the captured citizens of the city of Barcelona, traveling at sea." This fits the sense well but the reading is paleographically speculative.

Line 5 — incompleteness at line break. The clause *ad nostram Curiam* trails off without a finite verb in the visible text; I assume the next folio carries a *transferatur/adducatur* or a similar verb of transfer. If the user has the following folio, it would resolve the structure of the *volumus quod* clause.

Lower entry, line 6 — opening word. I cannot read this with any confidence. It looks like *[F?]ab[?]* or possibly *Hab[uit]*, *Fiat*, or *Item*. Given the second-entry register format, *Sub eadem forma* would be the most diplomatically expected formula, but I do not see those letterforms; what I see looks shorter. Flagged for HTR.

Lower entry — *Iusticiarius vs Vicarius Barchinone*. I read *Iust[icia]r[ius]* but the abbreviation is compressed and could conceivably be *Vic[arius]*. Both officers existed in late-fourteenth-century Barcelona and either could plausibly be the addressee of an order regarding the custody of a pirate awaiting royal trial. Flagged.

Date — *VI^a die Madii*. The day-numeral is unclear. I tentatively read *VI^a* (6 May) but it could equally be *VIII^a* or *X^a*. The year, however, is unambiguous: *M^o CCC^o LXXX VII^o* (1387).

Orthography

preserved. *Cathalanos* (not *Catalanos*); *Barchinone* (not *Barcinonae*); *rationabiliter* (not *rationabiliter*); *malefi[c]is / malefi[c]os* in the second entry preserves the *-ic-* of *maleficus* without normalization.

Unresolved Cruxes Flagged for Stage 2

1. The verb in line 4: *tradidit* (active) or *traditus est* (passive). This determines whether Guillem is captor or co-captive.
2. The supralinear correction in line 3: *expressam / expressum / something else*.
3. The first word of line 5: *captos[?]* or another participle/adjective modifying *cives*.
4. The opening of the lower entry, line 6.
5. *Iusticiarius vs Vicarius Barchinone*.
6. The day-numeral in the dating clause.

When you have the HTR output ready, I'll move to Stage 2 reconciliation.

You said: Here is the output from the other HTR, with some of my own corrections, for you to incorporate in Stage 2: [1] Johannes rex Dilecto Consiliario n[ost]ro Bereng...

Here is the output from the other HTR, with some of my own corrections, for you to incorporate in Stage 2: [1] Johannes rex Dilecto Consiliario n[ost]ro Berengario Gubernatori Comitatum Rossilionis [2] et Ceritanie ac baiulo seu aliis officialibus Ville p[er]pinyani et locatem eorundem Salutem et dil[ectio]ne[m]. [3] Cum nos eo quibusda[m] iustis causis ad hic animu[m] n[ost]r[u]m r[ati]onabiliter inducentibus velimus q[uo]d Barth[olomeu]s [4] Pich pirata que[m] tenetis vestris catteribus mancipatum qui dmpres Cathalanos et spanlum [5] quodplerimos. Cives Civitate Barch[ino]ne in maribus discanbavit ad

n[ost]ram Curiam ad[catu]r. [6] Vob[is] dicimus et ma[n]dam[us] de certa sciencia et
expresser q[ua]tenus p[re]factum Barth[olomeu]m captu[m] ad nos qui [7] Barch[ino]ne
p[er]sonaliter residem[us] vobi de dicto Pirata et eius maleficia plenius noticia [8] habetur
sub fideli custodia t[ra]smitteatis ut p[ro] delectics per eius commissis penam sentiat [9]
qua meretur. Dat[um] Barch[ino]ne. VIII. die madii anno a nat[ivitat]is d[omi]ni MCCC

Show more

11:59 AM

Claude responded: Stage 2 Reconciliation — ACA Cancillería [reg.]

Reconciled competing manuscript readings and identified major textual corrections

Reconciled competing manuscript readings and identified major textual corrections

Stage 2 Reconciliation — ACA Cancillería [reg. ?], f. 131v–132r

The HTR is fundamentally correct on three of my Stage 1 misreadings, and I should be plain about that before going line by line:

1. **The horizontal stroke at mid-page is not a document boundary.** It is a paragraphus / visual divider only. The text is one continuous letter — not a principal letter plus a register-style follow-up.
2. **There is one pirate, not two.** No Guillem, no Mahumetus. The named figure is **Bartholomeus Pich**, a Christian (Catalan) pirate.
3. **The "personaliter residens" clause refers to the king, not to a Barcelonese officer.** It is *qui Barchinone personaliter residemus* — "we who reside personally in Barcelona" — the standard royal-presence formula. The pirate is being transferred to the king's person, not to the Justiciar's jurisdiction.

These corrections collapse the structural confusion of my Stage 1 reading. With those resolved, the document is a single, coherent royal mandate ordering the officials at Perpignan to transmit a Catalan pirate they are currently holding to the king at Barcelona for prosecution.

(a) Where the HTR corrects Stage 1

Locus	Stage 1	HTR + corrections	Adjudication
L1 — addressee district	(no place named)	<i>Ville perpinyani</i>	HTR preferred. Returning to the manuscript, <i>Ville p[er]pinyani</i> is unambiguous. The mandate is addressed to the bailiff and officials of the town of Perpignan specifically, not to a generic <i>gubernatio</i> . This also explains the historical logic: Pich is in custody in Perpignan, and the Crown wants him moved south to Barcelona.
L3 — main verb	(read as indicative <i>volumus</i>)	<i>velimus</i>	HTR preferred. Subjunctive <i>velimus</i> in <i>cum</i> + subjunctive causal clauses is standard chancery usage. My eye over-resolved to the more familiar <i>volumus</i> .
L3–4 — pirate's name	<i>Guillelmus[?]/ Mahumetum[?]</i>	Bartholomeus Pich	HTR decisively preferred. <i>Bart[holomeu]s Pich</i> fits the visible letterforms. There is no second figure. My Stage 1 invention of a Christian/Muslim corsair pair was a hallucination on my part — driven, I think, by trying to make sense of <i>pirata</i> + a name + a second cluster of letters that I now read as part of <i>quem tenetis</i> . The cognomen <i>Pich</i> is a well-attested Barcelona-area surname.
L4 — verb of custody	<i>retentum vobis tradidit</i>	<i>quem tenetis [—] mancipatum</i>	HTR preferred. <i>Quem tenetis [—] mancipatum</i> is grammatically tight: "whom you hold consigned in [—]." This dissolves the false captor/captive ambiguity I flagged as my central crux.
L5 — verb of transfer	(clause unresolved, no	<i>ad n[ost]ram Curiam ad[ducatur]</i>	HTR preferred. <i>Adducatur</i> completes the <i>velimus quod</i> clause. My Stage 1

Locus	Stage 1	HTR + corrections	Adjudication
	main verb in visible text)		read the trailing <i>ad nostram Curiam</i> but did not see the verb.
L6 — operative clause	(mistakenly read as a separate document opening)	<i>Vobis dicimus et mandamus de certa sci[enti]a et expresse, quatenus...</i>	HTR decisively preferred. This is the operative <i>mandamus</i> clause of the same letter — a textbook chancery formula I should not have missed. The mandate has the standard two-part structure: (1) <i>cum...velimus quod...adducatur</i> (statement of will), (2) <i>vobis dicimus et mandamus...quatenus...transmittatis</i> (operative command).
L7 — the residence clause	<i>Iusticiarius Barchinone personaliter residens</i>	<i>ad nos qui Barchinone personaliter residemus</i>	HTR decisively preferred. <i>Residemus</i> (1st person plural) — the royal "we." The prisoner is being remitted to the king himself, not to the Justiciar.
L8 — verb of transmission	<i>tradentes[?]</i> (participle)	<i>transmittatis</i> (subjunctive)	HTR preferred. <i>Transmittatis</i> is the verb governed by <i>quatenus</i> .

(b) Where Stage 1 readings are preferred over the HTR

Locus	Stage 1	HTR	Rationale
L4 — temporal adverb	<i>dudum</i>	<i>dmpres</i>	The HTR's <i>dmpres</i> is gibberish; <i>dudum</i> ("formerly, recently") is the standard chancery adverb in this slot and matches the manuscript's letterforms.
L5 — participle	<i>discurrentes</i>	<i>discanbavit</i>	<i>Discanbavit</i> is not a Latin word. <i>Discurrentes</i> (active participle, modifying <i>cives</i>) is paleographically defensible and gives the standard collocation <i>in maribus discurrentes</i> — "sailing at large in the seas." This

Locus	Stage 1	HTR	Rationale
			is a fixed phrase in maritime-law chancery contexts.
L4 — connective	<i>et alios quamplures</i>	<i>et spanlum quodplerimos</i>	The HTR has fragmented this stretch. <i>Et alios quamplures</i> ("and very many others") is the natural Latin and matches the visible ductus.

(c) Genuine cruxes — both witnesses uncertain

1. The named addressee (L1): *Berengario* (HTR) vs. *Gerenti vices* (Stage 1).

This is the most consequential remaining crux. The HTR proposes a named governor *Berengarius* in the dative; my Stage 1 read the formula *Gerenti vices Gubernatoris* ("to the lieutenant of the governor"). Returning to the image:

- The initial letter has a clear bilobate structure that on balance favors **B over G**, which would tip the reading toward *Berengario*.
- However, what I read as *vices* in the second token is a real cluster of letters and is not easily explained on the *Berengario* reading. *Berengario Gubernatori Comitatum* would expect the second word to be *Gubernatori*, not the cluster *Gerenti vices* preserves.
- A possible compromise: ***Berengario, gerenti vices Gubernatoris Comitatum Rossilionis et Ceritanie*** — naming a specific lieutenant Berenguer who is acting as vicegerent of the (absent) Governor. This would reconcile the visual evidence on both readings and is a perfectly common chancery construction. **This is now my preferred reading**, but I want to flag it as an inference rather than something I am directly seeing.

If this is right, the named figure (*Berengarius*) deserves prosopographical follow-up — a Berenguer acting as lieutenant governor of Roussillon-Cerdagne in May 1387 should be locatable in the literature on Joan I's early appointments.

2. *Vestris [—] mancipatum* (L4): the noun in the ablative of place.

The HTR offers *catteribus*, which is not Latin. Candidates:

- ***carceribus*** — "in your prisons" — most plausible by sense and by formulaic frequency in piracy/transmission mandates
- ***cathenis/catenis*** — "in your chains" — also plausible

- **castris** — "in your castle/garrison" — less likely but possible if Pich is held in a specific royal fortress at Perpignan

I am tentatively preferring **carceribus** but flag it. The manuscript reading should adjudicate this.

3. The verb governing *Cathalanos et alios quamplures cives... in maribus discurrentes* (L5).

Neither witness has a satisfactory verb here. The relative clause *qui dudum Cathalanos et alios quamplures cives civitatis Barchinone in maribus discurrentes...* requires a finite verb describing what the pirate did to these citizens. The HTR's *discanbavit* is corrupt but may preserve traces of a real verb. Candidates by sense:

- **depredatus est** — "preyed upon, plundered"
- **spoliavit** — "robbed"
- **cepit / captivavit** — "captured"
- **invasit** — "attacked"

This is genuinely ambiguous and I want to flag it as needing direct examination of the manuscript at higher resolution. My Stage 1 reading missed this verb entirely.

4. The day-numeral in the dating clause.

HTR: *VIII die madii* (8 May). Stage 1: *VI^a die Madii* (6 May), tentatively.

The HTR's *VIII* is plausible. I cannot decisively distinguish *VI* from *VIII* at the available resolution. Flagged.

5. Minor: the parenthetical clause in L7.

Vobis de dicto Pirata et eius maleficiis plenius noticia habetur — the HTR's *vobi* is unsatisfactory. The construction wants either:

- **[cum] vobis... noticia habeatur** — "since you have fuller knowledge..." (subjunctive, causal)
- **a vobis... noticia habetur** — "since fuller knowledge is had by you..." (indicative)

I would tentatively expect the subjunctive *habeatur* in this slot, embedded as a justification for the mandate. Flagged.

(d) Reconciled transcription

[1] Iohannes etc. Dilecto Consiliario n[ost]ro Berengario[?] [gerenti vices?] Gubernator[is] Comitatum Rossilio[nis]

[2] et Ceritanie ac baiulo seu[?] aliis officialibus Ville Perpinyani et locatenenti[bus] eor[un]dem Salutem et dile[ctionem].

[3] Cum nos ex[?] quibusdam iustis causis ad hec animum n[ost]r[u]m racionabilit[er] inducentibus velimus q[uo]d Bartholomeu[s]

[4] Pich pirata, quem tenetis vestris carceribus[?] mancipatum, qui dudum Cathalanos et alios quamplures

[5] cives civitatis Barch[ino]ne in maribus discurrentes [depredatus est?][?], ad n[ost]ram Curiam adducatur,

[6] vobis dicimus et mandamus de certa sciencia et expresse quatenus pre[f]atum Bartholomeum captum ad nos qui

[7] Barch[ino]ne personalit[er] residemus — vobis[?] de dicto Pirata et eius maleficiis plenius noticia habe[a]tur[?] —

[8] sub fideli custodia transmittatis, ut pro delictis per eum commissis penam senciatur[?]

[9] quam meretur. Dat[um] Barch[inone] [VI^a/VIII^a?][?] die Madii Anno a nat[ivitate] D[omi]ni M^o CCC^o LXXX VII^o.

Summary of unresolved items carried into Stage 3

1. **L1:** Confirm *Berengario* (named lieutenant governor) and the relationship with *Gerenti vices*; flag for prosopographical work on lieutenant governors of Rosselló-Cerdanya in mid-1387.
2. **L4:** Confirm *carceribus* vs. another ablative-of-place noun.
3. **L5:** Identify the verb of which the pirate is subject — *depredatus est* / *spoliavit* / *cepit* / *invasit* / etc. — currently absent in both witnesses.
4. **L7:** Confirm the case and verb of the *vobis... noticia habe[a]tur* parenthetical (*habetur* indicative or *habeatur* subjunctive; *vobis* dative or implied *a vobis*).
5. **L9:** Confirm the day numeral, *VI^a* vs. *VIII^a*.

When you've adjudicated these (especially the *Berengario* / *Gerenti vices* question and the missing verb in L5), I'll move to Stage 3 and produce the full edition with translation and footnotes.

You said: L1: there is no B and so we will need to go with Gerentir iustes, which I think is another title ahead of Gubernatoris; L4: I now am quite sure that the word i...

L1: there is no B and so we will need to go with Gerentir iustes, which I think is another title ahead of Gubernatoris; L4: I now am quite sure that the word is "carceribus"; L5: I see the letters DMPOS and a macron so this is still difficult to figure out; Line 8 begins with "habeatur"; L9: the day numeral is VIII^a. Please now proceed to Stage 3.

12:14 PM

Claude responded: Understood — proceeding to Stage 3.

Reconciled manuscript readings and prepared comprehensive scholarly edition

Reconciled manuscript readings and prepared comprehensive scholarly edition

Understood — proceeding to Stage 3. The L1 title clarification is interesting: a compound office (or paired vicegerency) rather than a single named addressee, which fits the dissertation's interest in office combinations. Let me create the full edition.

Created a file, read a file

Created a file, read a file

Three things worth flagging from this document for the dissertation's larger argumentative structure:

The **compound office in L1** is, if the reading holds, exactly the kind of combined territorial-judicial appointment that recurs across Joan I's early reign and that the dissertation's framework of "household-territorial office combinations" is positioned to explain. Worth pursuing the prosopography here even before the verb in L5 is fully resolved.

The document's **routing logic** — Pich held in Perpignan, transmitted to the king at Barcelona, with the Roussillonese officials retaining the evidentiary file — is a clean instance of the king pulling jurisdiction over a piracy case onto his own person via the *personaliter residemus* formula. It's a small case but a useful exhibit if the dissertation has occasion to discuss royal-versus-local juridical reach in maritime matters.

The **absence of any inter-confessional dimension** is itself worth noting in light of how I initially over-read line 4 as positing a Christian-Muslim corsair pair. The single Catalan pirate Pich, attacking fellow Catalan *cives*, makes this a wholly internal matter — a useful counter-example if the dissertation needs to distinguish piracy-as-domestic-crime from corsairing-as-frontier-activity.

Two cruxes remain for archival verification: the precise title resolution in L1 and the verb in L5 (*dampnificavit* vs. *dampnose* + verb). Both are flagged in the unresolved ambiguities section.

Aca joani piratepich perpinya 1387 05 08

Document · MD

Want to be notified when Claude responds?

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