

Claude Opus 4.7 Adaptive

May 19, 2026

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

Claude finished the response

I have another document from 1387 written in Gothic Secretarial Hand. The language is Catalan. Please do your best to transcribe for Stage 1.

4:55 AM

Deciphered medieval Catalan manuscript and identified royal intercession letter

Deciphered medieval Catalan manuscript and identified royal intercession letter

Stage 1 — Initial Transcription

A lletra.closa in Catalan, addressed by the king to an unnamed bishop, concerning the bishop's imprisonment of one of the king's household members. Dated 21 April 1387 at Barcelona. The hand is a competent if slightly hurried Gothic secretarial, with the usual high incidence of abbreviation in the formulaic closing.

Transcription

· Bisbe entes hauem q[ue] vos tenits pres en G[uille]m[?] Ribes de Prenya[?] lo qual es domestech n[ost]re e al qual diem q[ue] ffets enantament contra ell mas p[er] ynstigacio d'alcuns qui li porten ynimjztat q[ue] no per justicia de la qual cosa si be es nos marauella[m?] molt p[er]q[ue]ns p[er] g[ra]n[?] e manam[?] q[ue] e[n] lo dit fet ffaçats justicia e no als. Certifficant vos q[ue] si lo contrari ffariets, co que no creem, ffariets cosa des[h?]onesta a nos desplaent, majorment co lo dit G. e[s?] n[ost]re domestech segons dit es. Dada en Barch[ino]na a .xxj. dia d'ayrils[?] de l'any sta nati[vitat?] de n[ost]re S[en]yor M.ccc.lxxx.vij. — Affinasc[?] en Cost[a?]

Document identification

- **Type:** Lletra.closa / lletra.missiva of royal intercession on behalf of a household member (domèstic). No formal intitlatio — the king speaks directly in the first-person plural to the bishop (inscriptio = "Bisbe").
- **Date:** 21 April 1387, Barcelona.

- **Sender:** Joan I of Aragon (implied — first regnal year, royal "nos," Barcelona itinerary all consistent).
- **Addressee:** An unnamed bishop. The omission of the see in the surviving register copy is normal for lletres closes; the full address would have appeared on the (now-lost) folded exterior.
- **Subject:** The king has learned that the bishop is holding one **Guillem[?] Ribes de Prenyà[?]**, a member of the royal household, and is proceeding against him not by justice but at the instigation of enemies. The king expresses displeasure, orders the bishop to render justice "in the said matter and nothing else," and warns that failure to do so would be "an unjust thing, and displeasing to us, all the more since the said G. is our domèstic."

This fits comfortably with the recurring pattern of royal jurisdictional reach into ecclesiastical proceedings on behalf of household servants in the early reign — and the dating places it within a few weeks of the Perpinyà documents already in the corpus.

Notes on uncertain readings

1. **Line 1, the prisoner's given name.** I read **G[uille]m**, expanded from a "G" + abbreviation, on the strength of line 7's "lo dit G." (the back-reference clearly uses an initial G). The minim count and the suprascript over the initial are consistent with Guillem / Guillem. I would not stake more than the back-reference on it without HTR or a second image at higher resolution.
2. **Line 1, the toponym/cognomen "de Prenya[?]."** The final word of line 1 is the weakest reading on the folio. The first three letters look like pre_, the descender on what I'm reading as a "y" is ambiguous, and the terminal _a sits tight against the line-end. Prenyà (cf. Sant Miquel de Prenyà; Prenyanosa) is plausible as a Catalan toponymic surname, but *Penya*, *Pereya*, or another reading cannot be excluded. Flag for HTR comparison.
3. **Line 4, "nos marauella[m?] molt."** The verb wants a first-person plural inflection ("we marvel much") but the final stroke is ambiguous — it could be a simple flourish on *marauella* (3rd sg., "it astonishes us"). The Catalan idiom *nos meravella* (impersonal) is well attested in chancery prose, so both are formulaically defensible.
4. **Line 4 end, "per g[ra]n."** I'm reading an abbreviated *gran*, but the line breaks here and what I expect — something like *per.gran.rao.us.pregam* or *per.gran.zel.us*.

manam — does not clearly continue on line 5, which begins e.mana-. There may be a word lost or compressed at the break, or my expansion is wrong.

5. **Line 5, "e mana[m?]."** I want to read manam (1st pl., "we order"), parallel to the Certificant.vos of the same line, but the abbreviation stroke is faint. E.mana (3rd sg.) is not impossible if the subject is implied. The choice matters for the document's pragmatic register.
6. **Line 5, "ey lo dit fet."** I take ey as a contraction e.en ("and in"), giving "and in the said matter you should render justice." An alternative would be en.lo.dit.fet with an otiose initial stroke.
7. **Line 6, "cosa des[h?]onesta."** The expected reading is deshonesta ("dishonest, improper"), but the descender between de_ and _onesta looks more like a p than a long s + h. I have provisionally marked the h uncertain. Cosa.desonesta (without the h) would also be acceptable medieval Catalan orthography.
8. **Line 7, "lo dit G. e[s?] n[ost]re domestech."** I expect es ("is"), but the letterform reads more like ha or e. The sense requires the copula. If the scribe wrote e it is a slip for es; if ha, it is harder to construe.
9. **Line 8, "d'ayrils[?]."** The terminal _s is unusual for abril — I would expect d~~x~~abril or d~~x~~abrils. Could be a scribal habit (cf. agosts, setembres in some chancery hands) or a misread terminal flourish.
10. **Line 8, "de l'any sta nati[?]."** The standard formula is del.any.de.la.nativitat.de.nostre.Senyor. I am reading sta.nati as a heavily compressed de.la.nativitat, with sta = abbreviated santa or simply sa / de.la. Worth verifying against parallel datings in the same register.
11. **Final line, "Affinasc[?] en Cost[a?]."** This is the iussio / registration notation, and I cannot make confident sense of it. The first element does not match the common chancery formulas (Dominus.rex.mandavit, Idem, De.mandato.regio) or a recognizable scribe's name (it is not obviously Sirvent, Beviure, ça.Costa, or Bonastre). En.Costa at the end could conceivably be **Francesc ça Costa** (vice-chancellor) — but the preceding word does not look like Provisa or Visa. Possibly a vidit / examinata notation specific to this scribe; flag for archival check.

Awaiting your HTR output for Stage 2.

Here is the output from the other HTR for Stage 2: Line 1: Bisbe entes havem q[ue] vos tenits pres en Guill[e]m Ribes de p[er]pinya Line 2: lo qual es domestich n[ost]re e al qual diu[e]n q[ue] fo s[er]enament contra Line 3: ell / mas p[er] jnstigacio d'alcuns quj lj porten

jngvjntat que no p[er] Line 4: justic[i]a de la qual cosa sj deua es nos marauellam molt /
p[er]que[n] v[os] diu[e]m Line 5: e ma[n]ma[m] que en lo dit fet fassets justic[i]a e no als /
Certifica[n]t vos Line 6: q[ue] sj lo contrarj faheets co que no creem faryets cosa dezonesta
a nos Line 7: desplaent[er] majorment co lo dit . G. sia n[ost]re domestich segons dit es /
Line 8: Dada en Barchel[o]na a . xxi . dia de maig / El any dlla nat[ivitat] de n[ost]re senyor
Line 9: . m . ccc . lxxxvii . Ffra[n]cisc[us] ca coftus .

5:00 AM

Systematically reconciled medieval manuscript transcriptions against HTR output

Systematically reconciled medieval manuscript transcriptions against HTR output

Stage 2 — Reconciliation

The HTR provides a number of decisive corrections — including one that materially repositions the document in the corpus chronology — but it also exhibits the now-familiar pattern of fabricating plausible-sounding Catalan in the densely abbreviated stretches. The two outputs are best read against each other.

(a) Where the HTR corrects Claude

1. **Line 1 — "Perpinya," not "Prenya."** Looking again at the image, the initial cluster is p with the per_ stroke + _pinya, not pr_ + _enya. **Guillem Ribes de Perpinyà** is a man, not a toponymic specifier of an obscure place. This is a clean correction and immediately makes the document make sense — Perpinyà is in the corpus already (cf. the 8 May 1387 pirata Pich document).
2. **Line 4 — "marauellam" (1st pl.), not "marauella."** Confirms my flagged uncertainty (Stage 1 note 3). The terminal nasal is present.
3. **Line 4 — "perque vos diem" rather than my "per gran."** My reading dead-ended at the line break; perquè.us.diem.[e.manam] is the correct chancery syntax and connects cleanly to line 5. This was a paleographic failure on my part.
4. **Line 5 — "manam," not "mana."** Confirms my flagged uncertainty (Stage 1 note 5).
5. **Line 5 — "en lo dit fet," not "ey lo dit fet."** My reconsidered alternative was correct; HTR confirms.
6. **Line 6 — "dezonesta" (= *deshonesta*), not "de ponesta."** Confirms my flagged uncertainty (Stage 1 note 7). The medieval _z_ orthography for _sh_ is regular.

7. **Line 7 — "sia," not "ha."** Confirms my flagged uncertainty (Stage 1 note 8). Sia (subjunctive of ésser) is the right form: majorment.com.lo.dit.Gj.sia.nostre.domèstech.
8. **Line 8 — "de maig," not "d'ayrils."** This is the consequential correction. The descender I had taken for terminal s is the descender of g; the initial ml had misread as al. The document is **21 May 1387**, not 21 April. This places it ten days after the Pich/Perpinyà document of 8 May 1387 already in the corpus, and the involvement of a Perpinyà domestic locks the document into the same May 1387 northern-frontier cluster.
9. **Line 9 — "Ff[ranciscus] ça Costa," not my "Affinasc en Cost."** This is the iussio / sign-off, and the HTR has clearly recognized it as **Francesc ça Costa**, vice-chancellor. My nonsense reading was a paleographic failure of the most embarrassing kind; the long-s in Costa I had parsed as f, and the Ffl initial of Franciscus (with the doubled-f convention typical of the name) I had read as a freestanding word. With ça.Costa in the iussio, the document's chancery provenance is no longer inferential — it is signed.

(b) Where Claude is preferred

1. **Line 2 — "ffets enantament," not "fo serenament."** This is an HTR hallucination of the kind we have seen before — a phonetically plausible-sounding Catalan string that does not exist as a phrase. Enantament is the technical chancery noun for "legal proceeding" (from enantar), and fets.enantament.contra.ell is exactly the construction one expects. Fo.serenament parses to nothing. **Claude reading retained.**
2. **Line 2 — "diem" (we say), not "diuen" (they say).** The king is reporting his own communication with the bishop in the first-person plural; the sentence then continues e.manam in line 5. A 3rd-pl. diuen breaks the discourse. **Claude reading retained.**
3. **Line 3 — "ynimjztat" (= inimicitat), not "jngvjntat."** Inimicitat (enmity) is the correct word in a passage about enemies bearing ill-will toward Ribes. Jngvjntat is not a word. **Claude reading retained.**
4. **Line 5 — "ffaçats" preserved over HTR's "fassets."** Same word (2nd-pl. subjunctive of fer), but per project convention we preserve the scribe's ffl initial. Likewise **"ffariets" (twice) in line 6** preserved over HTR's inconsistent "faheets"/"faryets," which look like recognition artifacts on a uniform letter-shape.

5. **Line 7 — "desplaent" (adjective), not "desplaenter" (adverb).** The HTR has over-expanded; cosa. • .a.nos.desplaent needs the adjective.

(c) Where both readings remain uncertain

1. **Line 2 and Line 7 — "domestech" vs "domestich."** Both forms are well-attested medieval Catalan orthographies for domèstic. The terminal vowel in this hand is ambiguous in both occurrences. I have preserved **domestech** as in my Stage 1, but flag it as a candidate for archival verification against parallel attestations in the same register.
2. **Line 4 — "si be es" vs "sj deua es."** Neither reading is paleographically secure. Si.bé.és ("although it is [so]") fits the chancery formula and is what the syntax wants ("of which thing, although it is so, we marvel much"); si.deua.es yields no obvious sense. I retain "**si be es**" but flag it.
3. **Line 8 — "Barchinona" vs "Barchelona."** Both are attested medieval forms; the chancery Latin standard is Barchinona, but Catalan-language lletres. closes occasionally use Barchelona. I preserve **Barch[ino]na** as the expected chancery form, but this is a coin-flip on this folio and warrants verification.

(d) Reconciled transcription

· Bisbe entes hauem q[ue] vos tenits pres en G[uille]m Ribes de Perpinya lo qual es domestech[?] n[ost]re e al qual diem q[ue] ffets enantament contra ell / mas p[er] ynstigacio d'alcuns qui li porten ynimjztat q[ue] no per justicia, de la qual cosa si be es[?] nos marauellam molt, p[er]q[ue] vos diem e manam q[ue] en lo dit fet ffaçats justicia e no als. Certifficant vos q[ue] si lo contrari ffariets, co q[ue] no creem, ffariets cosa dezonesta a nos desplaent, majorment co lo dit G. sia n[ost]re domestech[?] segons dit es / Dada en Barch[ino]na[?] a .xxj. dia de maig de l'any de la nativitat de n[ost]re S[en]yor M.ccc.lxxx.vij. — Ff[ranciscus] ça Costa.

Dissertation-relevant note

Three points worth carrying into Stage 3:

- **Date shift.** This is **21 May 1387, Barcelona**, not April — placing it in the same Perpinyà-related cluster as the 8 May pirata document. The corpus's May 1387 file is denser than it appeared.
- **Francesc ça Costa as signing officer.** The vice-chancellor's iussio on a letter of this register-type (royal intercession on behalf of a domèstech against an episcopal

proceeding) is itself worth noting for the dissertation's argument on chancery routing of household-jurisdictional business.

- **The jurisdictional content.** The document is a textbook case of royal intervention against ecclesiastical jurisdiction over a household member — the king explicitly characterizes the bishop's proceeding as motivated by inimicitat rather than justicia, and demands that justice be rendered "in the said matter and nothing else" (a phrase that limits the bishop's procedural latitude). This fits squarely within the household-territorial and household-ecclesiastical office and jurisdiction patterns the dissertation is tracking.

Ready to proceed to Stage 3 when you are — or to revisit any of the (b) or (c) items first.

The phrase in Line 4 is "se vera es nos maravellam molt." All of the other uncertainties are minor. In Stage 3, please include any information you find about Guillem Ribes of Perpignan. Please proceed to Stage 3.

5:04 AM

Reconciled manuscript phrase and charted Stage 3 research plan

Reconciled manuscript phrase and charted Stage 3 research plan

Excellent correction — "se vera es" reads beautifully: the king is hedging on his report ("if it is true, we marvel much") before pivoting to the order. That makes the whole line cohere.

Let me search for Guillem Ribes of Perpinyà before drafting the file.

Identified bishop ambiguities and prepared Stage 3 edition file

Identified bishop ambiguities and prepared Stage 3 edition file

The search yielded little on Guillem Ribes himself in the Joan I context — the prosopography will need archival follow-up — but it did clarify the episcopal landscape: the bishop of Elna (whose jurisdictional seat had effectively migrated to Perpinyà by the 14th century) is the most plausible addressee, and the May 1387 dating sits on the cusp of the transition between Ramon d'Escales (1377–1380) and Bartomeu Peiró (whose episcopate the Catalan Wikipedia list dates 1387–1408). I'll note this carefully in the edition rather than over-commit.

Now drafting the Stage 3 file.

Created a file, read a file

Created a file, read a file

Stage 3 edition delivered. A few brief notes:

- I could not identify Guillem Ribes in published reference works, so footnote 2 flags him for archival follow-up rather than inventing a profile. The Perpinyà notarial archive, the Llibre.Verd.Major, and the Real.Patrimonio household lists would be the natural places to look.
- The episcopal addressee is treated as probably-but-not-certainly the bishop of Elna; the 1387 succession between Ramon d'Escales and Bartomeu Peiró is itself unresolved enough in the standard lists that I did not want to commit further on the surface of this folio.
- I have flagged the domèstech / e.no.als / iussio-by-ça-Costa cluster as dissertation-relevant in the closing note, in case it's useful when this document is collated against the other intercession letters in the corpus.

Aca joani guillemribes bisbe perpinya 1387 05 21

Document · MD

Want to be notified when Claude responds?

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