

Claude Opus 4.7 Adaptive

May 25, 2026

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

Claude finished the response

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

11:43 AM

Wrestled with Gothic Secretarial paleography and uncertain toponyms

Wrestled with Gothic Secretarial paleography and uncertain toponyms

Stage 1: Initial Transcription

A compulsòria from Joan I to the jurats and probi.homines of two towns, dated 28 May 1387 at Barcelona, concerning unauthorized impositions levied over the past six years. The eschatocol shows the vidit of Francesc ça Costa.

Transcription

1. Iohanes etc. ffidelibus nostris luratis et probis hominibus villarum [Cinistrelli?] [morsfran(--)?][1] Salutem
2. et gratiam. Percepimus relacione fidedign(or)um quod vos absque aliquo n(ost)ro [iussu? mandato?][2] seu co(n)cessione impositistis
3. certas [?] iuxta[?] pectinas [or pecunias?] in personis et levatis seu levari fec(is)tis in dicta villa et eius singulis impo-
4. siciones seu adiutas a .vi. annis citra de quo si ita est estis nobis puniendi. Quoc(ir)ca vob(is)
5. dicimus [si? et?] manda(mu)s [sub?] [nostre?] [et?] pen[a?] [acm?][3] quatenus infra .vi. dies a p(resenta)cione p(rese)nciu(m) vob(is)

6. fienda iuxta simplicem requisicionem qua(m) imp(re)nti(s) [or impositum?] vob(is) p(ri)mo [scito? facto?] et omne(m) p(ro)p(ri)am assignans q(uod)
7. v(est)ros responsalis legitimos comparere cora(m) nob(is) aut cora(m) n(ost)ro Theso(rario) qu(i) legitima
8. documenta de p(re)d(i)ctis heris[?][4] hostensuri. Al(ia)s lapso d(i)c(t)o t(er)mino p(re)d(i)cta cont(ra) vos et e(ti)am
9. un(iversi)tate(m) et eius singulares (in?) bona v(est)ra et eo(rum) occone [or actione?] pe(r) iuris [or iusticiam] sua(m)
10. debitu(m) v(est)ra absencia no(n) obstante (in?) co(n)maria [or contraria?][5] exigent(es). Data Barchin(on)e xxviiij die
11. Madii anno a nat(ivita)te D(omi)ni M.CCC.LXXX septimo. ffran(ciscu)s ça Costa

Document identification

- **Document type:** Compulsòria / mandatory citation summoning municipal officials to appear before the king or treasurer to answer for unauthorized fiscal impositions.
- **Issuing authority:** Joan I of Aragon ("Iohanes etc.).
- **Recipients:** Jurats and probi.homines of two villages whose names I cannot read with confidence (see note 1).
- **Date:** Barcelona, 28 May 1387 (anno a nativitate Domini M.CCC.LXXXVIIo).
- **Vidit:** Francesc ça Costa, vice-chancellor — consistent with his attestations elsewhere in this register.
- **Subject:** Royal inquiry into impositions (imposiciones.seu.adiute) levied "a .vi. annis citra" without royal authorization; demand that legitimate representatives appear with documentary justification within six days of presentation, on pain of proceedings against the universitas and its members despite their absence.

Paleographic notes on uncertain readings

[1] **Line 1, the two toponyms.** I cannot resolve either place name with confidence. The first appears to read something like Cinistrelli / Cimistrelli / Castristrelli — beginning with a downstroke that could be C, with subsequent minims allowing several readings of the medial cluster, and an _lli termination. The second begins with what looks like m + o-e + rs-ff, then fran with a tilde — possibly Morsfran(ch) or Mor(t)fran(co) or even an abbreviated form of Montfran_ / Montferrand_. Given that this is an address to a paired

set of villages under shared jurisdiction, identifying these toponyms will likely clarify the document's territorial significance considerably.

[2] Line 2, "absque aliquo n(ost)ro ___ seu commissione." The expected formula is "absque aliquo nostro iussu seu mandato" or "absque aliquo nostro mandato seu commissione." The word between nostro and seu shows minims I cannot resolve — possibly iussu, possibly consensu, possibly mandato. Note also that what follows could be read as concessione rather than commissione; the latter is the standard chancery formula, but the c_ form is what I see.

[3] Line 5, the penalty clause. The standard formula here is "sub ira et indignacione nostra et pena ___" or "sub privacione graciae nostre et pena ___ aureorum." I cannot make out enough to choose between these confidently. The figure looks like it might be a sum in aureos or morabatinos, but the abbreviation is not legible to me.

[4] Line 8, "heris." I'm reading what looks like heris (= heredes? "heirs"?) or possibly hi[bi] / ibi. The grammar of the surrounding clause — "documenta de p(re)d(i)ctis ___ hostensuri" — would prefer ibi ("there") or eis ("to them") over heris, but the letters as I see them favor heris. The ibi reading would yield much smoother sense.

[5] Line 10, "co(n)maria" / "contraria." Either is paleographically defensible; contraria (substantival, "contrary measures") fits the syntax better, but I'm seeing what looks like an m rather than ntr. If co(m)maria is correct, I have no satisfactory gloss — perhaps a chancery-Catalan loan I don't recognize.

General orthographic notes: Preserved as written: *graciam* (line 2), *relacione*, *fec(is)tis*, *occone* (?), *responsalis* (line 7, nom. pl. instead of *es*), *Theso(rario)*, *p(re)d(i)cta*, *hostensuri* (with prosthetic *h*), *Barchin(on)e*. The hand is consistent with what we've seen elsewhere from this register and from this scribe (compressed Gothic Secretarial with the usual extensive suspension).

Whenever convenient, send the HTR for Stage 2 reconciliation — the two toponyms in line 1 and the penalty clause in line 5 are the readings I'd most like a second witness on.

Here is the output from the other HTR for Stage 2: [Line 1] Johannes rex fidelibus r[egiis] iuratis [et] p[ro]bis hominib[us] ville d[e] Ministrolli montisserrat[i] salut[em] / [Line 2] et gra[tia]m P[er]cepim[us] relacione fidedignor[um] q[uod] vos absq[ue] aliquo titulo seu concessione imposuistis / [Line 3] exorib[us] p[re]teritis [et] imponitis et levatis seu levare facitis in d[ic]ta villa et eius t[er]m[in]is impo / [Line 4] siciones s[e]u adiutas a .xx. annis c[i]rca d[e] quo si ita est est[i]s n[ost]ro iudicio puniendi Quare vob[is] / [Line 5] dicim[us] [et] ma[n]dam[us] vob[is]q[ue] p[er] p[re]sentes firmit[er] iniu[n]gim[us] q[ua]t[enus] infra .iiij. dies a p[re]sentacione p[re]sen[cium] vob[is] / [Line 6] facie[n]da i[m]m[edi]ate

seque[n]tes qu[em]cu[m]q[ue] vob[is] p[er] p[ri]mo s[ecun]do [et] t[er]cio et
p[ere]mpt[orie] assignam[us] p[er] / [Line 7] vros resp[on]sales l[egi]timos co[m]peat[i]s
cora[m] nob[is] aut cora[m] n[ost]ro Thes[aurari]o s[e]u qua l[egi]tima / [Line 8]
docume[n]ta de p[re]missis h[ab]ent[is] ostensuri Et lapso d[ic]to t[er]m[in]io p[re]dicto
co[n]tra vos [et] d[ic]tam / [Line 9] u[ni]v[er]sitate[m] et eius si[n]gulares [et] bona n[ost]ra
et eor[um] r[aci]o[n]e p[re]d[i]c[t]a p[ro]ut ius [et] iusticia sua[de] / [Line 10] debit[ur]
v[es]tri absentia no[n] obsta[n]t[is] [et] contumacia exigente Da[ta] barch[inone] xxvj[o] die
/ [Line 11] dece[m]b[ri]s anno a nat[ivitate] d[omi]ni m[o] CCCo lxxxo sep[ti]mo. /
Fra[n]cisc[us] ça Costa

Show more

11:51 AM

Reconciled competing transcriptions and adjudicated paleographic uncertainties

Reconciled competing transcriptions and adjudicated paleographic uncertainties

Stage 2: Reconciliation

The HTR catches several of my errors decisively — most importantly, the toponym — but also contains at least one clear hallucination ("exoribus") and at least two readings I'd contest on paleographic grounds (the month). Working through systematically:

A. Where the HTR corrects my Stage 1

Line 1, the toponym. HTR's "ville d[e] Ministrolli montisserrat[i]" is correct, and resolves my struggle: this is **Monistrol de Montserrat**, not two separate villages. What I was reading as "morsfran" with abbreviation is in fact "M[on]s[i]serrat[i]" with the heavy nasal/abbreviation strokes I misparsed as letterforms. Ville (singular) rather than my villarum (plural) is also correct — the genitive-singular ending of the place name confirms this. This is a Benedictine-jurisdiction town below the abbey of Montserrat, which has obvious dissertation relevance for royal reach into ecclesiastically-subordinate communities.

Line 2, "absque aliquo titulo seu concessione." HTR's titulo is right; my nullo / iussu readings were wrong. The standard chancery doublet "sine titulo seu concessione" fits paleographically and formulaically. Concessione over my commissione/confessione is also correct.

Line 4, "nostro iudicio puniendi." HTR is right. I read this as just nobis.puniendi; the nostro. iudicio phrase is paleographically present and gives proper sense.

Line 5, the order clause. HTR's "et mandam[us] vob[is]q[ue] p[er] p[re]sentes firmit[er] iniu[n]gim[us] q[ua]t[enus]..." is the standard formula and is what's actually in the manuscript. My Stage 1 attempt at this clause was speculative; the HTR resolves it.

Line 6, the assignment-of-terms formula. HTR's "p[er] p[ri]mo s[ecun]do [et] t[er]cio et p[er]empt[orie] assignam[us]" is correct — this is the standard *citatio peremptoria* in three terms which I should have recognized and didn't. My "p(ri)mo [scito] et omne(m) p(ro)p(ri)am" was a misparse of exactly this formula.

Line 8, "documenta de p[re]missis h[ab]entes ostensuri." HTR is right; my *heris. hostensuri* is wrong. The "habentes.ostensuri" participial chain is the standard construction (citizens "having [documents] about to show").

Line 9, "ratione predicta prout ius et iusticia suade[bit]." HTR's formula is correct. My *occone / iusticia.sua* readings were fragments of this standard chancery clause.

Line 10, "et contumacia exigente." HTR is right. My *co(n)maria.exigent(es)* was wrong; the correct phrase is the standard penalty for contumacious absence, *contumacia. exigente* ("contumacy requiring [it]").

Line 10, day number. HTR's *xxvj* (26) is probably correct over my *xxviiij* (28). Looking again at the manuscript, after the *v l* I see only one *minim* with a final stroke, not three; *xxvj* fits better.

B. Where my Stage 1 is preferred, or HTR is clearly wrong

Line 3, "exoribus preteritis." This is an HTR hallucination — *exoribus* is not a Latin word, and the phrase as given makes no grammatical sense in the surrounding context. Given the syntactic position (between *imposuistis* and *et.imponitis.et.levatis*), the expected reading would be something like "**temporibus preteritis**" ("in past times") or possibly "**exactionibus preteritis**" ("on past exactions"). The manuscript image is unclear here but does not support "exoribus" as such. I'd flag this for archival verification but read it provisionally as *temporibus.preteritis*.

Line 7, "compeatis." HTR's *compeatis* is not standard Latin. The expected form is *compare[a]tis* ("that you appear") or *comparere.faciatis* ("that you cause to appear" — i.e., your responsales). The manuscript almost certainly has one of these; *compeatis* is an HTR misread of *compare[a]tis*.

Line 10, "debitur." HTR gives *debitur*, which is not a standard form. The construction wants something like *debit[a].fuerit* or *fuerit.debitum* — the manuscript probably has *debit[a]. fuerit* or similar. Leaving as [?] in reconciled text.

Line 11, the month name. HTR reads decembris; I read Madii. Looking carefully at the manuscript again:

- The word is short and compact, more consistent with the 5 graphemes of Madii than the 9 of decembris even allowing for abbreviation.
- I see a clear descender mid-word that fits the d of Madii better than anything in decembris (in this hand b and r don't typically descend; p does, but decembris has no p).
- The first letter has minim-structure that fits M better than d with curved ascender.

I lean **Madii** over decembris. But this is genuinely contested and I'd want archival verification — the difference between 26 May and 26 December 1387 matters for itinerary and for the document's place in the regnal sequence. **Important for adjudication:** if Joan I's itinerary places him at Barcelona on only one of these two dates, that should settle it.

C. Where both readings are uncertain

Line 4, "a .[?]. annis citra." I read ꝑviꝑ (6 years); HTR reads ꝑxxꝑ (20 years). Looking at the manuscript: the strokes are more vertical and minim-like than crossing, which favors ꝑviꝑ over ꝑxxꝑ. But Roman numerals in this hand can be ambiguous. The historical implication is significant — a 20-year reach back would extend into the reign of Pere III; a 6-year reach back is contained within the recent past. Marked [?] with both readings noted.

Line 5, "infra .[?]. dies." I read ꝑviꝑ (6 days); HTR reads ꝑiiiiꝑ (4 days). Similar paleographic ambiguity. Both are plausible response-windows in chancery citations. Marked [?].

Line 3, "imposuistis [?] et imponitis et levatis." As noted above, HTR's exoribus. preteritis is wrong; my reading of this passage is also weak. Temporibus.preteritis is my best guess but not paleographically confirmed.

Line 5, "Quare" vs "Quocirca." HTR has Quare; I had Quocirca. Both are standard chancery transitions; I cannot adjudicate from the image without zoom — neither significantly affects the sense.

D. Reconciled transcription

1. Iohannes etc. ffidelibus n(ost)ris luratis et p(ro)bis ho(min)ib(us) ville
de Ministrolli M(on)t(is)serrat[i][1] salutem

2. et gratiam. Percepim(us) relacione fidedign(or)um q(uod) vos absque aliquo titulo seu concessione imposuistis
3. [temporibus?] p(re)t(er)itis et imponitis et levatis seu levati fec(is)tis in d(i)c(t)a villa et eius t(er)m(in)is impositionibus seu adiutas a .vi.[?] / xx.[?] annis citra de quo si ita est estis n(ost)ro iudicio puniendi. Qua(re) vob(is)
5. dicim(us) et manda(mu)s vob(is)q(ue) per p(re)sentis firmit(er) iniu(n)gim(us) q(ua)t(enus) infra .vi.[?] / iiii.[?] dies a p(re)se(n)ta(c)ione p(re)se(n)cium vob(is)
6. facienda im(m)ediate sequentes que(m)cu(m)q(ue) vob(is) p(er) p(ri)mo s(e)c(un)do et t(er)cio et p(ere)mpt(orie) assignam(us) p(er)
7. v(est)ros responsales legitimos compare[a]tis cora(m) nob(is) aut cora(m) n(ost)ro Theso(rario) seu qua[2] legitima
8. documenta de p(re)missis h(ab)entes ostensuri. Et lapso d(i)c(t)o t(er)m(in)o p(re)dicto cont(ra) vos et d(i)c(t)am
9. un(iversi)tate(m) et eius singulares et bona v(est)ra et eo(rum) ra(c)io(n)e p(re)d(i)c(t)a p(ro)ut ius et iusticia suade-
10. -bit[?] v(est)ri[3] absentia non obstante et contumacia exigente.
Data Barchin(on)e xxvj die
11. Madii[?] / decembris[?] anno a nat(ivita)te D(omi)ni M(o) CCCo LXXXo septimo. ffran(ciscus) ça Costa

Reconciliation notes:

[1] Read with HTR; the heavy abbreviation in the manuscript made me misparse this as two separate village names. The town is **Monistrol de Montserrat**, in the comarca of Bages — a community subject to the abbey of Montserrat.

[2] HTR's seu.qua.legitima — seu here may instead be cum or qui; the relative pronoun is paleographically ambiguous. Reading as seu.qua with HTR provisionally.

[3] HTR has vestri; I had vestra in Stage 1. Vestra (agreeing with ausencia) is grammatically correct; vestri (genitive of vos) is also possible but unusual. Leaning vestra despite HTR.

Items I'd most want to verify against the original manuscript

1. **The month name** (line 11). Madii vs decembris materially changes the document's date and Joan I's itinerary attribution.
2. **The year-count for impositions** (line 4). ꝑviꝑ vs ꝑxxꝑ — six versus twenty years — significantly changes the document's reach.
3. **The response-window** (line 5). ꝑviꝑ vs ꝑiiiiꝑ days.
4. **Line 3's "[temporibus?] preteritis"** — what is actually in the manuscript between imposuistis and preteritis?

When you have a moment to verify these, I can move to Stage 3.

The month is definitely Madii (May). Line 4 resolution: it is certainly .xx. which is 20 years. Line 5 resolution: q[ua]t[enus] infra .iiii. dies with "or" as superscript over .iiii. and this resolves to quattor, four days. Line 3 resolution: it is certainly temporibus preteritis before et imponitis et lavatis. Please now proceed to Stage 3.

12:02 PM

Reconciled textual ambiguities and prepared comprehensive scholarly edition

Reconciled textual ambiguities and prepared comprehensive scholarly edition

Stage 3 edition is in the outputs directory. A few notes on the substance worth flagging beyond what's in the document itself:

The twenty-year reach is the most dissertation-relevant feature here.

Levying impositions without royal authorization at Monistrol for two decades takes the abuse back to roughly 1367 — well into Pere III's reign — and the choice to litigate it within five months of Joan I's accession (January 1387 → 26 May) is a posture worth noting. It fits the pattern of a new king asserting jurisdictional control over fiscal practice in lordship-subject communities at the opening of the reign, which is exactly the kind of intervention your argument about royal reach would want to track.

The compressed citatio.peremptoria in four days is also unusually tight. For a town under abbey jurisdiction, four days to assemble documentation, draw up procuratorial mandates, and dispatch representatives to Barcelona is procedurally aggressive. Whether that

aggression reflects the seriousness of the alleged abuse or a deliberately squeezing posture toward Montserrat's lordship is something I'd want to compare against parallel mandates in the same register window.

The reference to alternate appearance coram.nobis.aut.coram.nostro.Thesaurario is also worth flagging for your dual-office-routing interests — fiscal matters can be heard by the king directly or by the Treasurer, with no other intermediate body named. That binary is itself a jurisdictional claim.

Aca joani impositionsmonistrol barcelona 1387 05 26

Document · MD

Want to be notified when Claude responds?

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