

Claude Opus 4.6 Medium

June 17, 2026

I have a Catalan letter written in 1387 in Gothic Secretarial Hand. Please do your best to transcribe for Stage 1.

10:30 AM

Deciphered medieval Catalan manuscript and compiled comprehensive transcription

Let me examine this manuscript image carefully. It's a Catalan document from 1387 in Gothic Secretarial Hand. Let me transcribe what I can see.

The document appears to be a letter from the Queen (la Reyna) to the battle general, concerning property/possession in the vila d'Exea (Ejea). Let me work through it line by line.

Let me enhance the image first to get a better look.

Enhance the full manuscript image for better reading

Script

Let me view the enhanced image.

View enhanced manuscript image

Now let me do targeted crops of individual lines for closer reading.

Crop individual lines for close reading

Script

Let me view the individual lines.

Line 1

Line 1: "la Reyna."

Line 2

Line 2: "battle general. Lo senyor Rey per sa letra patent vos escriu com anat [?] vos entr[e/o]mpet [?]"

Let me look more carefully. "battle general" — yes. "Lo senyor Rey per sa letra patent vos escriu / co[m] anat [?] vos entrompet [?]"

Wait, let me re-read. "Lo senyor Rey per sa letra patent vos cpriu / cos [?] anat vos [entro]mpet"

Hmm, "escriu" - the word looks like "cpriu" but that's probably "escriu" with the 'es' abbreviated or ligated.

Looking again at the sequence, I'm trying to parse "vos escriu com anat" — whether this reads as "writes to you as..." or if there's a different construction. The phrase "cos manat" doesn't quite fit Catalan grammar, so I'm reconsidering whether it's "com anat" or something else entirely. I'm stepping back to look at the broader context—this is a royal letter to the battle general about a property dispute involving Sancho Boyl and houses in the vila d'Exea. Reading line 2 again with fresh eyes: "cos" might be "com vos" contracted, and "manat" could be a past participle, making it "as he has commanded you to involve yourselves." But the letterforms are still giving me trouble—I need to look more carefully at what comes after "escriu" to pin down whether it's "cos anat" or "com manat."

Show less

Targeted crops of difficult readings

Script

Let me view these crops.

End of line 2 close-up

OK, now I can read this more clearly:

"patent vos escriu com anat [?] vos entrometets [?]"

Wait — "escriu" — looking at it: "e" then "s" then what looks like "criu" — so "escriu". Then after that: "com" (with nasal bar) — wait, I see "cos" — no. Let me look letter by letter.

After "escriu" I see: a letter that looks like 'c' or 'e', then 'o', then what might be 's' — forming "cos" — but then looking further I see "mana" with a bar over it followed by 't' — "manat".

Then "vos" then "entrometets" with a bar. So the sequence is "escriu cos manat vos entrometets" — which would translate to something like "writes to you how he has commanded you to involve yourselves." Though "cos" could be a contraction of "com vos" or just "com" with an 's' attached. But looking back at the original image at the end of line 2, after "escriu" the next word might actually be "com" with a nasal bar over the 'm', then "anat" or "manat", then "vos", then "entrometets." I'm second-

guessing myself on whether that's "cos" or something else entirely. I'm trying different interpretations of the text now. Maybe it's "escriu com anat vos entrometets" meaning "writes as you have gone to involve yourselves," or possibly with a singular verb form instead. I'm working through various ways the letters could be parsed together, considering whether certain words might be contracted or written closely.

My best reading so far is "com [h]a manat vos entrometets" — "as he has commanded you to involve yourselves" — where "cos" could be "com ha" written together with a nasal mark. This makes the most syntactic sense. Now I'm moving on to examine lines 3-4.

Show less

Lines 3-4

Lines 3-4:

Line 3: "lmets an Sancho Boyl pore me possessio dalcuns cases q [?] po en la vila d'Exea/"

Line 4: "e ot dret de placa (o de almudi) de la vila de Sos/ deles qls cases lo dit senyor"

Wait, let me look more carefully.

Line 3: "lmets" — this is the continuation from the previous line "entrometets" — no wait, that ended on the previous line. This line starts with "lmets" — is this "hmets" or "lmets"? Actually I think this is the beginning of a new word.

Actually, I need to reconsider how line 2 ends. Looking at the crop again, "vos entrometets" has what looks like an abbreviation mark on the final letters, so it might be "entrometets" or possibly "entrompuet" — I should trace back to see where line 2 actually terminates and whether line 3 continues from there or starts fresh. like it's written in a different language or script. The word boundaries are unclear, and I'm struggling to parse where one word ends and another begins — whether "entrompuet" flows into "hmets" or if there's a line break creating separate words. Let me step back and look at the full context to see if the surrounding text gives me clues about what this passage is actually saying. I'm trying to parse the opening word of line 3 more carefully — it could be "hmets" or "lmets," which might be a form of "metre" (to put). If it's "hmets en Sancho Boyl pore me possessio," that would read as "you put Sancho Boyl into possession," which makes sense in the context of a royal letter about property. But the construction with "entrometets" preceding it doesn't quite fit grammatically, so I'm still working through whether this is the right

reading or if there's an abbreviation I'm missing. I'm considering whether "metets" could be the medieval Catalan verb form of "metre" (to put), making the phrase "metets an Sancho Boyl" mean "put Sancho Boyl [into possession]" — though the exact preposition and object remain unclear from the text. I'm reconsidering whether the line break is where I thought it was—maybe "entro" ends line 2 and the rest continues below. Looking back at the macron marking, it seems to indicate a standard nasal abbreviation rather than a word ending, so "entrometet" might be the actual word with line 3 starting fresh. Maybe the issue is that I'm treating this as two separate words when it could be one continuous word split across the lines. Let me focus on deciphering that first word of line 3 more carefully.

Show less

More targeted crops

Script

Let me view these.

First word of line 3

Now I can see it more clearly. The first word on line 3 starts with what looks like "hm" — but actually, now I see it more clearly: it's "hmetets" or "lmetets" — wait. Actually looking at this crop: "hmeto an San..." — no.

The letters I see are: first a tall stroke (h or l), then 'm', 'e', 't', 'o' or 's'. Then "an" then "San[cho]..."

Hmm, actually the word looks like "hmeto" or "lmeto" — could this be "liurets"? No, the letters don't match.

Wait — I think the first letter is 'h' and it's followed by "mets" — so "hmetets." But in medieval Catalan, could this be "hiurets" where the 'i' and 'u' are run together? Looking at the letterforms: tall ascender (h), then what I'm reading as 'm' could actually be 'iu' — then 'r' — then 'ets'. So "hiurets" might be a form of "lliurar" (to deliver)? Actually no, "hiurets" would come from "hiurar," which isn't standard. Let me reconsider the letterforms here.

Maybe it's "lliurets" instead — that would make sense: "lliurets an Sancho Boyl en possessio" meaning to deliver or put Sancho Boyl into possession. "Lliurar" is a common legal verb in medieval Catalan documents. The issue is matching the actual letterforms to this reading — the first tall letter could be 'll', then what looks like 'm' might be 'iu', followed by the rest of the letters. I'm uncertain about this one, so I'll flag it as ambiguous between "hmetets" or "liurets."

Show less

Last word of line 2

Now I can see it much more clearly. The last word on line 2 is "entrompuet" — wait, no. Let me look letter by letter:

First: a capital or large 'E' — then 'n' — 't' — 'r' — 'o' — 'm' — 'p' [?] — 'u' [?] — 'e' — 't'

And there's a macron (bar) over the top, above the word, suggesting an abbreviation.

Hmm — actually I think this reads "Entrometets" — with the macron covering the missing letters.

Looking more carefully at the individual letters, the 'e' in "Entro" has that tall stroke, followed by 'm', then what could be "puet" or possibly "metets" if the macron indicates an abbreviation. The word might be "entrometent" — a form meaning "involving (themselves)" — with the nasal bar over the ending. But that second-to-last letter really does look like a 'u' or 'v', and the 'p' is quite distinct, so I'm still uncertain whether it's "entrompuet" or something else entirely. I'm settling on "entrometets" as my best reading—the macron likely abbreviates what would be the second person plural form of "entrometre," meaning to involve or intervene. The letterforms are tricky to parse, but this seems like the most plausible Catalan word that fits the visible strokes. Now I'll move on to parsing the remaining lines.

Show less

Lines 5-6

Lines 5-6:

Line 5: "li ha feta donacio abenplant / pregons [?] q la dita letra porto veure pus"

Line 6: "largament / per q com lo senyor Rey hi nos haja acor e vuila / mogutz q los"

Wait, let me re-read more carefully.

Line 5: "li ha feta donacio abenplant" — "abenplant" — is this "ab en Plant [?]" = "with en Plant"? Or "ab en plant" — hmm. Wait, there's a superscript: I see a '3' or similar above "abenplant." Looking again: "ab en plant" — with the '3' superscript indicating an insertion or a scribal correction.

Actually: "donacio ab en plant" — no. Looking again: "feta donacio" then what? I see "ab" then "enplant" [?] or "ab" then "en" then "plant." Could this be "ab en Plantí" [?]? Or "abemplant" [?]? The superscript mark might be a correction indicator rather than a numeral. Moving on: "/ pregons co [?] q la dita letra porto veure pus" — "pregons" — is this "segons" (according to)? That doesn't quite fit the context here.

Wait, looking more carefully at the letterforms, that first letter with the descender could be a long 's' rather than a 'p'. Reading it as "segons que la dita letra porta veure pus largament" makes much more sense — "as the said letter shows more fully."

But I'm noticing there's a slash mark between "abenplant" and "segons," so there might be a word or abbreviation I'm missing there. And looking at the ending of "porto," it could actually be "porta" — the third person singular form fits the grammar better, even if the scribe wrote it with an 'o'.

Now examining line 6: "largament / per que com lo senyor Rey hi nos haja acor e vuilla / mogutz q los" — I need to parse what "per que com" means in this context and how it connects to the king's agreement. I'm working through the grammar and vocabulary here. "Mogutz" is the past participle "moved," and I'm trying to parse whether "acor" is a variant of "acord" (agreement). The phrase seems to be saying "because since the lord King has therein given us agreement and will, moved that the..." — though the exact construction with "haja acor e vuilla" is still unclear, possibly involving subjunctive forms of "haver" and "voler."

Show less

Lines 7-8

Lines 7-8:

Line 7: "pueys ql dit porter [?] nos ha fets longament / e fa tot dia q ell se alegre [?]"

Line 8: "de la concessio despodia [?] / e y consequent haja obtingut [?] la dita possessio / per qany [?]"

Hmm, let me re-read.

Line 7: "pueys" — wait, the first letter has a descender. Is it 'p' or 'g'? Looking: "pueys" with a 'p'.

Now looking at "ql" which expands to "que·l" or "que el". The word after "dit" is tricky — it could be "porter," "porrer," or something else entirely. In the context of a letter about Sancho Boyl, I need to reconsider what makes sense here.

The phrase structure "pueys que·l dit porter" might mean "since the said porter/doorkeeper," but that doesn't quite fit the flow. I'm wondering if "porzer" could actually be "poder" (power) or "portar" (to carry), or if it's "portier" — a doorkeeper or gatekeeper. Let me look at the letterforms more carefully to pin this down.

Reconsidering the passage: the Queen is writing about the King's letter regarding Sancho Boyl and the houses in Exea. The phrase "nos ha fets longament" suggests

someone has "done" or "made" something for them at length — so I need to figure out who or what that entity is.

Looking more carefully at the letters after "dit," I'm second-guessing whether it's "porter" at all. The character sequence could be "portier," "prior," or even something like "procés" — the handwriting makes it genuinely difficult to pin down. Maybe the word breaks aren't where I think they are, and it's actually "dit por" followed by something else entirely.

Let me step back and reconsider the whole sentence structure. If "dit" modifies "senyor" from the previous line instead of the word immediately after it, that changes everything. And then there's "mogutz" — I'm not sure how that connects to what follows. It might be "mogutz que los pueys" or perhaps "mogutz que los / pueys que·l dit porter" — the syntax is unclear enough that I should probably flag this section and move forward rather than get stuck on it.

Actually, I'm wondering if "pueys" is the medieval Catalan word for "since" or "then" rather than something else entirely. And what about "porter" itself — could it be a surname like "Portella," or is it referring back to someone mentioned earlier in the letter? The letterforms really do look like p-o-r-t-e-r, but maybe I should consider alternatives like "procer" or "procés."

I'll flag "porter" as uncertain and move forward. Looking at the next line, "nos ha fets longament" — the "fets" (meaning done or made) makes more sense contextually than "fits," so that's probably "has done them for us at length." Then "e fa tot dia" means "and does every day," followed by what looks like "que ell se alegre" — "that he rejoices" — though I need to verify whether that last word is actually "alegre" or something else.

The phrase "que ell se alegre" could work if the King wants Sancho Boyl to enjoy the concession. But I'm also wondering if "se" might be "pe" or if "per" is abbreviated there. Moving to line 8, I'm seeing "de la concessio despodia" — and "despodia" is unclear, possibly the start of another word.

Actually, "dessus dita" (above-said) contracted together could explain this — "de la concessió dessus dita" would mean "of the above-said concession," which fits the context perfectly. The letterforms are ambiguous enough that it could be "despodia" or "dessus dita" run together, but the latter makes more sense grammatically.

Now I'm trying to parse the next phrase — "e y consequent" or possibly "per consequent" — the abbreviation mark is making it hard to tell exactly what's contracted here.

Then there's the word after "haja" that I'm struggling with. It looks like it could be "obtingut" (obtained), but the letters are ambiguous — I'm seeing 'o' 'b' followed by what might be 't' 'i', though the handwriting makes it difficult to be certain. I'm struggling to make out the exact word here — it could be "comprat," "cobrat," or something like "copramet," but the letterforms are too unclear to be certain. The context suggests the passage is describing how someone has obtained or acquired the mentioned possession, so I'll note this as highly uncertain and move forward with a tentative reading. , then 'a', then what looks like 'met' or 'niet'. Wait — could this be "obtingut" with the 'bt' combination creating an unusual letterform that looks like 'bp' or 'pt'? That would give me 'i', 'n', 'g', 'u', 't' following. But I'm probably overcomplicating this. Let me step back and read lines 7-8 as continuous text in the enhanced image to see if that clarifies things.

Show less

Zoom in on specific crux readings

Script

Let me view these.

Line 8 crux word

Now I can see it more clearly. The crux word: "consequent haja" then the next word — let me look: it starts with what looks like 'ob' — wait, actually it looks like "de" then "pramet" or "prament" — no.

Actually, looking again: I see "ob" (the 'o' is clear, then 'b' with a stroke) then "pramet" or "prament". So "obpramet" [?].

Wait — could the first letters be "ob" and the stroke on the 'b' is a standard abbreviation marker? "ob" with a stroke through the 'b' could expand to... hmm, not standard.

Hmm, let me reconsider the opening letters entirely. What if the first character isn't 'o' but 'c' or 'e'? And the second one might not be 'b' but something with a descender like 'h' or 'k'? The more I look at it, the less certain I am about those initial letters. Let me try different word combinations — maybe it's "obpramet" or something with "emparar" as the root, but none of these are matching up. I'm wondering if I'm misreading the letterforms entirely, or if this could be two separate words like "de pramet" instead of one compound word. Looking at the individual letterforms more carefully — in this Gothic hand, certain letters can be deceptively similar, so I'm reconsidering what each stroke actually represents. The second letter might be 'h'

rather than 'b', the third could be 'p' or 'q' depending on the descender, and later letters like 'm' versus 'ni' or even 'e' versus 'c' are ambiguous in this script. I'm working through the sequence letter by letter to see if "ob" at the start makes sense as a prefix. is genuinely difficult to pin down. Given the context about recovering the said possession, my best guesses are "obpramet" or "cobramet," though I'm not fully confident. Let me try one more angle — what if it's actually "obrament"? That would make more sense as a medieval Catalan word. probably refers to something like "obtained" in meaning. Now I need to work through the other difficult readings in this passage and continue transcribing the remaining lines.

Show less

Line 7 crux - "pueys ql dit porter"

OK, now I can see this more clearly. The word after "dit" — let me look letter by letter:

First letter: descender — 'p'

Second letter: 'o'

Third letter: 'r' (with a connecting stroke)

Fourth letter: 't' (the crossbar is visible)

Fifth letter: 'e' or 'a'

Sixth letter: 'r' or 'z'

So: "porter" or "portar" [?] — I think "porter" is correct. But in this context...

Wait — actually, "pueys ql dit porter" — in this context, "porter" could also be an infinitive: "portar" with scribal -er ending (Catalanism).

Or it could be a noun meaning someone who carries. I'm second-guessing the letter sequence though — could this be "procer"? No, the order seems clearly p-o-r-t-e-r. And if "porter" relates to "aportar" in medieval Catalan, meaning to bring or carry, then "lo dit porter" would be "the said carrier" or "the aforesaid one who brings."

This interpretation fits the context: the passage describes how this bearer of the King's letter has been pressing the battle general about the matter at length. The verb "ha fets" is giving me pause though — it needs an object, and I'm wondering if something like "precs" (requests) is implied but unstated.

Show less

Lines 9-end

Lines 9-11:

Line 9: "vos afectuosament q aquella li liurets o facats liurar / segons ql dit senyor"

Line 10: "en la dita sua letra vol e manay. Dada en Barchelona [?] jous [?] me pregell [?] pret [?] a"

Line 11: "xxvj. dies de juny. del any m ccc lxxvij. Berth. [?]"

Let me re-read more carefully.

Line 9: "vos afectuosament" — yes, "affectuosament" (affectionately/earnestly).

Continuing with line 9, the phrase "que aquella li liurets o facats liurar" means "that you deliver it to him or cause it to be delivered," followed by "segons que·l dit senyor" — "according to what the said lord." Line 10 opens with "en la dita sua letra vol e mana" (in his said letter he wishes and commands), and the document is dated in Barcelona, though some words remain unclear. I'm wondering if this might be "sots me segell pret" — "under my seal" — where "sots" means "under," "me" is "my," and "segell" is "seal," though "pret" still doesn't quite fit. The text is fragmentary here, but it seems like part of a dating or authentication formula that should come between the location and the actual date.

Show less

More targeted crops for remaining crux readings

Script

Let me view these crops.

Date formula

Now I can see it more clearly. After "Dada en Barchinona" (with typical abbreviation), the next words are:

"jots" or "sots" — looking: the first letter has a loop at top and descender — could be 's' or 'j' or even 'f'. Then 'o' 't' 's' — wait, actually it might be "jots" or "sots" or "lots" [?].

Then "me" or "me" — "mon" or "meu" (my)?

Then "pregell" or "segell" — wait, the first letter of this word: 'p' or 's' or 'f'? In the enhanced crop, it looks like it starts with 's' — so "segell" (seal)? Or 'p' — "pregell" [?].

Then the next word could be "jret" or "pret" or "prit" — or possibly "secret"? The letterforms are tricky here.

Actually, stepping back: "sots mon segell secret" would be a standard chancery formula meaning "under my secret seal" — this makes sense as a formulaic closing phrase. "Sots" means under, "mon" is my, "segell" is seal, and "secret" is secret. Looking at the actual letterforms though, I'm still uncertain about some of these readings. Looking at the seal formula more carefully — "sots nostre segell" seems to fit, where "sots" is the long initial 's' form. The word before "a" is trickier; it could be "pret" or "prit," but I'm not certain it matches "secret" as an abbreviation. Let me consider if "pret" might be a different word entirely in this context. I think "secret" is the word I'm struggling with—the letterforms are compressed and the 's' might look like a 'p' in this handwriting style. Given that this is from the Queen, the formula should be "sots nostre segell secret" (under our secret seal), using the royal plural, which is standard for Aragonese chancery documents. I'm second-guessing whether that first word might be "jots" instead, but that doesn't make sense as a word. Let me step back and accept the full formula as "Dada en Barchinona sots nostre segell secret a xxvj dies de juny del any m ccc lxxxvij" — that reads much more coherently as a dating clause. I'll move forward with this reading and check the remaining lines.

Show less

Line 3 middle section

Now I can read line 3 more clearly:

"[San]cho Boyl pore me possessio dalcuns cases q jo en la"

Wait — "pore me" — should be "pore [?] en" or "per en [?]?" Let me look: after "Boyl" I see "pore" or "pors" then "me" or "me" — hmm.

Actually: "pore" could be "poré" (= to put)? Or "pore" could be "per" expanded with 'e'. And "me" could be "en" — so "per en possessió" — "into possession." Hmm, but I clearly see 'p-o-r-e' and then 'm-e' (or maybe 'n-e').

I'm wondering if "pore me" might be a contracted form of "posar en" — the standard medieval Catalan administrative phrase meaning "to put in possession." Could this be abbreviated or written in a way I'm not immediately recognizing? Or perhaps "pore" is "per" and "me" is part of "metre"? I'm reconsidering whether "me" might actually be "en," and whether "pore" could be part of a longer construction like "por en" or an abbreviation of "metre en." The reading remains uncertain, but "por en metre en possessió" (to put into possession) seems most plausible, even if the exact parsing of these contracted or abbreviated forms isn't entirely clear. I'm reconsidering the line breaks and word boundaries here. What if "entrometets"

spans across lines 2 and 3, and the start of line 3 is actually a separate word like "lliurets" from the verb lliurar? Let me look more carefully at that first word on line 3 to see if it might be "hiurets" or something similar.

Actually, thinking about the medieval Catalan formula "lliurar en possessió" (to deliver into possession), I wonder if the text reads "lliurets an Sancho Boyl por e metre en possessió d'alcuns cases" — where "por e metre" means "for putting into possession." That would make more sense than my earlier reading of "pore me," though there's still some uncertainty here. I'll flag these as my best attempt and move forward.

Now I'm looking at "d'alcuns cases" (of certain houses) and trying to parse what comes next — there's a "q" followed by what might be "po" with an abbreviation mark, then "en la." The "jo" I initially read as "l" could actually be "ço" (a demonstrative), or the abbreviation might be hiding something else entirely. The text seems to be saying something like "that [something] in the [town]," but I need to look more carefully at what that abbreviation actually represents. The nasal bar over the 'o' in "so" indicates "son" (they are), which fits perfectly with the phrase "que són en la vila d'Exea" — "that are in the town of Exea." So the full passage reads "possessió d'alcuns cases que són en la vila d'Exea" — "possession of certain houses that are in the town of Exea."

Though looking at the actual letter in the image, it resembles 'j' or 'g' more than 's', but in Gothic secretarial script, the long initial 's' can take on those shapes, so I'm confident it's "son." Now moving to line 4.

Show less

Line 4

Now I can see two lines in this crop. The top one is line 4 and the bottom one is line 5.

Line 4 (top): "e ot dret de placa [?] co de almudi [?] dela vila de Sos / deles [?] qles cases lo dit senyor"

Wait — let me look more carefully. I see: "e ot" — is this "e ot" or "e ol" or "e olt" [?]? Could be "e olt" = "e olt[ra]" = "and beyond"? Or "e ol" = "e lo"?

Reconsidering "ot" — it might be an abbreviation for "del" if the 'd' is rendered as 'o', or possibly "olt" meaning "oltra" (beyond). The phrase "e ot dret de placa" could parse as "and of the right of the plaça" if "ot" is standing in for a preposition or article.

Actually, "e tot dret de plaça" makes more sense — "and all right of the plaça" — though I'm not seeing "lo" between "tot" and "dret" as I'd expect. But reading it as "e del dret de plaça o de almudí de la vila de Sos" fits perfectly: "and of the right of the plaza or of the almudí of the town of Sos," where almudí refers to a grain market or measure office. That's administratively coherent.

Now I'm noticing a superscript mark between lines 4 and 5, possibly a '3', and on line 5 the text continues with "li ha feta."

Looking more closely at line 5, I see "li ha feta donacio abenplant" with that superscript above "abenplant." Could this be "ab en Plantí" — with "en" as a courtesy title and "Plantí" as a name? That would give "li ha feta donació ab en Plantí" — "has made him/her a donation with/to en Plantí." Though "li ha feta donació" typically just means "has made a donation to him/her," so the construction feels slightly off.

But now I'm wondering if that superscript mark is actually an abbreviation indicator rather than a numeral, and whether the word might be something like "ab exemplar" or perhaps "ab en plan" with a final letter — or even a person's name like "ab en Plançó" or "ab en Planer." The letterforms aren't quite matching up with any of these readings yet.

Let me step back and try treating "abenplant" as two separate words instead: "aben" could be an Arabic-origin name prefix similar to "Ibn," which would give me "Aben Plant" or "Aben Plantí" as a possible surname. I'm also wondering if that superscript mark might indicate a marginal insertion or correction that I'm not seeing clearly.

My best guess at this point is either "ab en plant" or "abenplant" as a single word, though I'm flagging both as uncertain — and I'm still considering whether the whole thing might resolve to something like "ab en planta."

Moving on to line 4, I'm starting to make out what looks like an "e" followed by "ol" or something similar at the beginning. dit senyor" — "of which houses the said lord." So the passage reads: "and of the right of the plaza or of the almudí of the town of Sos / of which houses the said lord has made him a donation with en Plantí [?]" This is starting to come together — the Queen is instructing the battle general that the King's letter commands them to put Sancho Boyl into possession of certain houses in Exea and the rights to the plaza or almudí in Sos, which the lord has donated, though "ab en Plantí" remains unclear.

I'm wondering if this could be a patronymic — "Aben" or "Abenplant" — since those Ibn- or Aben- prefixes were common in 14th-century Aragon for Jewish and Muslim

names. Or it might be a misreading entirely, possibly "ab ençaplant" or "ab en plaçi." Either way, this is a critical reading I need to flag. Now I should move through the rest of the document to complete the full transcription.

Show less

Line 5 details

OK now I can see lines 5-6 together. Let me re-read:

Line 5: "li ha feta donació ab en plant [?] / segons ço q la dita letra porta veure pus"

Line 6: "largament / per q com lo senyor Rey hi nos haja acor e vuilla / mogutz q los"

Wait, in line 5: "segons ço q" — "ço" has a cedilla? Looking: "segons" then what looks like "co" or "ço" with some mark — in medieval Catalan "segons ço que" = "according to what." Yes.

After "abenplant" there's a separator, then "segons" followed by what could be "co" or "ço," then "q" standing for "que." The phrase "la dita letra porta veure pus" means "the said letter shows more [fully]" — though I'm debating whether that final letter is "porto" or "porta." The scribal 'a' at word endings often resembles 'o', but "porta" as the third person singular of "portar" fits the grammar better.

Line 6 continues with "largament" meaning "fully" or "amply," then another separator, then "per q" which expands to "per que," meaning "because" or "therefore."

Now I'm working through the next phrase: "com lo senyor Rey hi nos haja acor e vuilla mogutz que los" — this is tricky. "Hi" means "there" or "in this," "nos" is "us" or "our," "haja" is the subjunctive form of "have," and "vuilla" appears to be "vulla," the subjunctive of "voler" (to wish). The word "acor" might be "acord" (agreement), though it's unclear. Then "mogutz" looks like "moguts" (moved), which creates an awkward construction with "que los" that I'm still trying to parse.

Let me reconsider the full phrase with different word breaks: "per que com lo senyor Rey hi nos ha, ja acor e vulla, mogutz que los pueys que·l dit porter nos ha fets longament" — this would read as "because since the lord King has us therein, already in agreement and willing, moved that the... since the said bearer has importuned us for a long time." But the grammar still feels off, so I'm trying yet another arrangement where the subjunctive forms work better with the overall structure. que ell se alegre de la concessió dessus dita e en consequent haja la dita possessió, per gran vos affectuosament que aquella li liurets o façats liurar, segons que·l dit senyor en la dita sua letra vol e mana."

So the full structure is becoming clearer — we're moved by the prayers the bearer has made to us repeatedly, asking that he rejoice in the concession and consequently obtain the possession, and we're earnestly requesting that you deliver it to him as the lord King wishes and commands in his letter.

Now I'm reconsidering the line breaks and word divisions. Looking at "mogutz que los / pueys que·l dit porter nos ha fets longament" — the temporal conjunction "pueys" (since) seems to be the key here, indicating the reason for being moved, rather than "precs" (prayers) as I initially thought. Maybe "pueys" is actually "precs" (prayers/requests)—I need to look more carefully at the handwriting to distinguish between those letters. If it's "los precs," then the phrase makes more sense: "moved by the fact that the requests that the said bearer has made to us for a long time, and makes every day, [are] that he rejoice in the above-said concession." rife both possibilities. But looking at the grammar, "precs" (requests) fits perfectly—"ha fets" agrees with the masculine plural noun, and the full sentence structure makes sense: the requests that the bearer has made to us for a long time. So I'm confident "precs" is the correct reading, not "pueys."

Now I'm working through the syntax of "mogutz que·ls precs"—it's an unusual construction. "Mogutz" is a past participle meaning "moved," and it could modify "nos" (we are moved), with "que·ls precs" introducing a causal clause: we are moved by the fact that the requests... Then "que ell se alegre" would express the content of those requests—that he rejoice. I'm looking at line 7 more carefully now, examining the enhanced crop to pin down the exact letters. The first word appears to start with 'p', and tracing through the subsequent letters, it looks more like "pueys" than "precs" — the second letter really does seem to be 'u' rather than 'r'. So I'll transcribe "mogutz que los" and flag the uncertain reading, though "pueys" seems like the stronger reading for that opening word. I'm settling on "pueys" as the correct reading and working through the syntax — "mogutz que los pueys que·l dit porter nos ha fets longament" seems to have "los" referring back to something earlier, with "pueys que" introducing a new clause about what has been done for a long time. Now I'm moving forward with transcribing the full text, marking uncertain passages with brackets where the handwriting or abbreviations are ambiguous. I'm finishing the document with the location and date, then realizing there are quite a few uncertain readings throughout that I should review more carefully. Let me go back through some of the trickier passages—particularly some of the names and phrases that are hard to make out in the manuscript—to see if I can improve my transcription before finalizing it. Looking at the letter formation more carefully, I can see "p-r-e-g-a-m" — this is definitely "pregam," the standard Aragonese royal formula meaning "we ask

you." The word appears to be split across the line break, with "pregam" at the end of line 8 and "vos affectuosament" continuing on line 9.

Now I need to reconsider what comes before it. The sentence structure should be "and consequently may [verb] the said possession, we ask you affectionately that you deliver it to him or have it delivered" — so the verb after "haja" needs to be something like "obtained," "recovered," or "gained." Medieval Catalan would use words like "obtingut," "cobrat," "guanyat," or "aconseguit" for this sense.

Looking more carefully at the letterforms in the crop, I'm trying to parse whether it's "ob" or "de" followed by what looks like "pramet" or "prament." Could this be "obtengut"? The letters don't quite match what I'd expect. I'm wondering if I've been misreading the whole word — maybe it's "de pròpiament" or something else entirely. Let me look at the actual strokes after "haja" again to see if I can identify the first letters more clearly. Maybe "obtinguda" could work as an abbreviated form — that would be the feminine past participle meaning "obtained" or "possessed," which fits the context of "should have obtained the said possession." The letterforms seem to match up with around 7-8 visible strokes if it's abbreviated. I'm reconsidering the word at the beginning of line 3 — breaking down the letterforms, I think it's "lliurets" (you deliver/hand over), which would fit the construction "Lliurets an Sancho Boyl" meaning "you deliver to Sancho Boyl." That gives me a clearer reading of the sentence structure, though the phrase that follows still needs work. "per a" (for) and "me" might actually be a misread "en" (into), so the phrase would read "per a en possessió" — into possession — which would make the construction "deliver to Sancho Boyl for [the purpose of] into possession of certain houses."

But that's redundant. What if "me" is actually an abbreviation for "metre" (to put)? Then "per metre en possessió" would mean "to put into possession," giving us "deliver to Sancho Boyl to put [him] into possession of certain houses" — which makes much more sense grammatically and semantically.

Now I'm reconsidering the second line ending. Looking more carefully at "com ha manat vos entrometets," I wonder if "cos" might be "com hos" or "com vos" (as/that you), and "manat" as the past participle of "manar" — so the phrase would read "as he has commanded you to involve yourselves."

But examining it again, I think "cos" is actually "com ha" run together, making it "escriu com ha manat vos entrometets" — "writes to you how he has commanded you to involve yourselves." Let me look at the exact sequence one more time to be sure. So "com ha manat" makes sense as "as he has commanded," likely written

with compression. Looking at the word order again, I'm seeing "com" then "manat" then "vos" before "entrometets" — which would give "com [ha] manat vos entrometets," meaning "as [he] has commanded you to involve yourselves." That reading fits better grammatically. The construction "com ha manat" makes sense as an absolute past participle — "as commanded" — so I'll go with that reading. Now I'm looking at line 3 where "pore me possessio" is tricky; it could be an abbreviated form like "per a metre en possessió" meaning "to put into possession," though I'm not entirely certain. I should move forward with compiling the full transcription now.

Show less

Final targeted crops for remaining crux readings

Script

Let me view these final crops.

pregam area

Now I can see this more clearly. On the right side of line 8, I see: "la dita possessio / pregam" — wait, looking: "la dita possio [?]" — hmm, "possio" or "possessio" — actually I think it's abbreviated "posso" with a macron = "possessió."

Then: "/" separator, then: "per gany" or "pregany" — looking: I see 'p' then what looks like 'er' or 're' ligature, then 'g' then 'a' then 'm' or 'ny'.

Actually, I think the word is "pregam" — the correct form meaning "we pray" or "we ask" — but those final strokes are confusing me. The 'm' with its descender might be what I'm reading as 'y', since "pregany" isn't a real word in this language.

Looking at the context, this fits perfectly with the formulaic phrase "pregam vos affectuosament" (we earnestly beseech you), so I'm confident it's "pregam." The full passage reads: "la dita possessió, pregam vos affectuosament que aquella li liurets o façats liurar..." and below that I can make out the start of line 10 with "mana / segons que·l dit senyor."

Show less

The crux word between haja and la dita possessio

Now I can see this word more closely: after "haja" the next word is — looking letter by letter:

First: what looks like 'ob' — but actually, it starts with a letter that has a descender or a loop — it could be 'o', 'c', or even 'de'. Then there's a 'b' or vertical stroke.

Wait — actually, I now see that the first element is: a round letter 'o' or 'c', then what looks like 'b' with a stroke through it. In some abbreviation systems, 'p' with a stroke through the descender = "per" or "pro." So could this be "per" + something?

Looking more carefully at the sequence, I'm seeing what might be 'o' followed by 'b' with a stroke, then 'r' or 'l', then 'a', then 'm' or 'in', and finally 'et' or 'ent' at the end. The whole thing could potentially be an abbreviated form of "obtingut" or something similar, though I'm still uncertain about that initial abbreviation mark. "obtrament" or similar doesn't work either. But then I consider "cobramet" — could this be "cobrament," a medieval Catalan noun meaning recovery or acquisition from the verb "cobrar"? That would fit the phrase "haja cobrament la dita possessió" as "have recovery of the said possession." Checking the letterforms against c-o-b-r-a-m-e-n-t, the 'c' does appear to be that rounded form.

Looking more carefully at the opening letters, I see two distinct elements — a round shape followed by a vertical stroke with something at the top, which could parse as 'co' or 'ob' followed by 'b' or 'l'. If it's "cob," then the remaining visible letters should spell "rament," and I can make out what looks like 'r-a-m-e-t' or 'r-a-m-e-n-t'. So "cobrament" does seem to fit, though the syntax of "haja cobrament" with "possessió" following is still unclear.

If "haja" means "has" and "cobrament" means "recovery," the phrase would be "has recovery of the said possession," but that would normally require a preposition like "de" before "la dita possessió." I'm also considering whether there might be a different word boundary or structure I'm missing — perhaps something like "de prement" or another construction entirely. I'm cycling through more possibilities—"obtament," "optament," trying different letter combinations with abbreviation marks—but none of them yield a word that makes sense in context. Even parsing "ob" + "pre" + "ament" or "ob" + "per" + "ament" leads nowhere. I'm genuinely stuck on this crux and need to flag it as uncertain.

The most plausible reading from context is that it means "obtained" or "recovered," so my best guesses remain "cobrament" or possibly a compressed form of "obtingut." But I'm also wondering if this could be "de present" (meaning "presently" or "at present" in medieval Catalan) written in a compressed or abbreviated way—perhaps "pramet" is a contracted form of "present"—which would give the phrase "have presently the said possession," though the syntax feels off.

The letter compression theory is a stretch, so I'll settle on the uncertain reading and finalize the transcription.

Show less

Line 6 end - mogutz q los

Now I can see: "acor e vuilla / mogutz q los" —

"acor" — the word looks like: 'a' + 'c' + 'o' + 'r'. "Acor" = probably "acord" (agreement, with silent final 'd').

"vuilla" — 'v' + 'u' + 'i' + 'l' + 'l' + 'a'. "Vuilla" = "vulla" (wish, subjunctive of voler). With the 'i' being an insertion or just how the scribe writes the double-l.

"Mogutz" breaks down as 'm' + 'o' + 'g' + 'u' + 't' + 'z', which should be "moguts" (moved, past participle masculine plural). And "q los" is "que los" or "que·ls" (that the...). Now I need to see what word comes next on line 7 to complete this phrase.

Line 7 start

Now I can see the first word of line 7 more clearly. It starts with a 'p' (clear descender), then: 'u' or 'r', then 'e' or 'i', then 'y' or 'c', then 's' or 'o'.

Looking at the letters: 'p' → 'u' → 'e' → 'y' → 'o' or 's' → so "pueyo" or "pueys"?

Hmm — "pueyo" — that's a place name (Pueyo = a hill/settlement name in Aragonese). But in this context...

The second letter could actually be 'r' instead of 'u' — in Gothic secretarial hand, 'r' often has a curved form, especially after round letters. So I'm weighing two possibilities: "pueys" (meaning "since" or "then" in French) versus "precs" (meaning "prayers" or "requests"). The curved bottom of that second letter is the key to distinguishing between them.

Looking at the full phrase "mogutz que·ls precs que·l dit porter nos ha fets longament" makes much more sense contextually than the "pueys" version, but paleographically the letter still reads more like 'u' to me. If it is "pueys," I'm struggling to parse what that would mean in this context — unless it's a verb form or refers to weights/burdens somehow. I'm also considering whether it could be "prechs," a variant spelling of "precs," but the letter forms don't quite match that either.

Wait, I should reconsider the syntactic structure entirely. What if "mogutz" starts a new sentence and "que·ls" breaks down differently — as "que + los" where "los" is the pronoun "them"? That would give me "Moved by those, since the said bearer has importuned us for a long time and does every day..." where "que los" means "by those" and "pueys que" functions as a conjunction meaning "since."

But that doesn't quite work either — "los" can't easily be the object of "mogutz" with "que" preceding it. Let me try another parsing: what if it's "mogutz que los precs" — "moved by the prayers" — where the prayers are what the bearer has made to us repeatedly, and the whole thing means he's asking that he rejoice in the concession? Or without "precs," just "mogutz que los pueys" — but that leaves me uncertain about the structure.

I'm wondering if I should be reading the line break between line 6 and 7 differently. The Queen is moved by these repeated requests and wants to write to the battle general to ensure compliance. I'm also working through some ambiguous phrases like "e y consequent" — whether that's "and consequently" or another construction — and "se alegre," which seems to mean the porter should enjoy or benefit from the concession. I have enough now to produce a solid first transcription.

For the date formula, I'm parsing "Dada en Barchinona sots me segell pret a xxvj dies de juny del any m ccc lxxxvij" — trying to determine if "sots" might be "jots" or if "me" could be "mon," though the standard reading seems more likely. I'm trying to parse the abbreviations and letter forms more carefully. "Sots mon segell secret" seems like the most likely reading — "under my secret seal" — where "mon" might be abbreviated to "mo" with a macron, or possibly "me" representing "meu." The seal word looks like it starts with 's' rather than 'p', so "segell" makes sense. That last word before "a" is trickier — it could be an abbreviated form of "secret," though the initial letter is ambiguous.

Now I'm looking at the scribe's name at the end: "Berth." appears to be a signature, possibly short for "Bartholomeus" or "Barthomeus." The dating formula "del any m ccc lxxxvij" is starting to come into focus — "m" represents 1000, "ccc" is 300, and I need to work out the rest of the Roman numerals to get the full year. Sos del Rey Católico in Aragon fits the geographical context alongside Exea, both towns in the Cinco Villas region. Now I'm assembling the full Stage 1 transcription from the document, starting with the royal letter where the King instructs the bailiff to involve himself in delivering properties to Sancho Boyl — specifically some houses in Exea and rights to the market or granary in Sos. I'm reconsidering the verb forms and syntax more carefully — "façats liurar" means "cause to be delivered," and the phrase "segons que·l dit senyor en la dita sua letra vol e mana" translates to "according to what the said lord in his said letter wills and commands." I'm also second-guessing my earlier reading of "liurets" in line 3, as it might be a different word form entirely. ometets y metets an Sancho Boyl en possessió..." — "you involve yourselves and put Sancho Boyl into possession..." In this reading, "y metets" = "and

put" and "pore me possessió" = "en possessió" with 'p' being 'en' [?] — hmm, that doesn't work because "pore" clearly starts with 'p'.

But wait: "entrometets / e metets an Sancho Boyl por [a] en [?] possessió..." — "and you put Sancho Boyl into possession..."

Hmm, looking at the first word of line 3 one more time in my crop: I see a tall stroke (ascender), then what follows looks like 'me' 'ts' or 'iu' 're' 'ts'. If the tall stroke is 'l' (or 'll

'), then "liurets" = "lliurets." If it's 'h', then... "hmetets" [?].

For "pore me possessió": in context, "por en me possessió" or "por en [?] possessió" — what if "pore" = "pore" [?] and "me" is actually "en" with 'm' misread for 'n'? "por en possessió" = "per en possessió" — "into possession." Still awkward. Or what if the entire phrase is "liurets an Sancho Boyl por en me possessió" where "en me" = "a mi" (to me)? That doesn't quite work either, and I'm wondering if "me" is even a separate word or part of something else.

The most straightforward interpretation might be "lliurets an Sancho Boyl por [a] en possessió d'alcuns cases" with "me" being either a misreading on my part or a filler word, or possibly "lliurets an Sancho Boyl, por ell, en possessió d'alcuns cases" — "deliver to Sancho Boyl, through him, into possession of certain houses" — though that would require "por ell" to be "per ell" in proper Catalan, and the letter forms don't quite match what I'm seeing.

Let me consider whether "pore" might actually be "poré" as the stressed form of "per" in Aragonese, making "pore me possessió" something like "per en [?] possessió" or "into possession," with "me" potentially being Aragonese for "mi" or "en" — this is genuinely difficult to parse with certainty, so I'll flag this uncertain passage and move forward with my best transcription.

As for the scribe "Berth.," this could be Bartholomeus abbreviated, and while Bartholomeus Sirvent is a known scribe from Violant de Bar's chancery, the fact that this letter is from "la Reyna" suggests it might indeed be from the Queen's own scribal staff, which opens up other possibilities.

What's particularly interesting here is that the Queen is writing to enforce the King's command to the battle general — this is a case of reginal authority backing royal mandates, which could be significant for the dissertation.

Show less

Done

Here is my Stage 1 transcription. This is a dense, tightly written Catalan letter with several genuine crux readings that I'll flag.

Document identification: Letter from Queen Violant de Bar ("la Reyna") to the batlle general, ordering compliance with a royal patent letter of Joan I concerning Sancho Boyl's possession of properties in Exea and Sos. Dated Barcelona, 26 June 1387. Scribed by "Berth." (likely Bartholomeus Sirvent).

Document type: Administrative mandate — reginal enforcement of a royal possessory order.

Stage 1 Transcription

la Reyna.

Batlle general. Lo senyor Rey per sa letra patent vos escriu com [h]a manat [?] vos entrometets [?] / liurets [?] an Sancho Boyl por [a] me[tre en] [?] possessió d'alcuns cases que son [?] en la vila d'Exea, / e del [?] dret de plaça o de almudí de la vila de Sos, / de les quals cases lo dit senyor / li ha feta donació ab en Plant [?]^[?] / segons ço que la dita letra porta veure pus / largament. / Per que com lo senyor Rey hi nos haja acor [?] e vuilla, / mogutz que·ls / pueys [?] que·l dit porter nos ha fets longament, / e fa tot dia, que ell se alegre / de la concessió dessús dita [?], / e y consequent haja obpramet [?] la dita possessió, / pregam / vos affectuosament que aquella li liurets o façats liurar, / segons que·l dit senyor / en la dita sua letra vol e mana. Dada en Barchinona sots mon [?] segell secret [?] a / xxvj dies de juny. del any m ccc lxxxvij. Berth[?].

Crux Readings

1. **"com [h]a manat vos entrometets"** (line 2): The word after "escriu" is compressed; I read "com [h]a manat" (as he has commanded), with the "ha" possibly absorbed into what follows. The final word of line 2 carries a macron; I expand to "entrometets" (2nd pl. subj. of *entrometre*), but the visible minim strokes are ambiguous — could be "entrompuet" [?].

2. **"liurets"** (line 3, first word): Begins with a tall ascender. My best reading is "liurets" (= *lliurets*, 2nd pl. subj. of *lliurar*), but the ascender-plus-minim sequence could also yield "hmetets" or "e metets" [?]. Contextually, "lliurets an Sancho Boyl" (you deliver to Sancho Boyl) fits the possessory mandate well.
3. **"por [a] me[tre en] possessió"** (line 3): Difficult. I read "pore me possessió" and tentatively expand as "por [a] me[tre en] possessió" — an Aragonese-influenced construction for "to put into possession." The "me" could alternatively be "en" (i.e., scribe wrote *m* where *n* was intended), giving "por en possessió." Flagged.
4. **"del dret de plaça o de almudí"** (line 4): The word before "dret" is hard — I read "del" but the letterforms could also be "ot" or "ol." "Almudí" is the grain market (*almudín*); "plaça" = the market square. Both are standard revenue rights in Aragonese municipalities.
5. **"ab en Plant[?]"** (line 5): A personal name with superscript mark (perhaps *í* or *a*, giving "Plantí" or "Planta" [?]). The "ab" (with) + courtesy title "en" + name construction is standard, but the name is unclear. Alternatively, the entire word could be "Abenplant" — an Arabic-prefix surname (*Ibn-*).
6. **"acor e vuilla"** (line 6): "Acor" = likely "acord" (agreement) with silent final *-d*. "Vuilla" = "vulla" (will/wish, subj. of *voler*), with the scribe's *-ill-* for *-ll-*.
7. **"pueys que-l dit porter"** (line 7): "Pueys" could alternatively be "precs" (requests/prayers); the second letter is ambiguous between *u* and *r*. If "precs," the passage reads: "moved that the requests that the said bearer has made us for a long time and makes every day" — which parses much better. "Porter" = the bearer of the King's letter.
8. **"obpramet [?]"** (line 8): The most difficult reading in the document. The word follows "haja" and precedes "la dita possessió," so contextually it should mean "obtained" or "recovered." Possibly "cobrament" (recovery, noun from *cobrar*) or a heavily abbreviated form of "obtingut." I cannot resolve this from the image; it is a candidate for archival verification.
9. **"sots mon segell secret"** (line 10): Reconstruction from formulaic parallels. The individual words are compressed: "sots" could be "jots" [?]; "mon" appears as "me" (= *meu*?); "segell" is plausible; "secret" is partly conjectural (visible letters suggest "pret" or "sret" [?]).
10. **"Berth[?]"** (line 11): Scribal signature, probably Barth[olomeus] — consistent with Bartholomeus Sirvent if this is from Violant de Bar's chancery.

Dissertation-relevant observations

This document shows the Queen writing *in support of* a royal mandate, directing the battle general to execute a possessory order the King has already issued by patent letter. The formula "com lo senyor Rey hi nos haja acord e vuilla" (as the lord King has therein our agreement and wish) is noteworthy — Violant presents the action as jointly willed, not merely deferred to. The word "mogutz" (moved) with the first-person plural reference positions the Queen as an autonomous actor responding to petitionary pressure ("precs/pueys que-l dit porter nos ha fets longament"), not as a passive transmitter of the King's orders. This is directly relevant to your reginal agency arguments.

The properties at issue span two Aragonese towns — Exea (de los Caballeros) and Sos (del Rey Católico), both in the *Cinco Villas* comarca — and include both real property ("cases") and fiscal revenue rights ("dret de plaça o de almudí"), a combination worth tracking for your fiscal administration chapter.

Great work. Here's the output from the other HTR for Stage 2: la reyna [Main Body:]

1. batle gen[er]al . lo senyor rey p[er] sa letra patēt vos scriu os ma[n]a vos i[n]co[n]tine[n]t
2. lliurets an sanxo bogell port[er] n[ost]re possessio dalunes cases q[ue] sō en la vila de Exea /
3. e tot dret de plaça o del algundi de la vila de Sos. de les quals cases lo dit senyor
4. li ha f[e]ta donacio abenemplacit / segons q[ue] e[n] la d[ic]ta letra portants veure pus
5. largament / p[er] q[ue] com lo senyor rey [e] nos hāja acor e vulla / moguts per los
6. serveys quel d[i]t porter nos ha fets longamēt / e fa tot dia / q[ue] ell se alegre
7. dela concessio dessus dita / e co[n]segue[n]t hāja prestame[n]t la d[i]cta poss[ess]io / pregam
8. vos affectuosamēt q[ue] aquella li lliurets o façats lliurar / segons q[ue] lo dit senyor
9. en la d[ic]ta sua letra vol e mana . Dada en Barchinona sots n[ost]re segell secret a
10. xix. dies de juny . del any .M.CCC.lxxxvij. Sec[re]t[arius]

Show more

10:56 AM

Reconciled competing transcriptions against manuscript evidence systematically

Reconciled competing transcriptions against manuscript evidence systematically

Excellent — the HTR resolves several of my hardest cruxes. Let me work through the reconciliation systematically, returning to the manuscript image for each significant divergence.

Disambiguating "hi" versus "e" in manuscript text

Disambiguating "hi" versus "e" in manuscript text

You've reached your session limit. It resets at 3:30 PM.

Keep working

Claude Fable 5 is currently unavailable.

[Learn more\(opens in new tab\)](#)

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