

Chat GPT Version 5.2

December 29, 2025

You said:

I'm working on a document from the very beginning of 1387. The letter is written by Joan, the Duke of Girona. It is about the manumission of someone, or a group of people, somehow connected to a noble from Cauca Castle, which might mean Coca castle in Segovia. The document is addressed to the political elites of Cerdagne and Roussillon. There's another place name mentioned, which I think is Mosseto or Mosseco. It is possible that nobles of an island are being freed, but I am not sure about that. Please search for any records or secondary literature that might help me understand the historical context for this document or any other information about it.

ChatGPT said:

Here's what I'm going to do: I'll (1) pin down the most likely identifications for your puzzling place/"island" terms, (2) situate an early-1387 *Duke of Girona* letter to Cerdanya/Rosselló elites in the broader political moment, and (3) point you to the most relevant secondary leads I can find right now.

1) "Mosseto / Mosseco" is very plausibly Mosset / de Mosset (Roussillon/Conflent) — and it may be a *person*, not a place

In the Cerdanya–Rosselló documentary universe, **Mosset** commonly appears as:

- **Mosset (today Mosset, Pyrénées-Orientales)**, a place in historic Conflent/Roussillon; and
- **"de Mosset" as a noble surname** (e.g., *Asmar/Aymar de Mosset*), which shows up in 14th-century Catalan-Aragonese political/military contexts. For example, modern editions/translations of Pere III's chronicle preserve a form like "Asmar de Mosset" in narratives tied to the counties of Rosselló and Cerdanya. [De Re Militari+1](#)

So if your reading is something like *Mosseto/Mosseco*, it's worth testing whether the underlying text is actually **"Mosset"** (or **"de Mosset"**) with a scribal flourish or case ending that's throwing you off.

2) "nobles of an island" may actually be Illa (a place-name), not an island

This is a classic trap in your region: **Illà** can look like “island” in English, but in Rosselló it is very often **Illà/Ille** (Ille-sur-Têt), and the **vescomtat d’Illà** is a real jurisdiction (linked to the Fenollet line and later Pinós inheritance questions).

A solid starting point is Maria-Mercè Costa i Paretas, “*Notes sobre el Vescomtat d’Illà (segle XIV)*” (Quaderns de les Assemblees d’Estudis 7 [1991], 51–64). Even without your exact shelfmark, this is one of the few pieces that is specifically about *Illà* in the 14th century and will help you sanity-check whether “*Illà*” is what your document is invoking. raco.cat

Practical implication for your reading: if your text seems to free “nobles of an island,” re-test the phrase as “(vescomtes / gent) d’**Illà**” (a territorial label) rather than anything maritime.

3) Early January 1387 is an unusually sharp political “hinge moment”

You said “very beginning of 1387” and “Joan, Duke of Girona.” That’s important because **Pere III dies 5 January 1387**, and the titulature/authority situation changes immediately afterward.

A very useful contextual piece (even though it’s focused on titulature and the “dauphin” issue) is J. Riera i Sans, “**El delfinat de Girona (1387–1388)**”. It lays out the tight early-January sequence: Pere III’s death (5 Jan), the immediate political settling, and how the new regime begins issuing high-level acts in that window—including government appointments for Rosselló matters. raco.cat

Why this matters for *your* manumission letter:

- If it’s **before 5 Jan 1387**, Joan is acting as **duc de Girona** under his father’s reign.
- If it’s **after 5 Jan 1387**, you may be seeing either (a) scribal lag in titulature, (b) a copied/registered text preserving the earlier style, or (c) a document drafted under one style and registered after the accession.

That date logic can materially change what “kind” of act you’re looking at (routine ducal household business vs. early-reign political signaling).

4) How “Cauca Castle” fits: **Cauca = Coca (Segovia)** is plausible, but the **14th-c. “castle” angle needs caution**

You’re not imagining it: **Cauca is the Roman name associated with modern Coca (Segovia)**, and the Coca/Cauca identification is widely noted. [Wikipedia+1](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Coca_(Segovia))

But there's a catch for **1387**: the famous **Castillo de Coca** people think of is a **15th-century** structure; medieval "Cauca/Coca" can still be a lordship/fortified site, but if your document literally says *castro de Cauca* (or similar), it might be referring to:

- a **fortified place/territory** (not necessarily the later standing castle), or
- a **lord "of Cauca/Coca"** whose dependents/captives are the subject of the manumission.

So: **Coca is a reasonable identification for "Cauca,"** but I'd treat "Cauca Castle" as "Cauca/Coca as a named lordship/fortified locus" unless your text gives unmistakable architectural specificity.

5) What kind of "manumission" is most consistent with a letter to Cerdanya/Rosselló elites?

With the limited description (and without the exact Latin/Catalan phrasing), the *most common* scenario that matches **(a)** a high-status issuer, **(b)** a request directed to local political elites, and **(c)** "freeing" people tied to an external noble is:

- a **jurisdictional enforcement letter**: "Recognize X as free / do not impede movement / do not treat them as captive/servile / allow them to reside or travel," addressed to the *prohoms* / *universitats* / *officers* of Rosselló and Cerdanya.

In the Crown of Aragon this could involve:

- manumission of **enslaved captives** (Mediterranean slavery contexts),
- release of **hostages** or war captives tied to diplomacy,
- or freeing people from some **local servile obligation** (less likely in Rosselló/Cerdanya than, say, *remença* zones, but still possible depending on the persons/status involved).

For broad "Joan I era" context on Crown of Aragon governance/territorial politics (useful background framing even if not specific to your letter), see general scholarship situating Joan I's reign and Crown dynamics. [Cambridge University Press & Assessment+1](#)

6) High-yield next steps (so you can turn this into a *targeted* identification fast)

If you can locate *any one* of these from the document header or register entry, you'll likely be able to match it to a known dossier:

1. **Exact addressees formula** (e.g., *universis/prohominibus... in comitatibus Ceritanie et Rossilionis*; or named officers like *veguer/batlle*).

2. **The freed person(s) name(s)** and the exact status
word: *servus/servi, captivus/captivi, sclavus, manumittimus, franchs/franquesa*, etc.
3. **Archive pointer**: ACA register number + folio, or parchment series.
4. The exact form of “Mosseto/Mosseco” in context (is it preceded by **de, dominus, miles, castro**, etc.?).

If you paste just the address line + the clause containing “Cauca” and “Mosset...”, I can try to:

- tell you whether “Mosset” is grammatically a **place** or a **surname** in your text, and
- suggest which **Rosselló/Cerdanya institutional actors** the letter is trying to mobilize.

Quick working hypothesis (based on what you’ve said)

- “Mosseto/Mosseco” = **(de) Mosset** (person or place in Conflent/Roussillon)
- “island” = **Illa** (Ille-sur-Têt / vescomtat d’Illa)
- “Cauca castle” = **Cauca/Coca (Segovia)** as a lordship identifier (but don’t over-assume a 15th-c. building)

And the document is likely **an enforcement/notification letter** to Rosselló/Cerdanya elites to ensure a manumission is respected locally during the **regime transition of early January 1387**. [raco.cat+2raco.cat+2](#)

You said:

Here is my best effort at transcription of the header and first sentence. Please attempt corrections if the Latin seems incorrect: "Pro manumissoria victcomitorum de insula. Infans Johannes et cetera. Nobilis dilectis et fidelibus Geronti bienes pro nobis in comitatibus Rosser et Ceritan... universis et singulis officialibus et persones omnes domini Reges nostris et ipsorum oficornum locatem ad quem seu grans presentes perveniunt...salutem." Later in the letter Joan mentions "victcomitem de Insula de Caneto" or that could be "Caneco." What does this information help you to find out next?

ChatGPT said:

This new header is *very* diagnostic. It basically tells us that your document is not about an “island” in the literal sense—it’s almost certainly about the **viscounts of Illa (Ille-sur-Têt) and Canet (Canet-en-Roussillon)** in Rosselló/Conflent.

1) What your header most likely *should* say

A couple of small but high-impact corrections:

- **victcomitorum** → **vicecomitum** (standard Latin for “of the viscounts”)
- **de insula** → very likely **de Illa** (the place-name Illa/Ille), not *insula* “island”
- later: **de Insula de Caneto/Caneco** → very likely **de Illa et Caneto** (“of Illa and Canet”)

So I would tentatively normalize your rubric as:

Pro manumissoria vicecomitum de Illa (et Caneto).

Infans Johannes etc. ...

That “Illa + Canet” pairing is *exactly* how the title appears in the region’s noble titulature (vescomtat d’Illa i Canet). [Wikipedia+2Wikipedia+2](#)

2) The address line you transcribed matches a known chancery template

Your address wording is very close to a standard “Rosselló + Cerdanya officials” formula found in other published privilege collections:

You have (roughly):

“... in comitatibus Ross(er?) et Ceritan... universis et singulis officialibus ... salutem.”

A very typical version (seen in edited texts) looks like:

“... vicesgerenti pro nobis in comitatibus Rossilionis et Ceritanie et universis et singulis officialibus ... salutem et gratiam.” [Internet Archive](#)

So, concretely, you can try emending your line toward:

Nobilibus dilectis et fidelibus nostris vicesgerenti (vel: vicario / gubernatori) pro nobis in comitatibus Rossilionis et Ceritanie, ac universis et singulis officialibus et subditis ... ad quos presentes pervenerint, salutem (et gratiam).

(We can’t lock every word without seeing your manuscript line-by-line, but the *structure* is clearly that template.)

3) “vicecomitem de Illa et Canet(o)” gives you a very specific historical target

Once you read the title as **viscount of Illa and Canet**, your “what do we do next?” becomes much sharper:

Next thing to identify: *which* viscount is meant in **early 1387**.

The viscount list for Canet/Illa shows a handoff right around **1387** (Andreu/Andrew ending in 1387; Pere/Peter III beginning in 1387, in the simplified genealogical summaries). [Wikipedia+1](#)

And scholarly “notes” on the **Vescomtat d’Illa** discuss the 14th-century viscounts and the documentary basis for their actions. [CORE+1](#)

So your document may sit right at:

- a **succession moment** inside the Illa/Canet line, and/or
- the **royal succession hinge** (Pere III dies 5 Jan 1387; Joan becomes king), which can affect how acts are issued and registered.

4) What this lets you search for (very concretely)

With your improved header, the highest-yield searches are no longer “island nobles” or “Coca castle,” but:

1. **“manumissoria” + “vicecomes/vicecomit-” + “Illa” + “Canet”**
2. Names of viscounts in that window (Andreu / Pere / Fenollet / Canet / Illa) + “manumiss- / franch- / liber-”
3. ACA register indices under **Rosselló/Cerdanya** or **privilegia / gratiarum** style entries addressed to the **vicesgerens** and “universis officialibus” formula.

And on the secondary side, you now have an anchored context:

- **Vescomtat d’Illa / Canet** (who held it, what conflicts/obligations existed, what kinds of acts show up). [CORE+1](#)

5) One small transcription note that may save you time

Your **“Geronti bienes”** looks like it might be trying to capture **“gerenti / vicesgerenti”** (the acting administrator/governor), which appears in exactly this kind of address formula. Compare the printed exemplar’s **vicesgerenti pro nobis**. [Internet Archive](#)

Bottom line: what your new info tells us

- **“de insula” is probably “de Illa,”** i.e., Ille-sur-Têt, not an island.
- **“vicecomes de Illa et Canet”** is a real, well-defined title in Rosselló/Conflent. [Wikipedia+2Wikipedia+2](#)

- Your address line matches a **known Rosselló/Cerdanya chancery template**, so we can reconstruct missing bits with high confidence. [Internet Archive](#)
- The “next” task is to identify **which viscount** and whether your act relates to **succession (within Illa/Canet) and/or the January 1387 royal transition**.

If you paste just **(a)** the exact line with “de insula / Illa” and **(b)** the clause where “manumissoria” is executed (the verb phrase: *manumittimus / liberamus / concedimus franchitatem* etc.), I can give you a tighter corrected Latin and suggest what *category* of manumission this is (freeing captives vs. freeing from obligations vs. legal status confirmation).

You said:

One of the articles that you found mentions Andreu de Fenollet. This might be the viscount of Illa de Canet. This person is also in the letter I'm working on. Can you find more information about Andreu de Fenollet and how manumission would have been related to him?

ChatGPT said:

Yes — and the biggest “unlock” here is that **your “manumissoria” may not mean slave-manumission at all**.

In much Crown-of-Aragon documentary Latin/Catalan usage, **manumissor / manumissoria** very often refers to **executors of a will (Catalan: marmessors)** and the paperwork/authority surrounding **testamentary execution**, not emancipation. A modern scholarly edition/article on Barcelona notarial records uses *manumissoria* in exactly this “executor” sense (e.g., “*pro manumissoria inclite infantisse...*” tied to a *Liber ... manumissoriarum et tutelarum*). [raco.cat](#)

So before we chase slavery/captives, the next thing to test in *your* letter is: does the body mention **testamentum / ultima voluntas / manumissores / executores / tutela / heres / bona** (will, last will, executors, guardianship, heir, goods)? If yes, your rubric “**Pro manumissoria vicecomitorum de Illa et Canet(o)**” likely means:

“Concerning the **executorship / will-execution** of the viscounts of Illa and Canet.”

That dovetails *perfectly* with Andreu.

Who Andreu de Fenollet was (the reliable basics)

The **Gran Enciclopèdia Catalana** entry identifies **Andreu de Fenollet i de Saportella** as:

- **3rd viscount of Illa and 4th of Canet,**

- baron of **la Portella** and **Lluçà**,
- active in the **war of Sardinia (1355)** and later the **War of the Two Peters**, where he was **captured in 1363** while commanding the defense of **Magallón**,
- and it gives his death as **1386/87**. enciclopedia.cat

A focused study on the **Vescomtat d'Illa (14th c.)** notes Andreu's imprisonment and the family's residence at **Canet**, and treats his succession (his successor being his son Pere). [CORE](#)

So: **your date ("very beginning of 1387") + Andreu appearing in the letter** is exactly the moment you'd expect **testamentary/executor business** to surface, because Andreu is plausibly *dead or dying* in that window. enciclopedia.cat+1

How "manumissoria" would relate to Andreu (most likely mechanisms)

If the letter is about Andreu, "manumissoria" could involve one of these (ranked by fit with your evidence):

A) Royal order to *officials of Rosselló & Cerdanya* to recognize Andreu's executors / heirs

This is the cleanest match to your address formula ("to the vicar/lieutenant and all officials..."): the duke/king tells local officials to:

- **let the manumissores (executors) act**, collect debts, pay obligations, manage goods, etc.;
- **not obstruct** seizure/transfer of property, rights, or jurisdiction during probate;
- respect **guardianship/tutela** if the heir is underage.

If your text contains words

like *manumissores/testamenti/executores/bonorum/tutela/heres*, you're almost certainly in this lane. raco.cat+1

B) Confirmation/settlement of lordship rights in Illa/Canet at a succession hinge

Even if "manumissoria" is testamentary, the practical stakes can look like "freeing" someone if:

- dependents are released from *a particular obligation* by the testament/executors,
- debts are remitted, or
- a local dispute over status is resolved by the estate settlement.

But the vocabulary will usually expose this: you'll see *remitto / condono / absolvo / franchitatem concedo* (I remit/forgive/absolve/grant enfranchisement) — **not** the classic Roman-law slave manumission verb set.

C) A genuine slavery/captive manumission that happens to involve Andreu

Possible, but right now it's *less* supported by the wording you've shown than option A. If it were this, you'd expect the document to name:

- the enslaved/captive persons,
- the exact liberation formula (*manumitto... libero... ab omni servitute...*),
- and sometimes price/redemption language.

Why Mosset matters again

If your earlier “Mosseto” really is **Mosset**, that can connect to Andreu's territorial portfolio. One lineage summary (not a primary edition, but consistent with regional lordship patterns) explicitly associates Andreu with being baron of multiple places including **Mosset**. I would treat that as a *lead* rather than proof, and verify against charter evidence or Costa i Paretas. [Wikipedia+1](#)

What this lets you find out next — very concretely

Here are the highest-yield “next checks” you can do *inside the letter* (and if you paste these lines, I can help interpret them):

1. **Look for “manumissor/manumissores” in the body.**
 - If it's there, you've basically proven the “executors” sense. [raco.cat](#)
2. **Find any mention of a will: *testamentum / ultima voluntas / codicillus*.**
 - That will connect the letter directly to Andreu's death window. [enciclopedia.cat+1](#)
3. **Identify whether the rubric says “vicecomitum” (plural) or “vicecomitis” (singular).**
 - Plural can mean: viscount + viscountess, or multiple related estates being administered.
4. **Check the titulature of Joan in the dating clause.**
 - If it's after **5 Jan 1387**, he's king; titulature drift can be revealing for register copying.

5. Search target once you have names of the executors/heir:

- Those personal names are often the easiest way to match an ACA register entry or a local notarial dossier.

If you want the fastest confirmation

Paste 3 short snippets (even messy transcription is fine):

1. the **rubric line** with *manumissoria*,
2. the **first place the word manumissor/manumissoria reappears** in the body (if it does),
3. the **dating line** (day/month + place + year).

With just that, we can decide whether your document is:

- **probate/executorship authority (most likely)**, or
- true **emancipation of persons**.

You said:

You are correct that this is a letter about the execution of a will. I checked what you found about Andreu and other sources corroborate that he died at the end of 1386. I found mentions of *bonis*, *manumissoris totum*, and *voluntatis assignata*. The date of this letter is December 31, 1387, and so this is before Joan's father died (remember that the Crown of Aragon at this time began the new year on December 25). Can you help me understand why Joan is writing something about the execution Andreu de Fenollet's last will?

ChatGPT said:

Yes — and once you've spotted **bonis**, **manumissoris**, and **voluntatis**, Joan's involvement becomes much easier to explain as *routine (but politically weighty) royal administration* in Rosselló/Cerdanya.

First: your “31 Dec 1387” is almost certainly 31 Dec 1386 in modern-style years

If the register/chancery is using a **Christmas-style new year (year begins Dec 25)**, then the block **Dec 25–31** belongs to the *next* numbered year compared to a Jan-1 year.

So:

- “31 December 1387” (Christmas style) = 31 December 1386 (modern Jan-1 style)

That places the letter **days before Pere III's death on 5 Jan 1387**, which matches your instinct that Joan is still acting as Duke of Girona under his father. (Christmas-style year starts are a documented medieval practice.) [Chicago Journals+1](#)

Why is Joan (Duke of Girona) writing about Andreu de Fenollet's testament at all?

1) Because Andreu's lordship sat inside a sensitive border-government zone that required "making it work" on the ground

Rosselló and Cerdanya had a distinct **governació** and a dense mesh of royal officials (governor/vicegerent, veguers, batlles, etc.). Royal letters routinely **order those officials to observe** privileges, decisions, and administrative acts. The kind of addressee formula you quoted is exactly the channel by which the center ensures compliance in the counties. [Barcelona City Council+1](#)

When a major lord dies (like the viscount of **Illa and Canet**), the executors need:

- officials to **recognize their authority** (*manumissores* / *marmessors*),
- permission/support to **take possession of goods**, collect debts, settle claims,
- and protection against local interference.

That's exactly the "tell every official who sees this letter..." tone you described.

2) Because the Crown had legal and fiscal rights triggered by a noble's death

In feudal polities, a big succession is never "just private family business." Royal power often attached to:

- **relief / succession dues**, confirmation fees, or other incidents,
- questions of **jurisdiction** (who can hold "high justice" locally),
- and disputes over **which rights belong to the lord vs. to the king's fisc**.

So a royal/ducal order backing the executors can be as much about **protecting royal rights** and keeping order as about honoring the will.

(And in your region, these tensions are particularly common because the *governació* structure is explicitly about royal control and public order.) [Wikipedia+1](#)

3) Because Andreu de Fenollet was not a random local noble — he was a major player whose death had administrative consequences

The Gran Enciclopèdia Catalana identifies **Andreu de Fenollet i de Saportella** as **3rd viscount of Illa and 4th of Canet**, and places his death in **1386/87**. [Enciclopedia](#)

A dedicated article on the **Vescomtat d'Illa (14th c.)** treats the Fenollet viscounts in exactly this period and is the kind of work that helps explain why their succession matters to the wider region's governance. [CORE+1](#)

In other words: this is the sort of magnate death where you'd *expect* the chancery to issue enforcement letters so the executors can act.

4) A very specific scenario that fits your evidence: Joan is authorizing officials to let the executors administer the estate across jurisdictions

The phrase you found — **“manumissoris totum”** — sounds like the letter is confirming that the executors have **full authority** to carry out the will (*totum* = “in full/entirely”) over **bonis** (goods/estate). That implies practical actions that require cooperation:

- moving movable goods,
- collecting rents/arrears,
- compelling tenants/debtors,
- dealing with litigants or rival claimants.

Those are all things local officials could obstruct unless the royal center explicitly orders them not to.

So what should you look for next inside the letter to confirm which “reason” is primary?

Here are the “tells” (and what they mean):

1. Any clause about royal rights or dues

Look for: *ius regium, fiscus, regalia, confiscatio, compositio, emenda, pena, bannum*.

If present → this is partly about **protecting the crown's fiscal/jurisdictional interests**.

2. Any mention of a minor heir or guardianship

Look for: *tutor/tutela, curador, pupillus, minor aetas*.

If present → the crown may be ensuring orderly guardianship, not just executorship.

3. Any instruction to specific offices (veguer/batlle/vicegerent)

If it names them → the document is about **enforcement** (who must do what).

4. Any mention of disputes, violence, or obstruction

Look for: *impedire, molestare, turbatio, controversia, litis, querela*.

If present → the letter may respond to **active resistance** to the executors.

One more calendar nuance (because it affects your chronology)

It's completely coherent that the will was made in 1386 and the executorship is still being enforced on "31 Dec 1387" (Christmas style) — because that is **still 1386 in modern terms** (i.e., within days/weeks of the death), and estate execution often took months anyway. [Chicago Journals+1](#)

If you paste **just the paragraph that contains the "command"** (the bit that tells officials what to do / not do), I can tell you which of the four motives above is most strongly supported by *your* text (royal rights vs. minor heir vs. enforcement vs. dispute-response), and help normalize the Latin so it matches chancery idiom.

ChatGPT can make mistakes. Check important info.