
FOR REVIEWERS — INDEPENDENT VERIFICATION OF THE HLS MS 149 FF. 81R–83V

TRANSCRIPTION

Working document

Corpus	01_HLS_MS149_Floyd_ff81r-83v
Source	README_FOR_REVIEWERS.md
Integrity	sha256 b43b83c901e4 · rendered 2026-07-09
Status	<i>Derived render for review. The markdown source file governs; the modernized layer is never quotable; all readings are provisional pending the commissioned professional transcription (names above all). Canonical apparatus: _PRECISION_PASS_LEDGER.md; method: TRANSCRIPTION_AND_ANALYSIS_METHODOLOGY.md.</i>

HOW TO READ THIS RENDER (CONVENTIONS LEGEND)

strikethrough	struck in the manuscript (source: ~text~)
^{superscript}	scribal interlineation or raised letters (source: ^text^, m^r)
serif (Cambria) span	diplomatic text quoted inline (source: `text`); the type shift marks the source-text voice; conventions inside are rendered too
boxed serif panel	diplomatic transcription block
gray italic [...]	pass-annotation — editorial apparatus, NOT manuscript text
CONFIRM UPGRADE LEAN CONFLICT	delta-log verdict class: green = confirmed/convergent · blue = upgraded/new · amber = lean/open/variant · red = retraction/conflict
[?] / [...] / [] · « » · · △ ✓ eB X ★	sigla printed verbatim per methodology §6/§9

CONTENTS

Harvard Law School Library MS 149, Part 3 (Jacobean Star Chamber reports collection) — the <i>Floyd v. Barker</i> "second account" (Pasch. 5 Jac., 1607), ff. 81r–83r, with the f. 83v term boundary — transcribed 2026-07-08 → 2026-07-09	2
1. THE EVIDENTIARY CHAIN, AND HOW TO CHECK EACH LINK	2
2. READING THE APPARATUS	3
3. WHAT TO READ, IN ORDER	3
4. THE COPY PROBLEM: WITNESSES AND COLLATION (WHAT MAKES THIS CORPUS DIFFERENT FROM AN ORIGINAL)	4
5. HONEST LIMITS YOU SHOULD KNOW BEFORE YOU START	5
6. A TIME-EFFICIENT AUDIT (IF YOU CANNOT RE-READ SIX SIDES)	5

7. CREDIT, CONTACT, TERMS 6

Harvard Law School Library MS 149, Part 3 (Jacobean Star Chamber reports collection) — the *Floyd v. Barker* "second account" (Pasch. 5 Jac., 1607), ff. 81r–83r, with the f. 83v term boundary — transcribed 2026-07-08 → 2026-07-09

What you are holding. A complete, layered, first-hand transcription of the six digitized sides carrying the manuscript *Floyd v. Barker* report, made by a single accountable reader under the method stated in ../TRANSCRIPTION_AND_ANALYSIS_METHODODOLOGY.md, together with the **entire visual record** (every zoom tile the readings rest on, with pixel-exact manifests), the uncertainty ledger with its five open arbitrations, the witness-collation apparatus, and the fixity chain. The manuscript is a report-collection **copy** (one later-seventeenth-century hand), so this corpus carries two kinds of caution: reading uncertainty (ours, exhaustively logged) and copyist error against the exemplar (tested where possible, held open where not). All readings are provisional until a professional collation returns — **names above all**. Your independent judgment is exactly what this package is built to receive.

If you prefer to evaluate blind (recommended): work first from the six master images and crops/ only — they are self-contained, and tile names carry only zone tags (crop_hls82vR_b4_eB = side 82v, right half-column, band 4, blue-channel enhancement), not readings. Transcribe your sample. Only then open the transcription layers below and compare. That ordering makes your agreement (or disagreement) independent evidence rather than anchored review.

1. THE EVIDENTIARY CHAIN, AND HOW TO CHECK EACH LINK

1. The masters are Harvard's. ms149_f81r.jpg ... ms149_f83v.jpg = 2400px derivatives retrieved 2026-06-10 from the Harvard DRS IIIF manifest drs:425601024 (per-side image IDs drs:425601191–96; URLs and the folio table in README.md). Verify integrity: shasum -a 256 -c _FIXITY_SHA256_SOURCES.txt. To verify against the archive itself, re-fetch any side from the Harvard IIIF Image API at the logged derivation (/full/2400,/0/default.jpg) and compare, or collate visually in Harvard's own viewer.

2. Every tile derives from a master, provably. The sweep series crops/hls_p4/ (200 tiles: 8-band half-column pairs, natural + enhanced, all six sides, plus the f81r margin strips) and the audit series crops/hls_p4_audit/ (58 tiles: #25 audit re-cuts, comparators, and the 24 edge strips) each carry _manifest.jsonl: one JSON row per tile with the exact source-pixel rectangle. Rows from f81v onward also carry the full parameter set, CLI command, and the master's sha256 prefix (_crop_stac_v3.py, in the parent directory); **the f81r set was cut with v2** — same geometry fields, no per-row checksum/CLI (disclosed; the fixity file still pins every tile). Twenty additional audit files are deterministic derivatives (edge composites, rotation controls) — crops/hls_p4_audit/_DERIVED_FILES_NOTE.md states each one's parents and transform. crops/_FIXITY_SHA256_CROPS.txt pins **every file under crops/** (320 entries, tiles + manifests + notes); verify from inside crops/: shasum -a 256 -c _FIXITY_SHA256_CROPS.txt.

3. **Coverage is computable, not asserted.** `python3 ../_coverage_check.py crops/hls_p4/_manifest.jsonl` proves the band sweeps covered each side top-to-bottom with no gap > 12px across x 0.02–0.98; add `crops/hls_p4_audit/_manifest.jsonl` to the same command and the edge strips extend the proof **edge-to-edge (x 0.000–1.000)** on all six sides. (Last run clean 2026-07-09, at packaging.)
4. **Every reading cites its tiles.** The per-side line indexes (`_WORKING_MS149_ff81r_LINE_INDEX.md ... ff83v...`) give the line-by-line census with band IDs; contested items additionally cite the audit tiles and the **legacy native layer** — 19 native-resolution IIIF region crops (`crops/crop_B...crop_T`, fetched June 2026, subject-named; provenance in `README.md`). Those 19 are the one tile class without pixel manifests (they predate the manifest tooling); they are fixity-pinned, and no reading rests on them alone — they serve as the independent zoom layer reconciled against the manifested sweeps.
5. **Enhancement never stands alone.** Renders: nat (untouched control) · eB (blue-channel isolation + flat-field + CLAHE + unsharp). House rule: a reading is trusted only if it survives every render it appears in; artifacts flip between renders, ink does not. The #25 audit adds rotation controls (180°/90°) on the highest-stakes token.
6. **The full trace runs tile → census → delta → publication.** Each side's line index carries its census plus a verdict-chip delta log against both baselines; `_WORKING_MS149_P4C_AUDIT.md` is the audit pass; `_WORKING_MS149_P4D_DELTA_AND_QUOTED_AUDIT.md` consolidates every variance, audits every reading quoted in the citing article, and (§6) records the fold-in execution — so any quoted reading anywhere can be walked back to the strokes it rests on.
7. **One slip is preserved, disclosed:** the first ff83r cut ran with wrong parameters and was quarantined **unread** (`crops/_MISCUT_20260709_ff83r_nat014/`, `README` inside). Nothing rests on it.

2. READING THE APPARATUS

Conventions (full table in the methodology §6; TEI/EpiDoc mapping in §16.4 if you prefer that idiom): [?] uncertain · [...] / [] supplied/illegible · word / «...» scribal interlineation (Λ = caret) · ~~text~~ struck in the MS · ⟨x⟩ expanded/normalized letterform · || seam join · , comma-class mark · ≠ line-split · superscript money/abbreviation forms retained (30^{li}, Judg^{mt}, Chauncell^r) · △ lean / △△ contested-or-expectation-risk (recorded, never asserted) · ✓eB survives enhancement · X scan-limited. The hand's own allograph repertoire (swash-T, both C-bowls, ff-medial, thorn-form y^e, long-l) is charted with exemplar citations in `_HAND_ATLAS_ms149.md` — contested tokens were adjudicated against the same hand's confirmed forms, and the atlas arms you to re-adjudicate.

3. WHAT TO READ, IN ORDER

Layer	File(s)
Provenance + folio map	<code>README.md</code> (manifest, drs IDs, retrieval, corroborating records)
Reader-facing companion (diplomatic + modernized; the modernized layer is an aid, never source text)	<code>READING_COMPANION_ff81r-83v.md</code>

Layer	File(s)
Line-grain layer — censuses, revision strata, per-band text, eB dispositions, per-side delta logs	_WORKING_MS149_f81r/f81v/f82r/f82v/f83r/f83v_LINE_INDEX.md
Audit pass (fine-figure gate; his/this rotation audit; dual closures; edge/corner/rotation screen)	_WORKING_MS149_P4C_AUDIT.md
Consolidated delta + quoted-readings audit + fold-in record — every variance vs both baselines, every published quote traced	_WORKING_MS149_P4D_DELTA_AND_QUOTED_AUDIT.md
The uncertainty ledger — the highest-value review target	_WORKING_MS149_SURVEY_AND_LEDGER.md (survey census · closed q-queue · ARBITRATION LIST #1–#5 + declared minor row = the professional-commission brief · WITNESS COLLATION section with per-crux table C1–C17 · sweep log)
Hand atlas (allograph exemplars + confusable pairs)	_HAND_ATLAS_ms149.md
External baseline (first-pass source-of-record transcription, 2026-06; conformed at fold-in with flags)	../././2_Academic Articles/11_Immunity and Standing Doctrine Geneology/Immunity Notes/HLS_MS149_FLOYD_SECOND_ACCOUNT_TRANSCRIPTION.md
Witness-census source (banked)	_WITNESS_CENSUS_Williams_2021_StarChamberMatters_ch11.pdf (Williams, <i>Star Chamber Matters</i> ch. 11 (2021), CC BY-NC-ND 4.0)
Method	../TRANSCRIPTION_AND_ANALYSIS_METHODOLOGY.md
DOCX renders (derived; conventions become real formatting, with a legend page and a source-sha256 footer; the .md files govern — some renders lag the latest .md state)	docx_exports/ — regenerate: python3 ../_working_docx_render.py <file.md>

No crops/canon/ series exists for this corpus, by design: the hls_p4 sweep set is complete, uniform, manifested, and *as-read* — the tiles the verdicts were actually formed on ARE the citation layer, which is evidentially stronger than a post-hoc canonical re-cut.

4. THE COPY PROBLEM: WITNESSES AND COLLATION (WHAT MAKES THIS CORPUS DIFFERENT FROM AN ORIGINAL)

MS 149 Part 3 is one witness of the circulating **Jacobean Star Chamber reports collection** (census verified first-hand from the banked Williams chapter, nn. 8 & 12). Five sister copies exist — All Souls 163 · BL Stowe 397 · Bodleian Brasenose 61 · CUL LI.3.2 fos. 1–66 · CUL Add. 3105 fos. 133–184v — and **none is digitized** (reproducible negatives in the ledger's probe log). The ledger's **PER-CRUX COLLATION TABLE (C1–C17)** fixes exactly what one sister reading would decide at each contested site — C1–C5 are the five arbitrations; C10 (Granetts) is the stemmatic headline. **A reviewer with reading-room access to any sister can contribute the single most valuable evidence this corpus can still receive: fill a column of that table.** A Selden Society edition of these reports is in preparation; its publication will supersede this section with a professional collation. Independent non-sister checks already in play: the underlying TNA file STAC 8/203/38 (sibling

corpus ../02_STAC_8_203_38/, professional transcription commissioned and pending), the print (12 Co. Rep. 23), and Kesselring (2025).

5. HONEST LIMITS YOU SHOULD KNOW BEFORE YOU START

- **Single-reader risk is managed, not absent:** independent re-reads, letterforms-first, the wish-fulfilment hazard class (it retired the reader's own "crownes" candidate and ran against the Garnet hypothesis), and the retraction log are documented per item — but they are countermeasures. Your independent eyes are the missing control.
- **Five arbitrations are open** (ledger ARBITRATION LIST): Ch^r vs "Just[ice]" (caption office token) · ~~Lewes~~ struck vs baselines' unstruck (the 81v.1 junction) · A(p)price double-p · ff: vs "Ch:" (the Coke office cluster) · ⟨and|one⟩ before Griffith. Each is **recorded, not asserted**, with tiles cited; each carries a conform-on-professional-return rider in every document that touches it.
- **The masters are 2400px derivatives**, not full-resolution archival captures; native-region IIIF re-fetches were the escalation path, and Harvard's WAF intermittently 403'd them (failure logs preserved at crops/_failed_iiif_fetch_*.403.html). A full-resolution re-order from Harvard is the upgrade path for any X-class item.
- **The 19 legacy native crops lack pixel manifests** (§1 item 4) — the only tile class where you must trust subject-naming + fixity rather than a logged rectangle.
- **Deployment context, disclosed:** readings from this corpus are quoted (with disclosure) in the author's article ("The Doctrine of Fearfulness") and federal filings; the quoted-readings audit (_WORKING_MS149_P4D... §§3–4) traced every such quote to the FIRM censuses — one breaking variance was found and corrected article-side, and the one quote that touches an arbitration site now describes both weights. Nothing here asks you to endorse any legal argument — only, if you will, to read strokes.
- **Method version:** executed under **v1.1 → v1.3** of the methodology (the v1.3 edition layer — per-side edition transcripts for non-specialist deployment — is *not yet built* for this corpus; the working layers above are the current state, and §3's no-canon note governs the citation layer).

6. A TIME-EFFICIENT AUDIT (IF YOU CANNOT RE-READ SIX SIDES)

1. Adjudicate the five arbitrations (§5, tiles cited in the ledger rows) and the three substance headlines: 83r.1 his vs baselines' "this" · 82r.6 gr⟨oa⟩t(e)s · 82v.2 ⟨and|one⟩.
2. Check every reading on the quoted-in-print list — _WORKING_MS149_P4D_DELTA_AND_QUOTED_AUDIT.md §§3–4 is that list, each quote traced to census, tiles, and status.
3. Roll 4 random census lines per side from the line indexes and verify against tiles.
4. Inspect the revision stratum end-to-end (it is where copies most often deceive): the 81v.1 triple event (~~were~~ dittograph · ~~Lewes~~ + Λ«hugh ap» eye-skip repair · the cancelled catchword ~~William~~ at 81r's foot), the 82v Chauncell^r suspension bar (bar, not strike), the 83r reader's-mark diagonal and the "Readers" underline. Agreement there certifies the corpus to stated confidence; any disagreement is welcome — it feeds the same delta-log machinery every internal pass used.

7. CREDIT, CONTACT, TERMS

Transcription © the author (contact@lawsofexistence.com), offered for scholarly verification and critique; cite as "author's transcription from Harvard Law School Library MS 149, Part 3, ff. 81r–83v (via Harvard DRS IIF, drs:425601024), method at [this repository], professional collation pending." The underlying images are Harvard Library digitizations (funded by the Ames Foundation for Legal History) and remain subject to Harvard Library's terms of use — this package is shared for individual scholarly verification; please do not republish the images themselves without checking Harvard's reuse terms. The banked Williams chapter is CC BY-NC-ND 4.0 (UCL Discovery eprint 10126336) and travels under its own licence.