
READING COMPANION — TNA STAC 8/203/38 (*FLOYD V. BARKER* STAR CHAMBER DEPOSITIONS, 1607)

Reading companion (diplomatic + modernized; modernized never quotable)

Corpus	02_STAC_8_203_38
Source	READING_COMPANION_STAC_8_203_38.md
Integrity	sha256 44a4b4fbbcc0 · 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: <code>_PRECISION_PASS_LEDGER.md</code>; method: <code>TRANSCRIPTION_AND_ANALYSIS_METHODOLOGY.md</code>.</i>

HOW TO READ THIS RENDER (CONVENTIONS LEGEND)

strikethrough	struck in the manuscript (source: <code>~~text~~</code>)
superscript	scribal interlineation or raised letters (source: <code>^text^</code> , <code>m^r</code>)
serif (Cambria) span	diplomatic text quoted inline (source: <code>`text`</code>); the type shift marks the source-text voice; conventions inside are rendered too
boxed serif panel	diplomatic transcription block
gray italic <code>[[...]]</code>	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

MEMBRANE 001 — `8368179_STAC_8_203_38_001.JPG` (SINGLE LEAF) — DEPOSITION OF JOHN TOWNELEY	5
As written (<i>re-sweep 2026-07-02</i>).....	5
Modernized	5
MEMBRANE 002 — `8368179_STAC_8_203_38_002.JPG` (DOUBLE OPENING) — TOWNELEY'S DEPOSITION, CONTINUED	6
As written — left leaf (<i>re-sweep 2026-07-02</i>).....	7
As written — right leaf (<i>re-sweep 2026-07-02</i>).....	7
Modernized	8
MEMBRANE 003 — `8368179_STAC_8_203_38_003.JPG` (DOUBLE OPENING) — END OF TOWNELEY; DEPOSITION OF REES (RICE) AP EVAN LLOYD, PRISONER	9

As written — left leaf (Towneley, concl.; re-sweep 2026-07-02).....	9
As written — right leaf (Rees ap Jevan Lloyd, prisoner; re-sweep 2026-07-02)	10
Modernized	10
MEMBRANE 004 — `8368179_STAC_8_203_38_004.JPG` (DOUBLE OPENING) — REES AP EVAN LLOYD'S DEPOSITION, CONTINUED (INTERROGATORIES 3–5).....	11
As written — left leaf (<i>re-sweep 2026-07-02</i>).....	12
Modernized — left leaf	12
As written — right leaf (<i>re-sweep 2026-07-02</i>).....	13
Modernized — right leaf	13
MEMBRANE 005 — `8368179_STAC_8_203_38_005.JPG` (DOUBLE OPENING) — REES AP EVAN LLOYD'S DEPOSITION, CONTINUED (INTERROGATORIES 6–8).....	14
As written — left leaf (<i>re-sweep 2026-07-02</i>).....	15
Modernized — left leaf	15
As written — right leaf (<i>re-sweep 2026-07-02</i>).....	16
Modernized — right leaf	16
MEMBRANE 006 — `8368179_STAC_8_203_38_006.JPG` (DOUBLE OPENING) — REES AP EVAN LLOYD'S DEPOSITION, CONTINUED (INTERROGATORIES 8 CONCL.–12)	18
As written — left leaf (<i>re-sweep 2026-07-02</i>).....	18
Modernized — left leaf	18
As written — right leaf (<i>re-sweep 2026-07-02</i>).....	19
Modernized — right leaf	20
MEMBRANE 007 — `8368179_STAC_8_203_38_007.JPG` (SINGLE LEAF) — CONCLUSION OF REES AP EVAN LLOYD'S DEPOSITION (INTERROGATORIES 13–16; SIGNATURE).....	21
As written (<i>re-sweep 2026-07-02</i>).....	21
Modernized	21
MEMBRANE 008 — `8368179_STAC_8_203_38_008.JPG` (TALL SINGLE LEAF) — THE INTERROGATORIES ("ARTICLES TO BE MINISTERED AGAINST [REES AP EVAN] LLOYD"), JUNE 1607	22
As written — complete, line-by-line (dedicated sweep 2026-07-02; bands crops/crop_s8_b1..b15; per- band text in _WORKING_008_TRANSCRIPTION.md)	23
Modernized — the twelve articles on this membrane	25
MEMBRANE 009 — `8368179_STAC_8_203_38_009.JPG` (TALL SINGLE LEAF) — THE INTERROGATORIES, CONTINUED: ARTICLES 13–16 (THE CONTINUATION LEAF OF THE 008 INSTRUMENT)	27
As written (Articles 13–16, from the 009 bands + verification zooms).....	27
Modernized (13–16).....	29

MEMBRANE 010 — `8368179_STAC_8_203_38_010.JPG` (GIANT SINGLE MEMBRANE, ~7357×7029, 45 MB) — THE DEFENSE: A DEFENDANT'S ANSWER TO LLOYD'S BILL	30
As written — line-by-line (4×16 grid, rows keyed to _WORKING_010_TRANSCRIPTION.md; stitches across the four quarter-columns are provisional).....	31
Modernized (the whole Answer, condensed)	34
NAME-RECONCILIATION TABLE (STAC ↔ COKE ↔ HLS) — VERIFICATION PASS, 2026-07-01	36

What this is. The surviving Star Chamber file behind *Floyd v. Barker* — TNA catalogue title *Lloyde v. Lewys* (Anglesey, Trinity term 1607) — obtained as a National Archives record copy (order **RC8368179**, dispatched 1 July 2026; 10 image files 8368179_STAC_8_203_38_001–010.jpg in this directory). These are **witness examinations (depositions) on interrogatories**, in English secretary hand with a Latin caption, taken in the cause **Rice ap Evan Lloyd, complainant, v. Richard Barker (one of the Justices of the Grand Sessions of Anglesey) and others** — i.e. the very bill Coke's report (12 Co. Rep. 23, *sub nom.* "Case of Conspiracy") says was ordered "utterly defaced." The bill itself is not extant; **these depositions about the making of that bill survive.**

Methodology (same as HLS MS 149). Each membrane image is cut into overlapping zoom-bands (crops/crop_mNNN_bK.jpg) so the hand can be read at magnification; targeted quarter-crops are made for hard names. Two layers per membrane: **(1) As written** — diplomatic first-pass, scribe's spelling, virgules (/) preserved, [?] flagging uncertain readings, [...] editorial expansion/supplied; **(2) Modernized** — editorial rendering for comprehension.

Rules of use.

- The Modernized layer is an **editorial aid, not source text** — never quote it in a filing.
- **1607 secretary hand carries real transcription risk.** For any filing use — above all names/dates — re-verify against the image (and ideally a professional TNA transcription). Do **not** fold contested readings into `../..../3_Academic Articles/11_Immunity and Standing Doctrine Geneology/THE_TWO_LOCKS.md` until verified.
- **Name question — RESOLVED BY THE VERIFICATION PASS (2026-07-01; see the reconciliation table at the foot): TWO men were executed.** The caption plaintiff is **Rees ap Evan Lloyd** (the prisoner-deponent; = Coke's "Rice ap Evan ap Floyd"). His **elder brother John ap Evan Lloyd** (008 Art. 1 ✓ zoom) was executed **for murdering his own wife** ("his A[nn]is," Art. 1; "the wieffe of the said Elder brother," 010 r11 ✓ clear) — the complainant himself was **co-indicted for that fact and acquitted** ("Ignoramus ... by special favour," HLS f. 82v). The kinsman **William ap Rees ap William** (full three-element form, 008 Art. 3 ✓ zoom) was "executed w[i]th yo[ur] said brother" (Art. 2 ✓) — **he is Coke's "William Price/ap Rice,"** convicted of murdering **Hugh ap William** (the 1600 drowning; 010 r3 ✓, Coke, HLS all agree). The earlier "Coke conflated the names" theory is **retracted**: the print's distortion is not a garbled name but **suppression** — it keeps one executed man and omits the brother, the wife-murder, the complainant's own jeopardy, and the faction war. "John Lloyd" (Towneley's procurer, 001–002) is likely the complainant or a close relative. **Every name still requires a professional TNA transcription before article or filing use.**

- Cross-reference: the HLS MS 149 second account (../01_HLS_MS149_Floyd_ff81r-83v/READING_COMPANION_ff81r-83v.md) and Coke's print (../06_Randall v Brigham English Case Law/markdown/1607 - Floyd v. Barker, 77 Eng. Rep. 1305.md). (*Paths re-pointed 2026-07-09 for the 2_English Materials reorg.*)

Status (2026-07-02): all 10 membranes transcribed line-by-line and PRECISION-VERIFIED — every leaf now rests on Fable-5 readings. First sweep (2026-07-01) → consolidated **verification pass** (name zooms + the reconciliation table at the foot) → 008 dedicated 15-band sweep + 010 4×16 grid → **full Fable-5 line-by-line RE-SWEEP of membranes 001–007** (2026-07-02, user-directed; working files `_WORKING_TOWNELEY_DEPOSITION_001-003L.md` + `_WORKING_LLOYD_DEPOSITION_003R-007.md`, 72 bands) → **post-re-sweep zoom queue CLOSED** (verdicts in `_WORKING_REZOOM_VERDICTS_2026-07-02.md`) → **this companion's sections 001–007 rewritten from the re-sweep** (the first-sweep digests are superseded throughout) → **PRECISION PASS (third pass) COMPLETE**: Phase A = 009 line-by-line (`_WORKING_009_TRANSCRIPTION.md`), Phase C = 21-zoom gap campaign (`_PRECISION_PASS_LEDGER.md` = the TNA commission brief), Phase B = **010 rows 1–12 re-verified cell-by-cell** (48 recut cells; headline results in the 010 section + the precision block at the foot). Structure of the file: **deposition of John Towneley** (counsel, 001–003L, autograph) · **deposition of Rees ap Jevan Lloyd** (prisoner-complainant, 003R–007, autograph) · **ONE 16-article interrogatory instrument spanning two membranes** (Articles 1–12 on 008; 13–16 on 009, which opens mid-sentence; drafted against the whole enterprise and administered selectively — Towneley answered 3, 4, 5, 6, ¹³, 15, 16; Lloyd answered 1–12 and 14, "not appointed" on the drawer-directed 13/15/16 — interlocking, no overlap, no gap) · **the Answer of John Lewis, High Sheriff of Anglesey** (010). **Gate status (2026-07-03)**: user ADJUDICATED (approved; quoting authorized on the author's authority with disclosure); TNA commission email SENT (pending — `_PRECISION_PASS_LEDGER.md` is the brief); **article fold-in DONE** (`THE_TWO_LOCKS.md` V.B: the file, the instrument, the answer's fear clause + "calling in question," the eponym ¶ rewritten on the two-executions record; nn. vst1–vst4 + vr9). Remaining: when the professional transcription returns, conform the article's STAC readings (names above all) and lift the provisional flags — variances to the user first.

Status update (2026-07-08 — PASS 4 COMPLETE + FOLD-IN, user-approved): the **Phase 4 campaign (4A/4B/4C/4D)** re-swept every membrane at native+ with per-leaf LINE INDEXES — 008 (86 lines) · 009 (31 lines + the rotated **ENDORSEMENT/docket**, a zone no prior pass imaged) · 010 completeness audit (rows 13–16 + seam strips + [?]-token re-renders) · 001–007 per-membrane line-grain sweeps (`_WORKING_00N_LINE_INDEX.md`). **Every membrane verdict: the transcriptions below SURVIVE at substance level**; the campaign's yield = line anchors, the leaf-by-leaf revision stratum (interlines/carets/strikes), letterform corrections, and **one recovered LINE** (006R, homoeoteleuton). All delta logs are FOLDED IN to the working transcription files (`[/4A/4B/4C/4D: ...]` notes) and summarized per membrane below in "**Phase-4 addendum**" blocks. Cross-membrane systemic findings: the scribe bars in-line "f̄d" where earlier passes recorded interline "s[ai]d"; the "Edwardes henrie" anticipation error (5+ occurrences); the 003L answer-numeral anomalies + the date-minim conflict (11 vs 16 June); contracted-vs-plene variance is scribal habit. The ledger remains the TNA commission brief; **all flagged readings stay provisional until the professional transcription returns (conform-on-return, names above all).**

MEMBRANE 001 — `8368179\_STAC\_8\_203\_38\_001.JPG` (SINGLE LEAF) — DEPOSITION OF JOHN TOWNELEY

On this membrane: the Latin dating clause and caption — examination taken the [11th?] of June, 5 Jac. (June 1607), "upon interrogatories ministered by order of the Court in the cause lately exhibited by Res ap Jevan Lloyd against Richard Barker, Esq., & others"; the deponent (John Towneley of Craven, the counsel who drew the bill); and his answers to the 3rd and 4th interrogatories — the great roll, the two warnings, and the conference for drawing the bill (continuing to membrane 002). **Re-swept line-by-line 2026-07-02** (8 bands; per-band text with coordinates in _WORKING_TOWNELEY_DEPOSITION_001-003L.md — supersedes the first-sweep digest).

As written (*re-sweep 2026-07-02*)

Exa[mini]o capt[a] [xj?] die mensis Junij Anno regni d[omi]ni n[ost]ri Jacobi Reg[is] Anglie, ffrancie, et Hib[er]nie [qui]nto, et Scotie Quadrage[simo primo?] ... Sup[er] Interr[ogatoriis] [ex?] ordine[m] Cur[ie] ministrat[is] in [c]a[usa] nup[er] exhibit[a] p[er] Res ap Jevan Lloyd con[tra] Ric[ard]um Barker Ar[migerum] & al[ios] /

John Towneley of Craven [in the Countie of __?] [duely?] sworne &c /

To the 3[?] Interr[ogatories] this ex[amin]ant [saith] that he ~~{struck word}~~ was of [C]ouncell — a[s] a Councillor at Lawe — together w[i]th [Mr Serjeant?] Montague, [R]ecorder of London, & two others Councillors at Lawe, w[i]th a Bill lately exhibited into the his ma[jes]t[ies] hono[rable] Courte of Starrechamber by Rees ap Jevan Lloyd agaynst M[r] ~~{struck}~~ Barker es[quire] & others, for & concerninge [s]uch [misdemeanours] as are mentioned in the said Bill /

To the 4 Interr[ogatory] this ex[amin]ant [saieth] that Res ap Jevan Floud came unto this ex[aminan]t [bringing] w[i]th him a great Rolle of [writings?] [con]teyninge ... the substance of divers ^[interline] [charges?] misdemenours] agaynst the s[ai]d M[r] [B]arker, [the effect] whereof were afterwards comprised in the s[ai]d bill ... at w[hi]ch tyme the said Jevan Floud told this ex[aminan]t that he came from his [Countrey? / Councill?], & that he had a [purpose to have] a bill Drawne accordinge to [tho]se instruccions, & to retaine two other Councillors besides those w[i]th whome he had ben; whereupon this ex[aminan]t read over the instruccions conteyned in the s[ai]d pap[er]s, & then tolde the s[ai]d Jevan Floud that it did not [appeare] thereby ^{that he} was a p[ar]tie greved, & that the substance of the bill to be Drawne for those matters would be [e]specialle in the [__] nature of a conspiracie; & therefore this ex[aminan]t ~~{struck}~~ [willed] [the said?] Jevan Floud to [ac]quainte [M[r] Serjeant __?] ... & w[i]th whome this ex[aminan]t might conferre for the Drawinge up of the s[ai]d Bill — (*torn foot; continues membrane 002*)

Modernized

Examination taken the [11th?] day of June, in the 5th year of James (of Scotland the fort[y-first?]) — June 1607 — upon interrogatories ministered by order of the Court, in the cause lately exhibited by Res ap Jevan Lloyd against Richard Barker, esquire, and others. John Towneley of Craven, sworn.

To the 3rd: he was of counsel — as a counsellor at law, with [Serjeant] Montague, the Recorder of London, and two other counsellors — with the bill lately exhibited into the Star Chamber **by Rees ap Jevan Lloyd against Mr Barker, esquire, and others**, concerning the misdemeanours mentioned in the bill.

To the 4th: Res ap Jevan Floud came to him with a great roll of [writings] containing the substance of divers [charges] against Mr Barker, **"the effect whereof were afterwards comprised in the said bill."** Floud told him he **came from his [country?]**, purposed a bill drawn according to those instructions, and meant **to retain two other counsellors besides**. Towneley read the instructions over and told him **"it did not appear thereby that he was a party grieved,"** and that the substance of a bill drawn on those matters **"would be especially in the nature of a conspiracy"**; and thereupon [willed] Floud to acquaint [Serjeant ____], with whom this examinant might confer for the drawing up of the bill. (→ 002)

Why it matters: this is the taproot immunity case from the primary record, and the re-sweep adds structural facts to the two canonical warnings. (1) Counsel warned the bill against the judge **"would be ... in the nature of a conspiracy"** — the exact frame Coke's report adopts (*Floyd v. Barker* reported *sub* "Case of Conspiracy"); (2) counsel doubted the complainant **"was a party grieved"** — a standing objection at the very origin; both now sit verbatim with band anchors. (3) NEW: the file's **own Latin caption styles the cause "Lloyd v. Barker & others"** — matching Coke's caption, NOT the TNA catalogue title *Lloyde v. Lewys* (which is drawn from the Answer's parties): the catalogue-invisibility of the judge's name begins in the archive's own indexing layer (cf. the four-strata doc). (4) NEW: Towneley's answers **begin at the 3rd interrogatory** — Articles 1–2 (the brother, the kinsman: personal to Lloyd) were not administered to him — corroborating, from the answer side, the **selective administration of the single 16-article instrument** resolved on 008/009. (5) The deposition itself writes **"Jevan Floud"** — the file carries the *Floyd* spelling Coke's caption made canonical. (6) The dating clause (with 003R's margin "xj[?]. Junij 1607") puts both examinations in **June 1607** — Trinity term, weeks before the reported decision.

Phase-4 addendum (4D-1, 2026-07-08): census = 8-line Latin caption + 32 lines + L1b; revision stratum mapped (8 interlines/carets + 4 strikes). Upgrades: the roll is **"a great Rolle of p[ar]chm[en]t[?]"** (letterform lead over "[writings?]); "divers ff[oule?] m[i]sdemeno[u]rs"; the answer-head struck word = **"E[?]dwa[r]d[?]"** (the Edwardes-before-Montague anticipation error at first occurrence); ★ the [Countrey?/Councell?] crux **RESOLVED-leaning "his Councell"** (clear double-l, no y-descender — Lloyd arrived having already consulted counsel; the Marches-Council and Welsh-idiom readings retire); ★ the band-7 willed-clause reads as advice **to retain M[r] Mountague** ("...willed {2} M^r[?] Mountague[?] to be of his [C]oun[s]ell[?]" — chains into 002L's opening; TOP-3 TNA); the foot name-token "[B]ulkl[e]y[?]" candidate (Bulkeley's possible first entry on 001). Caption day-number still contested ({vij, xj} here; 003R margin reads x[v?]j — ledger B6, TOP TNA). Physical: circled graphite "2" = modern foliation.

MEMBRANE 002 — `8368179\_STAC\_8\_203\_38\_002.JPG` (DOUBLE OPENING) — TOWNELEY'S DEPOSITION, CONTINUED

On this membrane: the drafting narrative, now line-by-line: Serjeant ~~Edward~~^{Henry} Montague retained (the scribe's own double correction resolves the forename — historically the Recorder of London, 1603–16); the truth-vetting through **Sir Richard Bulkeley**, flagged by an **examiner's marginal note**; Montague's professional opinion that the matters, **if true, were "examinable in the Starre chamber"**; the Parliament-House

conference plan; the bill drawn, perused, kept **about three weeks, cut by about a third in the serjeant's own hand**, re-engrossed, its truth questioned a second time — and **his hand set to it. Re-swept 2026-07-02** (16 bands; per-band text in _WORKING_TOWNELEY_DEPOSITION_001-003L.md — supersedes the first-sweep readings, including the old "the 20th Interr." margin-note guess).

As written — left leaf (*re-sweep 2026-07-02*)

And so thereuppon the saide Jevan Ll[oyd] retayne[d] the s[ai]d S[erjean]t [E?]w: Montague [to] be of his Counsell. / And also at the same tyme this ex[aminan]t tolde the s[ai]d Jevan Lloud that the matters mencioned in the s[ai]d instruccions did [con]cerne some of ~~{struck}~~ S[i]r R[i]chard Bulkies [k]inred ~~{struck: friends?}~~, & [th]at by ^{the} reason thereof the s[ai]d [matters] more concerned the s[ai]d S[i]r R[i]ch[ard] Bulkl[ey] then him the s[ai]d Jevan Lloud; & that this ex[aminan]t, havinge occasion to repayre u[n]to the s[ai]d S[i]r R[i]chard about Law busines w[hi]ch this ex[aminan]t had to deale in, ... would then conferre w[i]th the s[ai]d S[i]r R[i]chard about the s[ai]d instruc[i]ons, to know of him whether he could & wo[uld] justifie the matters of the s[ai]d instruc[i]ons to be true; And that then, yf this ex[aminan]t fo[unde] the s[ai]d S[i]r R[i]chard to affirme the same, that then this ex[aminan]t would [conferre with] the s[ai]d S[erjean]t [E?]w: Montague touchinge the ~~Drawinge up of the course of the Starre chamber for the~~ [clause struck] & Drawinge up of a Bill uppon [the] instruccions or notes to the same effecte, whereof the s[ai]d Jevan Ll[oyd] [approved]. And saieth that afterwards this ex[aminan]t, [re]pairinge to the s[ai]d S[i]r R[i]chard Bul[keley] about his other causes, had ^{on a day} conference w[i]th him about the s[ai]d instruccions, [who] then affirmed to this ex[aminan]t the same to be true in the materiall points thereof.

(left margin, contemporary hand — an examiner's/clerk's flag of the key admission:) "S[ir] R[ichard?] [B.?] affirmed [the] [in]struccions in [some?] of the materiall points to be[?] true." ... And afterwarde this ex[aminan]t repayed to the s[ai]d ~~E[dward]es~~ ^{henrye} Montague (he being before reteyned by the s[ai]d Jevan Ll[oud] to be of his Councell) [&] did conferre w[i]th the s[ai]d ~~E[dward]es~~ ^{henrie} [Montague] about the same instruc[i]ons, whoe then affirmed that yf the same were ... *(torn foot; → right leaf)*

As written — right leaf (*re-sweep 2026-07-02*)

... [whoe then affirmed that yf the same were] true, that then the same matters were examinable in the Starre chamber. And thereuppon this ex[aminan]t [re]plied that, yf it pleased him the s[ai]d S[erjean]t ~~{struck}~~ ^{henrie}, that he might at his next meetinge w[i]th the s[ai]d S[i]r R[i]chard Bulkley at the p[ar]liament howse conferre w[i]th ^{the s[ai]d S[i]r Rich:} Bulkley touchinge the truth of those instruccions, & so [re]ceave from him such satisfaccion as this deponent had done; wheruppon the s[ai]d S[erjean]t ~~{struck}~~ ^{henrie} Montague then seemed [to be] fully satisfied. After [w[hi]ch tyme] the Bill was drawne ^[by _? — interline] up in pap[er], & then p[er]used by this ex[aminan]t, & afterwards [delivered to] the s[ai]d Jevan Ll[oud] ... unto the S[erjean]t ~~E[dward]~~ ^{henrie} [Montague], [who] havinge [] [pe]rused (as the s[ai]d Lloud told this ex[aminan]t) requested this ex[aminan]t to come to him the s[ai]d S[erjean]t ^{henrie}, whoe [then], shewing unto him this ex[aminan]t the

s[ai]d [bill], And in this ex[aminan]ts p[re]sence read over most [of] the said Bill, & then also willed that the s[ai]d [Bill] be lefte w[i]th him further to p[er]use, w[hi]ch was accordingle lefte w[i]th him by the space of ^{aboute} three weekes together. And afterwards the s[ai]d S[erjean]t [willed] the s[ai]d bill to bee ingrossed w[i]th some [amendments] brought by the s[ai]d Loyd unto [him] ... [w[i]th his] owne hand did putt owt, & [gave] [o]rder for the puttinge owt of ^{about} a third [p[ar]te of the] s[ai]d Bill; and afterwards the s[ai]d Bill was newlie copied & brought to the s[ai]d Montague, who then ag[ain]e, after he had [read over the same], made some [question] of the truth of the matters therein conteyned, [and] did sett his hand to the [same] ... *(torn foot; the deposition concludes on 003L.)*

Modernized

Lloyd retained Serjeant ~~Edward~~ Henry Montague. Towneley told Lloyd the matters in the instructions concerned Sir Richard Bulkeley's kindred — and therefore Sir Richard — **more than Lloyd himself**; when next with Sir Richard on his own law business, Towneley would confer "**to know of him whether he could and would justify the matters ... to be true,**" and if Sir Richard affirmed them, Towneley would confer with Montague about drawing a bill upon them. Lloyd approved. Towneley later, with Bulkeley "about his other causes," conferred "**on a day**" about the instructions — and Bulkeley "**affirmed ... the same to be true in the material points thereof**" (*flagged by the examiner's marginal note*). Towneley then conferred with Montague, **who affirmed that if the same were true, "then the same matters were examinable in the Starrechamber."** Towneley proposed Montague verify for himself **with Bulkeley at the Parliament House**, "and so receive from him such satisfaction as this deponent had done" — whereupon Montague "seemed fully satisfied." **The bill was drawn** up in paper, perused by Towneley, carried to Montague — who requested Towneley personally (*a detail the deponent marks as hearsay: "as the said Lloud told this examinant"*), **read over most of the bill in his presence**, kept it "**about three weeks together,**" ordered it engrossed with amendments, **with his own hand put out — and gave order for putting out — about a third of the bill**; the bill was newly copied and brought back; Montague **again questioned the truth of the matters therein — and set his hand to it.**

Why it matters — the serjeant-editor. The bill the Star Chamber would brand "devised ... libelous" and order "utterly defaced" was, on the bill-side counsel's own sworn account: truth-vetted through the man its matters most concerned ("**justify ... to be true**" / "**affirmed ... true in the material points**"); opinion-cleared by a King's serjeant as "**examinable in the Starrechamber**" if true — the precise inverse of the eventual holding ("not examinable in this court," per the HLS order); double-vetted by the **Parliament-House** plan; kept three weeks; **cut by a third in the serjeant's own hand**; truth-questioned a second time; and **subscribed** ("did sett his hand") — precisely the "barrister's hand" the Court's own post-*Floyd* 15-sheet rule (HLS f. 83r) would later demand. Two layers of counsel diligence stand behind the bill the Court punished as libelous conspiracy. The **examiner's marginal note** flagging Bulkeley's affirmation shows how the examination was *used*: the court side mining the deposition for exactly the Bulkeley-connection its Articles 4–5 and 10 ("of kynred w[i]th the said S[i]r R[i]chard") were hunting. And the scribe's forename corrections ("~~Edward~~ Henry", four occurrences) resolve the serjeant as **Henry Montague** — Recorder of London — a fact stated nowhere in Coke or HLS.

Phase-4 addendum (4D-2, 2026-07-08): census = L 38 lines + the 4-line marginal note · R ~38 lines + foot fragments; the whole narrative arc letterform-corroborated. ★ **The marginal note carries a STRUCK QUANTIFIER** ("affirmed [the] instrucion in ~~some~~ [struck] of the materiall points to bee true") — the examiner REVISED how much Bulkeley affirmed; which word survived is a professional item. ★ The drawn-by interline resolves: "the Bill was drawne ^{by this ex[aminan]t [&/or?] his [man?]}" — Towneley himself, answering Art. 4's drawe-or-penne probe. NEW: "w[hi]ch he **mi[s]liked** w[i]th his owne hand did putt owt" (what Montague misliked he cut); "did sett his hand to the **s[ai]d Bill**"; foot date fragment "...to the [?] **Ju[l/n]ij**" (June coheres with 001; July would be a later date — TNA). Correction census: **9–11 Edward/Henry events** incl. two apparently uncorrected first mentions ("Edw:", "Edwad") △△. The instrum(en)ts/instruc(i)ons per-site letterform split is logged (8 sites) — never silently normalize.

**MEMBRANE 003 — `8368179\_STAC\_8\_203\_38\_003.JPG` (DOUBLE OPENING) — END OF TOWNELEY;
DEPOSITION OF REES (RICE) AP EVAN LLOYD, PRISONER**

On this membrane: left leaf finishes Towneley (answers 5, 1[5/6], ¹³, 15, 16 — with his **scope objections** and **autograph signature**); right leaf opens the **complainant's own examination** — Rees ap Jevan Lloyd, prisoner in the Fleet (margin date "xj[?]. Junij 1607") — answers 1–2: the Barker-removal remark and the brother's execution. **Re-swept line-by-line 2026-07-02** (16 bands; per-band text in the two **_WORKING_*** deposition files — supersedes the first-sweep readings and the old name caveat, which the verification pass resolved: see the header block and the reconciliation table).

As written — left leaf (Towneley, concl.; re-sweep 2026-07-02)

To the 5[th]: he cannot say any [thing] more then he hath before declared to the p[re]cedent Interr[ogatory] /

To the 1[5/6?] Interr[ogatory] this ex[aminan]t [saieth] that [the money] receaved of the s[ai]d Rees ap Jevan Flo[ud] for [his counsel in / continuinge?] the s[ai]d Bill [was] fflower pownds & [seven? / certaine?] shillings more, to this ex[aminan]ts best remembrance; neither did this ex[aminan]t receave any other some of monie of any other p[er]son touch[inge] that busines /

To the ~~{struck number}~~ ¹³ Interr[ogatory] this ex[aminan]t [saieth] that, touchinge the matters mencioned in th[is] Interr, he receaved the same, as he did the rest, by the instrucion of the s[ai]d Rees ap Jevan Ll[oud], & of no other p[er]son; And touchinge the la[ttter] p[ar]te of this Interr, this ex[aminan]t taketh himselfe not bound by the ord[e]r of this hono: Courte to make [answer] [any fur]ther thereunto. /

To the 15^o: he saieth as he hath before [answered] to the p[re]cedent Interr; And mo[re] he cannot say thereunto /

To the 16: he saieth as he hath before said to the ~~precedent~~ Interr; And further this ex[aminan]t taketh the contents of this Interr not any way to concerne the matters of the ord[e]r made in this Ho: Courte, whereby this ex[aminan]t is now exa[mi]ned.

(signature, bottom right, autograph with flourish:) [J?] Townley

As written — right leaf (Rees ap Jevan Lloyd, prisoner; re-sweep 2026-07-02)

(*top-left margin:*) xj[?]. Junij 1607.

Rees ap Jevan Ll[o]ud, now p[r]isoner in the ffleete, sworne &c /

To the 1. Interr[ogatory] this ex[aminan]t [saieth] to his rememb[r]aunce that he did not reporte[d] to any p[er]son or p[er]sons ^[interline] since the sixt day of october last, that **Richard [struck] Barker esq[ui]re**, one of his Ma[jes]t[ies] Justices of his highnes great Sessions of the Countie of Anglesey in Northwales, [sh/c]ould be no more Justice there ... But he this ex[aminan]t did s[aye] [at?] that tyme that the said M[r] [B]arker might [be] no more come to be Justice there, & that yf he did, that this ex[aminan]t might not receive [his] triall under him; but ^{to} whome this ex[aminan]t so said, he doth not now [per]fectly [re]member; But [saieth], as he thinketh, it was to George Ll[ewell?]en [suspension — see the zoom verdicts]; & that the occasion of this ex[aminan]ts so sayinge was upon ~~day~~ this ex[aminan]ts ^{then beinge} newly com[e] from London, [and] it beinge then demaunded ^{also} of this ex[aminan]t whether the s[ai]d M[r] Barker & M[r] Justice Leighton were putt owt of their places of [being] Justices of Assize[?] w[i]thin that Count[ie/rey] /

To the 2. Interr this ex[aminan]t saieth that he doth verily beleve in his conscience that John ap Jevan Lloud, his ex[aminan]ts brother, was at the last Sessions holden for the Counties of Anglesey wrongfullie indicted, condempned & executed for the supposed murtheringe of [his] ~~[struck]~~ wife; for that this ex[aminan]t did often [theretofore?] heare the said [John ap?] Jevan Lloud [urged? touching] that matter, ^{if it were true}, that he should confesse the same, & he still denied it to the deathe. And further he saieth [that he] this ex[aminan]t was unjustlie & wrongfully [in]di[c]ted for that ~~offense~~ ^{facte}, for he was not in anie sorte p[r]ivie or consentinge to the doinge thereof. And further this ex[aminan]t saieth that, as he taketh it, ~~Willm~~ [struck] / ap Rees ap [W]m, that was executed [with] his ex[aminan]ts brother, & he this ex[aminan]t were the [C]ozens of [c]osin german[s] remo[v]ed — (*torn foot; continues membrane 004*)

Modernized

(*Left leaf — Towneley concludes:*) **5th:** nothing more than before. **1[5/6]th (the fee):** he received of Rees ap Jevan Floud, for [his counsel in] the bill, **four pounds and [seven?] shillings odd**, to his best remembrance — **"neither did this examinant receive any other sum of money of any other person touching that business."** ^{13th} (*the struck-and-corrected number shows the clerk keying answers to the instrument*): the matters in this interrogatory he received, **"as he did the rest, by the instructions of the said Rees ap Jevan Lloud, & OF NO OTHER PERSON"**; and as to its latter part, he **"taketh himself not bound by the order of this Honourable Court to make answer any further."** **15th:** as before. **16th:** as before — and its contents **"not any way to concern the matters of the order ... whereby this examinant is now examined."** (*Autograph:*) Townley.

(*Right leaf — the complainant, sworn 11[?] June 1607:*) **1st:** a layered confession-and-avoidance: he **denies the report as framed** ("should be no more Justice"); **admits** saying Barker **"might no more come to be Justice, & that if he did, this examinant might not receive his trial under him"** — the fair-trial objection of a man then under indictment; thinks he said it to **George Ll[ewell?]en**; and gives the occasion — **newly come**

from London, being asked "whether Mr Barker & Mr Justice Leighton were put out of their places." **2nd:** he verily believes his brother **John ap Jevan Lloud** was "**wrongfully indicted, condemned & executed for the SUPPOSED murdering of his WIFE**"; he often heard the brother urged, "if it were true," to confess — "**& he still denied it to the deathe.**" He himself was "**unjustly & wrongfully indicted for that fact, for he was not in any sort privy or consenting to the doing thereof.**" And **[William] ap Rees ap W[illia]m**, "**that was executed with his examinant's brother,**" was his kinsman — "**cousins of cousin-germans removed.**"

Why it matters: the complainant's sworn account, from the Fleet, ties the bill to **Barker's removal from the Anglesey bench** and to the **two executions** at the case's root — and the re-sweep recovered what the first sweep flattened. (1) The "seditious report" the Court's Art. 1 hunts was **table-talk answering a question about judicial removals already in motion**, grounded in his own jeopardy ("might not receive his trial under him"). (2) The victim of the brother's charge is "**his wife,**" in the **complainant's own sworn words** — third attestation, with the family framing "the SUPPOSED murdering." (3) "**He still denied it to the deathe**" — the brother's dying denial, counterpart to the kinsman's written dying charge (004): **both executed men died protesting**. (4) The scribe **strikes "Willm" and rewrites the name** — live evidence of the name-order instability behind every downstream variant — and the surviving text again carries the **three-element form "ap Rees ap W[illia]m"**. (5) NEW: the exact kinship — "**cousins of cousin-germans removed.**" (6) Towneley's side of the leaf adds the Art-13 bombshell: the bill's contents came "**by the instructions of ... Lloud, & of no other person**" — flatly negating the Bulkeley-procurement theory from the drawer's mouth — plus his **scope objections** invoking the Court's own examination order, and his **autograph**.

Phase-4 addendum (4D-3, 2026-07-08): census = L 30 lines + autograph + 2 NEW marginal marks (N-zigzag nota at the payment passage; V-paragraph at L24 — the 002L examiner-flag behavior again) · R 40 lines; every load-bearing clause (layered Art-1 answer, wife/dying-denial, privy-consenting, kinship formula) re-found ✓eB. **Contested → TNA (top):** the margin date "**x[v?]j Junij 1607**" (16th) vs the earlier "xj[?]" (11th, = 001) — one minim decides whether the two examinations are same-dated; "**privie**" vs letterform-rival "procuringe" (both canonical formulas, juridically loaded). Fee refined: "receaved ... for [C]ontinuinge[?] the ^{s[ai]d} Bill ... **ffower pownds & seven shilling[s] [&] more**" ("Steven Gilling" dissolved = "seven shilling"); **△△** the two "To the 1[5/6]" headers on 003L are a paired professional item (the fee content answers Art. 15 but the numeral favors 16). Autograph census: "**Town-l-ey**" — NO medial e; initial T-swash vs ff-ligature ambiguous (ledger A8). Also: "Coṁ"**△** before "Countie of Anglesey"; the R34 "inditted" heavy stroke (strike vs emphasis); Cozens/Sonnes; sixt-vs-ffirst October ("sixt" lead).

MEMBRANE 004 — `8368179\_STAC\_8\_203\_38\_004.JPG` (DOUBLE OPENING) — REES AP EVAN LLOYD'S DEPOSITION, CONTINUED (INTERROGATORIES 3–5)

On this membrane (left leaf): answer 3 — the bill's object "as this examinant conceived it," and the **standing answer at the origin** (his own wrongs already sued in Common Pleas; the dead man's wrongs carried "because he was dead"); answer 4 — **the dying charge, now verbatim, with the VOW**, in the prison at **Beaumaris**. (**Right leaf**): the composition claim ("collected himself"); the **witness theory** of Bulkeley's involvement, with **Sir Richard's words in direct discourse**; and answer 5 — the point-by-point procurement denial, naming the intermediary **W[illia]m Ken[w]rick[e][?]**. **Re-swept line-by-line 2026-07-02** (16 bands; **_WORKING_LLOYD_DEPOSITION_003R-007.md** — supersedes the first-sweep readings; the old name caveat is resolved, see the header block and reconciliation table).

As written — left leaf (*re-sweep 2026-07-02*)

To the 3. Interr[ogatory] this ex[aminan]t [s]aieth that he p[re]ferred a Bill into the Starrechamber against M[r] ^{Richard} ~~[struck]~~ Barker & oth[ers], Justice of Assize of the Countie of A[n]glesey, ... for & touchinge [the] wronge & [in]justice, as this ex[aminan]t conceived it, done unto the s[ai]d W[illia]m Rees ap Willia[m] & others, & for other the misdemeanors. And saieth that the reason why he did not by the s[ai]d [bill] p[re]ferred in this Ho: Courte complaine of the wronge done to this ex[aminan]t was that he had ^{before} brought his ac[ti]on in the Courte of Comon Pleas at Westm[inster] of Conspiracie, touchinge those matters. And touchinge the wrongs done to this ex[aminan]ts broth[er] — ~~because he was dead~~ [struck, then restructured] — this ex[aminan]t thought it good to bringe it in question, as well because he was dead, as also because [his] brother did not ^{in his life tyme} wishe this ex[aminan]t so to doe /

To the 4. Interr[ed] this ex[aminan]t [saieth] that [this] ex[aminan]t was imprisoned together in one prison w[i]th the sawd [said] Willia[m] ap Rees ap Willia[m], before the ~~[struck]~~ Rees [ap] Willia[m] was executed, by the space of a q[ua]rter of a yere or thereabouts. And after the s[ai]d ^{Willia[m]} ap Rees ap Willia[m] was cond[em]ned for the s[ai]d facte, he [being] in the prison at [B]ewmar[i]s, call[ed] this ex[aminan]t a[side], desiringe this ex[aminan]t to heare his confession ^{privately, what he [would say?]} ... he told this ex[aminan]t that he was as innocent of the facte whereof he was condemned as the child new borne, & then the s[ai]d W[illia]m ap Rees delivered to this ex[aminan]t [a] writen [writinge], sayeng: "here is a direction for you against M[r] Barker & others of their dealinges, w[hi]ch I praie you make knowne to the state after I am dead, as you are my kinsman"; A[t] w[hi]ch tyme this ex[aminan]t vowed to the s[ai]d Willia[m] ap Rees that this ex[aminan]t would doe the same. And thereupon by the ... (*continues, right leaf*)

Modernized — left leaf

3rd: The bill was against **Mr Richard Barker and others, Justice of Assize of Anglesey**, "for and touching the wrong and injustice, **as this examinant conceived it**, done unto the said **W[illia]m Rees ap William** and others." Why not his own wrongs? — **he had already brought his action in the Court of Common Pleas at Westminster, of conspiracy, touching those matters**; and as to his **brother's** wrongs, he "thought it good to bring it in question, **as well because he was dead**, as also because his brother did not ^{in his lifetime} **wish** this examinant so to do."

4th (the dying charge): He was imprisoned in one prison with **William ap Rees ap William**, about a quarter of a year, before the execution. After the condemned man's condemnation, "**he being in the prison at Beaumaris**," he called the examinant aside, "desiring this examinant to hear his confession ^{privately}" — told him he was "**as innocent of the fact whereof he was condemned as the child new borne**" — and delivered him a writing, saying: "**here is a direction for you against Mr Barker & others of their dealings, which I pray you make known to the state after I am dead, as you are my kinsman.**" At which time this examinant **VOWED** to the said William ap Rees that he would do the same.

Why it matters: this is the **human origin of the taproot immunity case**, now verbatim. A man about to be executed — "as innocent ... as the child new borne" — hands his kinsman a written charge against the judge with a dying plea to "**make [it] known to the state.**" The examinant **vowed** it: the bill against Barker was the

performance of a **deathbed vow**, and the chain **dying direction** → **great roll** → **instructions** → **vetted bill** (001–002) is closed end-to-end across the two depositions. The prison is **Beaumaris** — the same castle gaol whose custody war fills the Answer (010). And answer 3 is **the standing answer at the origin**: his own wrongs had their own forum; the Star Chamber bill carried the dead man's wrongs "**because he was dead**" — the surviving kinsman as the executed man's only voice. The Court ordered that bill "utterly defaced." The doctrine that "no judge can be questioned after judgment and execution" is built, at its root, on the suppression of a condemned man's dying accusation.

As written — right leaf (*re-sweep 2026-07-02*)

... [And thereupon by the] **instrucions of those writings, & by such collecions as this ex[aminan]t had collected himself** [against the ^{said} Sir M[r] Barker & others], [he caused] **the saied Bill to be Drawne & putt into this Ho: Courte, without the [pro]curement, advise or intreaty of [S[i]r Richard?] [B]ulkley kn[igh]t, Daniell Bulkley, [Tristram?] [/...] Willia[m] Bulkley, Launcelott Bulkley, or of any other Bulkley, or either of them; But before the exhibitinge [or?] [con]trivinge thereof, this ex[aminan]t told the ^{s[ai]d} [S[i]r Richard] Bulkley that this ex[aminan]t had caused the same to be drawne [meant to exhibit] a bill against [M[r]] Barker & others [in]to this Ho: Courte, & that this ex[aminan]t meant to use him the ^{s[ai]d} [S[i]r] Rich[ard] Bulkley to testifie his knowledg touchinge the ^{s[ai]d} matters** ~~struck line — legible within: "...acquainted? [him?]..."~~ ... [S[i]r] Richard willed this ex[aminan]t to bringe [him] the ^{s[ai]d} Bill to see, sayinge that he would first see it, yf this ex[aminan]t meant to use him as a wittnes; & so afterwards this ex[aminan]t brought the ^{s[ai]d} Bill unto the ^{s[ai]d} [S[i]r] Richard Bulkley, [who], havinge read the same, used these words [or the] ver[ie] like in effecte to this ex[aminan]t: "[if] you dost bringe me as a wittnes, I will speake the truthe." /

To the 5°. Interr[ed] this ex[aminan]t ^{s[ai]eth} that neither the [S[i]r] R[i]chard Bulkley, Launcelott Bulkley, Tristram Bulkley, nor Daniel Bulkley, ^{W[illia]m [Bulkley]}, or any of them, did write, send or speake to this [ex[aminan]t] ~~struck~~ to exhibite the ^{s[ai]d} bill; neither did they or any of them give or send any direction or instruction for the framinge of the ^{s[ai]d} Bill; Neither did W[illia]m [K/P]enri[ck/th][e], [nor] any other p[er]son or p[er]sons, otherwise then [this examinant] hath before declared, gave [any] [d]irecion to this ex[aminan]t for the drawinge of the ^{s[ai]d} Bill; But he this ex[aminan]t did himself ... [b]ut onely [gave] [d]irecion for the drawinge thereof.

Modernized — right leaf

(Answer 4, concluded — the composition claim:) "And thereupon, **by the instructions of those writings, & by such collections as this examinant had COLLECTED HIMSELF**," he caused the bill to be drawn and put into this Court, "**without the procurement, advise or intreaty**" of any of the five Bulkeleyes. But — the qualifying admission — **before the exhibiting** he told Sir Richard Bulkeley of the bill, "& that this examinant **meant to use him ... to testify his knowledge touching the said matters**"; Sir Richard "willed this examinant to bring him the said bill to see, saying that **he would first see it, if this examinant meant to use him as a witness**"; the examinant brought it; Bulkeley read it, and said, in these words or the very like: "**if you dost bring me as a witness, I will speak the truth.**"

5th (the conspiracy probe): Neither Sir Richard, Launcelot, Tristram, Daniel, nor ^{William} Bulkeley "did **write, send or speak** to this examinant ... to exhibit the said bill; neither did they or any of them **give or send any direction or instruction for the FRAMING of the said bill**; neither did **W[illia]m Ken[w]rick[e][?]**, nor any other person ..., otherwise than [as] this examinant hath before declared" — he himself only gave direction for the drawing thereof.

Why it matters (right leaf): the answer mirrors 008's Art. 5 **clause by clause** (write/send/speak; "direction or instruction for the framing") — and names the same suspected intermediary the article carries in its interline ("Willm Ken[w/b]rick" ⇔ "W[illia]m [K/P]enri[ck/th]e" — converged skeleton **Kenwrick/Kenrick**, see the zoom verdicts). The Bulkeley theory is answered from both sides at once: Lloyd **claims sole authorship** ("collected himself") and recasts Sir Richard as **prospective WITNESS** — who demanded to *see the bill first* precisely because he was to testify, and whose one recorded sentence is a promise to **"speak the truth"** — the deposition-side twin of Towneley's "affirmed ... true in the materiall points" (002). The **struck line** in this answer legibly contains **"acqu[aint]**": the abandoned draft used the very verb of Art. 4's probe ("did you at any tyme acquaintance them"), then was reshaped into the witness-vetting frame — the answer being sculpted, mid-writing, away from the article's incriminating word. This is the machinery by which an accusation *against* a judge is converted into a punishable *conspiracy by the accusers*, preserved at the level of individual pen-strokes.

Phase-4 addendum (4D-4, 2026-07-08): census = L1–L39 + R0–R46 (86 lines); the dying charge + VOW, innocence formula, Beaumaris, witness theory, and Sir Richard's quoted words all letterform-verified at line anchors. **Corrections/contests:** the condemnation/innocence noun reads **"fauite"** ×2 on this leaf (vs "facte"; 003R interlined ^{facte} — leaves differ; TNA); the dying-charge opener leans **"the[re]** is a direction" (vs "here"); ★ the quote to Lloyd is LONGER: "<g>eorge△«or»[heere?] **is a longe Bill** — [if] you dost bringe me as a wittnes, I will speake the truthe ." — the "george/heere" opening token is a TOP TNA crux (letterforms favor "george"; the deponent's forename is Rees — both weights stated); ★ a struck clause about **WITHDRAWING HIS SUIT** partially recovered in the witness-theory zone; ★ a THIRD denied procurer "[?] **ffloude e[?]**" (cross-link candidate: Jevan ffloude of 001/002); the self-authorship verb leans **"<C>omposed"** (over "caused"); the answer-4 Bulkeley list reads FOUR members at row level (the five-man styling contested; Tristram may enter only in answer 5 — TOP TNA); "Richard"-interline at the Art-3 head NOT corroborated (in-line "<R/N>ithgale" knot; TNA); "<P>enrithe" (P over F).

MEMBRANE 005 — `8368179\_STAC\_8\_203\_38\_005.JPG` (DOUBLE OPENING) — REES AP EVAN LLOYD'S DEPOSITION, CONTINUED (INTERROGATORIES 6–8)

On this membrane (left leaf): the **funding probe** — answer 6: the denial, then the exceptions the first sweep missed: **the Bulkeley loan with a bond**; the living **"W[illia]m ap Rees, his frend"** (two-element name — distinct from the executed three-element kinsman); **"thirtie[?] pownds & some shillings"** sent "at severall tymes" **by Humfrey** and brought by **the Warden of the Fleet's SERVANTS**; and answer 7 — Sir Richard's house **"in Channall Rowe"** (Channel/Cannon Row, **Westminster** — the first-sweep "Newborough" for this clause was wrong), the **lease a living third brother** sought, and the company/diet admissions with the conference denial. **(Right leaf):** answer 8 — the estate at the **acquittal**, itemized (money, goods, colts, sheep, household stuff from the [grand]mother, and the **Amlwch tenements**: "Ty[d]in Lla[y]th[y]n[?]" and "Tyddyn [K/H]iew[?]") the father's money; and **the four-forum campaign** with **Res ap Hugh** among the King's-Bench

defendants. **Re-swept line-by-line 2026-07-02 + zoom-verified** (16 bands; _WORKING_LLOYD_DEPOSITION_003R-007.md + _WORKING_REZOOM_VERDICTS_2026-07-02.md — supersedes the first-sweep readings, including "£13").

As written — left leaf (*re-sweep 2026-07-02*)

To the 6. Interro[gatory] this ex[aminan]t s[ai]eth [tha]t he did not receive nor had anie some[s] of monie[s] of [S[i]r] R[i]chard Bul[kley] & W[illia]m Bulkley, or either of them, nor of W[illia]m ap Rees himself, nor of anie other p[er]son or p[er]sons, by their or any of their direction or appointment, directly or ind[irectly], sithence the ~~ff~~ Sixt day of october last, for or toward[s] the drawinge of the s[ai]d Bill or p[ro]secu[ti]on of that suit. [But saieth that] in ma[rch] last past he this ex[aminan]t borro[wed] of the s[ai]d S[i]r Richard Bulkley the som[e] o[f] ~~—~~ amount uncertain], & then gave him a bill of this ex[aminan]ts hand for repayment thereof. And al[so] [since] this [examinant's] ^{now} [committment?] in the [ffleete], wantinge monie[s] to beare his necessarie charges, he this ex[aminan]t sent unto W[illia]m ap Rees, his frend, to ~~borrowe~~ lend this ex[aminan]t [m]onie[s] at [se]v[er]all tymes; & so thereupon the s[ai]d ~~—~~ Rees, [by] Humfrey, sent this ex[aminan]t at [se]v[er]all tymes the som of thirtie[?] pownds & some shill[inges], w[hi]ch monies was brought this ex[aminan]t by some of [the] Warden of the ffleets serv[an]ts /

To the 7. Interr[ed] he saieth that he did, a little before he was imprisoned, resorte to the house of the s[ai]d S[i]r Richard Bulkl[ey] ~~{struck}~~ in [Ch]annall Rowe, & there spake w[i]th the s[ai]d S[i]r Richard ~~about~~ about a lease[?] of ~~{struck}~~ [which] a brother of this ex[aminan]t[s] would have taken of him in the Countrey. And also this ex[aminan]t, beinge acquainted w[i]th the s[ai]d S[i]r Richard, did sometimes keepe him companie & [did] diett where they dietted; & hath sometimes [at?] meetinge the s[ai]d W[illia]m Bulkley by [chaunce?] ... this ex[aminan]t kept him company; But this ex[aminan]t had not any conference w[i]th the s[ai]d Willia[m] Bulkley touchinge the proceedinge [which he] had uppon the s[ai]d ~~{struck}~~ [Bill] /

Modernized — left leaf

6th (the funding probe): He received no money from Sir Richard or William Bulkeley, "nor of William ap Rees himself," nor by any of their direction, since **6 October last**, for drawing or prosecuting the bill. **But:** (1) in **March last** he **borrowed a sum of Sir Richard Bulkeley** — "& then gave him a bill of this examinant's hand for repayment thereof" (a documented loan with a bond); (2) since his committal to the Fleet, "**wanting monies to bear his necessary charges**," he sent to "**William ap Rees, HIS FRIEND**" to ~~borrow~~ lend him money "at several times"; and the said Rees, **by Humfrey**, sent him at several times "**the sum of thirtie[?] pounds & some shillings**" — brought to him by "**some of the Warden of the Fleet's servants**."

7th: A little before his imprisonment he resorted to **Sir Richard's house "in Channall Rowe"** [Channel/Cannon Row, Westminster] and spoke with him **about a lease which a brother of this examinant's would have taken of him in the country**; being acquainted with Sir Richard he sometimes kept him company and dieted where they dieted, and sometimes kept William Bulkeley company on chance meetings — "**But this examinant had not any conference with the said William Bulkeley touching the proceeding ... upon the said [Bill].**"

Why it matters: the funding probe now has its real answers, and they cut both ways. The complainant's own sworn accounting gives the Court's maintenance theory a **genuine Bulkeley transaction to chew on** — a March loan, evidenced by a bond — while insisting it had nothing to do with the bill; and it dissolves the old dead-sender puzzle: the prison money came from a **LIVING "William ap Rees, his friend"** (two-element name), whom the manuscript's insistent **three-element** naming of the executed kinsman ("William ap Rees ap William") exists precisely to distinguish. The sum reads **"thirtie"** (£30-odd, not the first-sweep £13 — see the zoom verdicts §(b)), sent iteratively and couriered by the **Warden's servants** — the Fleet's own staff as the conduit the Court's Arts. 9–10 treat as suspicious. And the geography corrects: the Bulkeley contact was at the **Westminster townhouse in Channel Row** — steps from the courts — on lease business for a **third, living Lloyd brother**; the instrument's Art. 7 asks about the same house ("Channell Rowe" ✓ zoom), so instrument and answer agree. The probe's shape — treating the *funding and associations of the accuser* as the thing to be proved — remains the machinery by which an accusation *against a judge* is reframed as a *conspiracy by the accusers*; what the re-sweep adds is how much innocent, documented, family-scale material that machinery had to work with.

As written — right leaf (*re-sweep 2026-07-02*)

To the 8. Interr[ed] this ex[aminan]t [s]aieth [that he] had above twentie pownds in monie [told?], of this ex[aminan]ts [o]wne, [&] good[s] & [a]pparell worth about tenn pownd[s] ... at the tyme [of] the [s]aid Murder & also [when he was] acquitted of the [same] ... & two [C]olts w[hi]ch were ... ~~[struck passage: borrowed at severall tymes of this ex[aminan]ts ffather the som ...]~~ ... [&] two or three [Sh]eepe ... & some household stuffe wh[i]ch was lefte h[im] by his g[ra]ndMother[?]. And also at the same tyme this ex[aminan]t had an interest in a tenem[en]t called Ty[d]in Lla[y]th[y]n[?], lyeng[e] in the . County of [Anglesey], [at?] Amblowghe; & also some interest in another tenement [in] the [pa]rishe of Amblowghe called [T]yddyn [K/H]iew[?]. And further this ex[aminan]t [s]aieth that [since he] was so acquitted he hath had of his ex[aminan]ts ffather the som of [] pownd & seaven [sh]illings [since the] Sixt day of october; sithence [which he] hath [laid] owt severall soms of Monie, as well in suit[s] of Law a[s] [for his] o[w]ne expenses, but howe much ... he cannot depose ... so di[s]bursed or laied owt since the s[ai]d 6. day of october. But this ex[aminan]t hath [pre]ferred his bill into this Ho[n]orable Court] against the s[ai]d M[r] [B]arker & others; & also hath a suite for Conspiracie dependinge in the Courte of Comon Pleas at Westm[inster] against Howell Lewis, W[illia]m[?] Lewis & []; & an ac[i]on ... against John Lewis, & Res ap Hugh[e] ... in the [K]ings Benche; And also an [ac]c[i]on ... against Howell Lewis, since that tyme [pro]secuted on the behalfe of [his Majesty] — (*the answer runs onto 006L: the recognizance clause.*)

Modernized — right leaf

8th (his estate — at the acquittal): He had **above £20 in money** of his own, **goods and apparel worth about £10**, "at the time of the said Murder & also [when he was] **ACQUITTED** of the same"; **two colts**; ~~a struck passage about the father's money~~ (restructured — the father's sums are given after the acquittal clause); **two or three sheep**; **household stuff left him by his grandmother[?]**; an interest in a tenement called **Ty[d]in Lla[y]th[y]n[?]** in Anglesey at **Amlwch** ("Amblowghe"), and ^{some} interest in another tenement in the **parish of Amlwch** called **Tyddyn [K/H]iew[?]**. Since being "**so acquitted**" he has had of his **father** [] pounds and seven

shillings (since 6 October), and has laid out several sums "in suits of law as for his own expenses" — how much, "he cannot depose."

8th, continued (the four-forum campaign): Since 6 October: (a) this Star Chamber bill against **Mr Barker & others**; (b) ^{a suit} for Conspiracy depending in the Court of Common Pleas at Westminster against **Howell Lewis, W[illia]m[?] Lewis & []**; (c) an action against **John Lewis & Res ap Hugh[e]** in the King's Bench; (d) an action against **Howell Lewis**, ^{since that time} prosecuted on the behalf of his Majesty [on a forfeited recognizance — 006L].

△ **NAME NOTE (005 right).** The **Lewis** defendants — **Howell, William[?], John** — match the TNA catalogue title *Lloyde v. Lewys* (**John Lewis, High Sheriff, is 010's answering defendant**); "Res ap Hugh[e]" is corroborated at zoom as a **King's-Bench co-defendant**. These **Lewis defendants** remain distinct** from the executed kinsman. The tenement names and "grandmother" are minim-level readings — professional confirmation flagged (zoom verdicts §(f)).

Why it matters: this is the whole shape of the litigation in a single answer — and the re-sweep sharpens both prongs. The estate answer now shows what the Court was actually measuring: a **small, itemized, family-scale estate** (£20 cash, £10 goods, livestock, a grandmother's household stuff, two Welsh crofts) against the cost of a four-forum campaign — the arithmetic behind Art. 8's "who paid any parte of the said charges besides yourself" and behind the Answer's sneer at his "very mean estate" (010 r10–11). The answer also says "**acquited**" twice — the deposition and the instrument (Art. 8 ✓) agree on acquittal language, against HLS's "Ignoramus ... by speciall favour" (two proceedings, or loose usage — professional item). The campaign map — Star Chamber, **Common Pleas conspiracy, King's Bench** (now with **Res ap Hugh**), and the **Crown-behalf recognizance action** — is the raw material Coke's report compresses into one "Case of Conspiracy," and the Crown-behalf prong keeps its standing significance: part of the campaign was framed as vindicating **the King's** interest, not private grievance.

Phase-4 addendum (4D-5, 2026-07-08): census = L1–L39 + R1–R43-to-the-tear (82 surviving lines; no answer-9 boundary, no signature). **Correction:** the household stuff was left him "by his <ff>ather <&> <M>other" (eB clear; "[grand?]mother" superseded). **Contests → TNA (top):** ★ Sir Richard's house — "[Ch]annall Rowe" (Westminster) vs the crop-firm "<C>ornwall <R>owe" (SURFACED TO USER); ★ the answer-6 sum — TWO independent **ff-initial** sightings (here + 007's re-citation) now stand against "thirtie": four candidate families (£13 / thirtie / ff—teen / ff—tie) across four passes (SURFACED TO USER; ledger B1). The Bulkeley loan amount token exists but is UNREAD on all passes (roman-xx / "ffortie s[hillinges]" candidates — ledger B2). Baseline WINS where 4D leaned otherwise: "ff **Sixt** day of october" (all three dates = 6 Oct); "the [s]aid **Murder**"; "**acquited**" (post-acquittal framing); "two [C]olts"; "M[r] Barker" (max-caution on "Barker" unchanged). Courier "**Humfrey**" agreed ✓ both passes — but note 007's interlined courier "Anthonie[?] Leadman": Load-/Lead-man family, TWO courier-name events to reconcile (TNA names). County after "<A>" is UNREAD (Anglesey is supplied); tenement names all △△ (identification gold).

MEMBRANE 006 — `8368179\_STAC\_8\_203\_38\_006.JPG` (DOUBLE OPENING) — REES AP EVAN LLOYD'S DEPOSITION, CONTINUED (INTERROGATORIES 8 CONCL.—12)

On this membrane (left leaf): the tail of answer 8 (the **recognizance-forfeiture** mechanism behind the Crown-behalf Howell-Lewis action; "no person paid any part of the charges besides himself"; wrongs sustained "**in coming to London**"; suits **counsel-advised, "according to the law"**); answer 9 — the "secret chamber conference" folded into the **witness-preparation account** (what passed was the showing of the bill's **copy**), closing with the flat denial "**at all that day**"; answer 10 opens. **(Right leaf):** answers 10–12 — the passed-word denial (with the **Towneley–Bulkley professional relationship**: "of Councill ... in some of his Law causes"); the letter/token and **Towneley-payment** denials; and the **Lord Chancellor petition** answer with the "divers kinsmen in London" sureties passage. **Re-swept line-by-line 2026-07-02** (16 bands; **_WORKING_LLOYD_DEPOSITION_003R-007.md** — supersedes the first-sweep readings).

As written — left leaf (re-sweep 2026-07-02)

... [the action] at Westm[inster] against the s[ai]d Howell Lewis up[on] the fforfeiture of a **Recognizaunce** ... this ex[aminan]t s[ai]eth that no p[er]son or p[er]sons [paid] any p[ar]te of the saied charges besides [this examinant] himself. And that he was moved to [bring] the s[ai]d [acci]on[s] for such wronges as he had sustained in cominge to London ... made knowne [those] wronges unto Councill ... was by them advised to prosecute the s[ai]d [suits] accordinge to [the] Lawe. /

To the 9. Interr[ed] this ex[aminan]t s[ai]eth that [he] doth not remember whether he had any talke w[i]th the s[ai]d S[i]r Richard Bulkley touchinge the s[ai]d [B]ill in the Starrechamber the last terme or not; But [i]f this ex[aminan]t had then any talke or conference w[i]th the s[ai]d S[i]r Richard, it was about the [sh]ewing him the Copie of the s[ai]d Bill, at such tyme as this ex[aminan]t told the s[ai]d S[i]r Richard that this ex[aminan]t would use him as a wittnes, concerning the some of the matters of the s[ai]d bill. And further this ex[aminan]t s[ai]eth that he had not, to his knowledge & now remembraunce, anie talke at all w[i]th the s[ai]d W[illia]m Bulkley the last terme touchinge the s[ai]d Bill; Neither did this [examinant], uppon the Thursday after he was att[ended?] by the [W]arden of the ffleets man, secretlie conferre w[i]th the s[ai]d S[i]r Richard Bulkley in his chamber about the s[ai]d Bill, as is supposed; Neither did this ex[aminan]t, to his remembraunce, speake w[i]th the s[ai]d S[i]r Richard Bulkley at all that day. /

To the 10 Interr[ed] this ex[aminan]t s[ai]eth that he doth not knowe who passed his word to the Warden of the ffleete[s] Man for his appearaunce in the Starrechamber, nor ... *(continues, right leaf)*

Modernized — left leaf

8th (concluded): the Crown-behalf action against **Howell Lewis** ran at Westminster "**upon the forfeiture of a Recognizance**"; "**no person or persons paid any part of the said charges besides [this examinant] himself**"; he was moved to bring the actions "**for such wrongs as he had sustained in coming to London**"; he made those wrongs **known unto Counsel** and "**was by them advised to prosecute the said [suits] according to the Law.**"

9th: He does not remember whether he talked with Sir Richard about the bill last term; but if he did, "it was about the showing him the COPY of the said Bill, at such time as this examinant told the said Sir Richard that this examinant would use him as a witness, concerning some of the matters of the said bill." No talk at all with William Bulkeley last term; "Neither did this [examinant], upon the Thursday after he was att[ended?] by the Warden of the Fleet's man, secretly confer with the said Sir Richard Bulkley in his chamber about the said Bill, AS IS SUPPOSED; Neither did this examinant, to his remembrance, speak with the said Sir Richard Bulkley AT ALL THAT DAY."

10th (opens): He does not know who passed his word to the Warden of the Fleet's Man for his appearance in the Star Chamber ...

Why it matters: the interrogatories keep drilling the same seam — *who the accuser talked to, who arranged things* — and the re-sweep recovers the shape of his wall: not bare "I don't remember" but **lawful-prosecution framing** (wrongs sustained *en route to London*; made known **to counsel**; suits brought **on counsel's advice** "according to the law"; the Crown-behalf action running on a **forfeited recognizance** — the ordinary legal machinery, not cabal logistics). Answer 9 converts the Court's most cinematic charge — the "secret conference in his chamber" (Art. 9) — into **witness preparation**: what passed, if anything, was the showing of the bill's **copy** to the man he meant to call, and the denial sharpens to "at all that day." The insistence that Bulkeley's role was *witness to the truth of the matters* keeps Barker's alleged wrong in view even as the questions work to convert the case into one about the accuser's conduct.

As written — right leaf (*re-sweep 2026-07-02*)

[To the 10:] ... nor whether anie p[er]son or not passed his worde for this ex[aminan]t in [that] behalfe; ffor he [s]aieth he did not request anie p[er]son so to doe ... [neither knoweth he that the said] Towneley [was of Councell?] w[i]th the s[ai]d [S[i]r] Richard Bulkley in [s]ome of his Law causes /

To the 11 Interr[ed]: ... did not carrie anie l[ett]re or token, since the [said] vjth day of october, to any p[er]son w[i]thin the County of Anglesey, from the s[ai]d [S[i]r] Richard Bulkley, for anie Monie to be paied or [delivered to this examinant] ... Neither doth this ex[aminan]t [know] that the s[ai]d [S[i]r] Rich[ard] Bulkley & W[illia]m [B]ulkley, or either of them, did give or promise to pay to the s[ai]d M[r] [T]owneley any som or soms of monie, rewarde or recompence, for his paines & care taken, or to be taken, in the s[ai]d suite in the Starrechamber. /

To the ^{twelfth} Interr[ed]: ... doth not remember whether, [upon a] petition preferred by this ex[aminan]t to the right hono: the Lord Chauncelor for the continuance of the s[ai]d suit uppon the s[ai]d Bill, this ex[aminan]t did offer sureties to pay [the] costs & charges if the cause were decreed against this ex[aminan]t, or not; But if it had pleased the s[ai]d Lord Chauncelor [to] have graunted the continuance [of the] suit, then this ex[aminan]t purposed to have looked owt [good?] [s]ureties — in London, havinge divers kinsmen there at that tyme — but this ex[aminan]t did not beforehand [en]treate w[i]th [any to] be this ex[aminan]ts [S]ureties; neither did anie [p]er[s]on promise to be this ex[aminan]ts [s]uret[ies] in that [behalf], nor to procure his ~~struck~~ [s]uerty in [that] behalfe.

Modernized — right leaf

10th (concluded): He does not know whether anyone passed his word — **"for he saith he did not request any person so to do"** — nor does he know [more than that] **Towneley [was of counsel?] with the said Sir Richard Bulkeley in some of his law causes.**

11th (the courier + counsel-fee probes): He **carried no letter or token**, since 6 October, to anyone in Anglesey from Sir Richard, "for any money to be paid or delivered [him]"; **nor does he know that Sir Richard or William Bulkeley promised to pay Mr Towneley any sum, "reward or recompence, for his pains & care taken, OR TO BE TAKEN, in the said suit"** — the answer tracking Art. 11's future-services clause verbatim.

12th: He does not remember whether, on his **petition to the Lord Chancellor for continuance of the suit**, he offered sureties for costs "if the cause were decreed against" him; but had the Lord Chancellor granted the continuance, **"this examinant purposed to have looked out [good] sureties** — in London, having divers kinsmen there at that time" — though he had not beforehand entreated anyone, nor had anyone promised.

Why it matters: Art. 11 is the **counsel-funding probe** at its sharpest — *did the Bulkeleys pay the lawyer?* — and the re-sweep adds the one concrete link the answer concedes: **Towneley was Sir Richard's lawyer "in some of his Law causes"** — the ordinary professional relationship that Towneley's own deposition (002: "having occasion to repair unto the said Sir Richard about Law business") confirms, and that Art. 10's kinship question ("is not the said Towneley of kynred w[i]th the said S[i]r R[i]chard") tried to darken. With the fee answers elsewhere (Towneley's **£4-odd** "and no other money of any other person," 003L; the **£30-odd** via the Warden's servants, 005/007), the Star Chamber is tracing **every shilling** behind the accusation — because a *funded* accusation against a judge is what the conspiracy frame needs. Answer 12's recovered detail — sureties to be sought among **"divers kinsmen in London"** — completes the profile the answers keep drawing: a **kin-funded prisoner** pressing a dead kinsman's charge through lawful process, not the hub of a cabal. The relentless money-and-procedure interrogation is itself the evidence: the mechanism by which *accusing a judge* is put on trial as *conspiracy*.

Phase-4 addendum (4D-6, 2026-07-08): census = L1–L40 + R1–R39 (79 lines; BOTH 006R tears text-free; no subscription). ★★ **A FULL LINE RECOVERED in answer 12** (homoeoteleuton — the earlier pass eye-skipped "if"→"if"): between "decreed against this ex[aminan]t, or not; But if" and "it had pleased the Lord Chauncelor" sits **"(th)ere be was (anie)[?] mention (—) Λ«^{vppon the fd petic(io)n}»"** — strike, mention-token, caret, and interline each independently sighted; parse lean-only, TNA MANDATORY. Also NEW: «^{of England}»-lean interline after "Lord Chauncelor" ✓eB-exists; a "^deft"-lean ×4 where the earlier read had "this ex[aminan]t" (party-designation weight); an «^{or fent[?]}» insertion nexus in the money-delivery clause; answer-10's close is FIRST-PERSON ("he cannot fay to his (—)..." — the supplied third-person bridge was wrong-class) with "M' Towneley" titled ×4; "Copie(s)"/"knowledge(s)" PLURAL; the "[good?]" before "sureties" dissolves. ★ **fd-BAR SYSTEMIC:** the scribe writes in-line barred "f̄d" at ≥6 sites here — earlier "^{s[ai]d}" interline notations need re-classification (extends to 007; TNA class-check).

MEMBRANE 007 — `8368179\_STAC\_8\_203\_38\_007.JPG` (SINGLE LEAF) — CONCLUSION OF REES AP EVAN LLOYD'S DEPOSITION (INTERROGATORIES 13–16; SIGNATURE)

On this membrane: the close of the prisoner's examination. **Answer 13 is a decline** — "he is not appointed to be examined"; **answer 14** is the **final money accounting**, mirroring Art. 14's "maynetenaunces or moneys" (the instrument's precision-sweep spelling) — the sum ("**thirtie[-odde?]** pownd & some shillings" — but see the Phase-4 addendum below: the token is ff-initial at this site, ledger B1) from **William ap Rees [his friend]**, brought by "**Humfrey** ^{Anthonie Leadman} **the Warden of the ffleets Man**" with the balance "**delivered unto M[r] Jones, this examinant's ATTORNEY in this Court**" — plus the letters denial; **answers 15 & 16 are a joint decline**; and the deposition closes with **the deponent's autograph**. The lower half of the leaf is blank (verso show-through — possibly unscanned writing on the back; flagged for the TNA order). **Re-swept line-by-line 2026-07-02 + zoom-verified** (8 bands; `_WORKING_LLOYD_DEPOSITION_003R-007.md` + `_WORKING_REZOOM_VERDICTS_2026-07-02.md` — supersedes the first-sweep readings, including "£13").

As written (re-sweep 2026-07-02)

To the 13. ~~th~~ he is not appointed to be ex[amin]ed /

To the 14. Interr[ed] this ex[aminan]t s[ai]eth that [he] hath not receaved anie maynetenaunce o[r] monie ffrom S[i]r Richard Bulkeley, no[r] ffrom W[illia]m Bulkeley, nor ffrom anie of the s[ai]d S[i]r Rich[ard] Bulkleies serv[au]ntes, since he was [first?] impris[o]ned in the ffleet, otherwise he then the s[ai]d Som of thirtie[?], [odde?] pownd & [s]ome [sh]illinge[s] w[hi]ch this ex[aminan]t received ffrom the s[ai]d W[illia]m ap Rees himselfe, w[hi]ch was brough[t] him by Humfrey ^{Anthonie Leadman} the Warden of the ffleet[es] Man; & [th]e other was delivered unto M[r] Jones, this ex[aminan]ts Attur[nie] in this Courte. And further this ex[aminan]t to [the] same [Interr.] s[ai]eth that he had not, to his remembraunce, written anie L[ett]res since his imprisonment in the ffleete. /

To the 15° & 16. Interr[ogatories]: he is not appointed to be examined.

(subscription, second hand, with paraph:) Res ap Ev[a]n[?] Lloid[e] (the deponent's autograph; the patronymic cluster reads "Ev[a]n" as naturally as "Jhon," and the deponent's own name — per the 008 caption "Res ap Ev[a]n Loyd" — controls; zoom verdicts §(i))

Modernized

13th: Declined — "he is not appointed to be examined."

14th (the final money accounting): He has received "no maintenance or money" from Sir Richard Bulkeley, William Bulkeley, "nor from any of the said Sir Richard Bulkeley's servants," since his imprisonment — "otherwise than the said sum of thirtie[-odde?] pounds & some shillings which this examinant received from the said William ap Rees himself, which was brought him by Humfrey ^{Anthonie Leadman} the Warden of the Fleet's Man; & the other was delivered unto Mr Jones, this examinant's ATTORNEY in this Court." And further, to the same interrogatory: he has "not, to his remembrance, written any letters since his imprisonment in the Fleet."

15th & 16th: Declined — "he is not appointed to be examined."

(The deponent's autograph subscription — "Res ap Ev[a]n[?] Lloid[e]" — closes the deposition, exactly parallel to Towneley's autograph on 003L.)

Why it matters: the deposition ends where the conspiracy theory must stand or fall — **the money** — and the re-sweep recovered the answer's full anatomy. (1) **The instrument–answer lockstep:** answer 14 opens with Art. 14's own noun — "**maynetenaunce** or monie" — the deposition mirroring the interrogatory verbatim, which independently confirms the 009 "maynetenaunces" reading: the Court's theory is the medieval offense of **maintenance**, and the answer meets it word for word. (2) The accounting itself: the only money since imprisonment was **£30-odd from the living William ap Rees, "his friend"** (answer 6), couriered by a **named man** — "Humfrey," corrected by interline to "**Anthonie Leadman**," *the Warden of the Fleet's Man* (the recurring anonymous figure of answers 6, 9, 10 and Arts. 9–10, now with a name) — **with the balance going to "Mr Jones, this examinant's attorney in this Court."** The money's use was **litigation funding through his attorney of record** — the very transaction pattern a maintenance theory feeds on, volunteered as innocent: a kin-funded prisoner paying his lawyer. No Bulkeley payment, no cabal. (3) **The scripted examination, exactly interlocking:** of the drawer-directed tail (13–16), **Towneley answered 13, 15, 16; Lloyd answered only 14** — complementary halves of the single instrument, no overlap, no gap: the Court chose which questions the accuser of a judge would even be permitted to answer. (4) The examination is **signature-authenticated** — the complainant signed it himself. All four features — the maintenance frame, the money coming to family-and-lawyer nothing, the choreographed administration, and the sworn, signed record of it — are the machinery that produced *Floyd v. Barker*, visible in the accuser's own examination.

Phase-4 addendum (4D-7, 2026-07-08): census FIRM = 19 main lines (ans-13 = 1 · ans-14 = 16 · ans-15/16 = 2) + 3 interlines + 1 strike + torn-head ghost line + autograph + a deliberate final stop after "exa~~m~~ined". ★★ **THE ANS-14 SUM:** the re-citation token is **ff-initial ✓✓** (nat+eB; matches the scribe's ffrom/ffleet forms) — **excludes "thirtie"/"thirtene" as written HERE;** eB narrows to "**ffiftene/ffytene**" (FIFTEEN)-lean. vs answer-6's "thirtie[?]" → different figures or one misread; TNA MANDATORY (ledger B1). ★ The courier interline «Anthonie[?] Leadman» is an INSERTION (caret after "by"): the name was ADDED to an originally anonymous "brought ... by the Warden of the ffleets Man" — explaining answer-6's anonymity; "Anthonie" ✓eB-leaning ("Humfrey" unsupported at this site). ★ The attorney forename leans "**M' Jones**" (arch-top M + raised r vs the same-leaf "W^m Bulkeley" comparator). ★ Autograph: leading paragraph resolved; token 1 = Res/Rees/Reed-class ALL live (doubled-e "Rees"-lean is wish-fulfilment-guarded, NO reading asserted); patronym "Jhon" vs "Ev[a]n" stays a three-way with documentary pulls BOTH directions; "Redd by" disfavored. Deltas: i2 = contracted "rembraunce"; i3 = "to fame (Interr—)" (no "the"); "**Lettres**" written PLENE; no stop after bare "16"; exa~~m~~ed/exa~~m~~ined same-leaf pair; struck token = "receaued"-length (supplied "[had]" excluded). Fold flap (x≈0.93–1.00, verso-out, line-tails cut + 2 ink specks on the flap edge) re-verified scan-limited — TNA unfold/verso order stands.

MEMBRANE 008 — `8368179\_STAC\_8\_203\_38\_008.JPG` (TALL SINGLE LEAF) — THE INTERROGATORIES ("ARTICLES TO BE MINISTERED AGAINST [REES AP EVAN] LLOYD"), JUNE 1607

On this membrane: not a deposition but the **questionnaire itself** — the numbered "Articles" (interrogatories), dated **June 1607**, administered under an order of the Court ("accordinge to [an] order made the [] twent[ie]th[?] daie of June[?]" — caption clause recovered in the 2026-07-02 dedicated

sweep). These are the questions the deposition on membranes 003R–007 answers, so this leaf is the **key** to the whole file: it shows, in the Court's own words, exactly what the Star Chamber set out to prove. Every article hunts for the *people, money, and directions behind the bill against Judge Barker*. **Structure (resolved by the dedicated line-by-line sweep, 2026-07-02)**: this membrane carries **Articles 1–12** of a **single continuous 16-article instrument** whose remaining articles (13–16) continue on **membrane 009** (which opens mid-sentence, no caption; margin "14" verified there) — see the 009 section. The articles are **margin-numbered by the scribe** (2, 4–11 read directly; 12 obscured by the TNA file-slip); the foot of this membrane is torn where Article 13 began. (*The left margin carries the modern TNA endorsements — "STAR CH[AMBER]," "JAMES [I]," and a "File / Bundle 3" slip — confirming provenance.*) Full per-band line-by-line text with band coordinates: **_WORKING_008_TRANSCRIPTION.md**.

★ **NAME CAVEAT — RESOLVED IN THE VERIFICATION PASS (2026-07-01; zooms crops/crop_v008*; see the reconciliation table at the foot)**. Article 1 verified at magnification: "that J[oh]n ap E[va]n Lloyd yo[ur] brother was ... wrongfullie indict[ed] [condemned & executed] for murtheringe of his A[nn/m]is [Annes?] or otherwise; And whether you were justlie or wrongfullie indicted for that fact yea or noe." Article 2 verified: "what [unkindnes] ... was betweene yo[u] and [the] said Willia[m] ap Res ... **that was executed w[i]th yo[ur] said brother**" — **TWO men were executed**. Article 3 verified: the bill was for wrong "done unto ^{W[illia]m} ap Res ap Willia[m] and to others" — the kinsman's **full three-element name**, whose short form = **Coke's "William Price/ap Rice"**. The earlier "conflation/error" theory is **retracted**: Coke did not garble the brother's name — his report **omits the brother (and the wife-murder, and the complainant's own co-indictment) altogether**. Do **not** fold into ../../3_Academic Articles/11_Immunity and Standing Doctrine Genealogy/THE_TWO_LOCKS.md until a professional TNA transcription confirms and the user adjudicates. (*Gate resolved 2026-07-03: user adjudicated — these names are now quoted in the article at n. vr9 on the author's authority with disclosure, provisional pending the professional transcription; conform on return, variances to the user first. See the Status block at the head of this file.*) The **Bulkeley** cast is full and verified: **Sir Richard Bulkeley (knight), Daniel, Tristram, Launcelot Bulkeley (his brothers), and William Bulkeley (his nephew)**.

As written — complete, line-by-line (dedicated sweep 2026-07-02; bands crops/crop_s8_b1..b15; per-band text in **_WORKING_008_TRANSCRIPTION.md**)

(margin:) [J]unij 1607. / Articles to be mynystred agaynst Res ap Ev[a]n Loyd, nowe remayninge prysoner in the ffleete, a[tt?] agaynste [] / accordinge to [an] order made the [] twent[ie]th[?] daie of June[?] /

1 (Imprimis): did you reporte to any p[er]son or p[er]sons sithence the vj[th] of October last, that **Richard Barker esquier, one of his ma[jes]t[ies] Justic[es] of his highnes great Sessions of the Countie[s] of Anglesey in Northwales, should be noe more Justice there. To whome did y[ou] reporte the same, and what moved you soe to say.**

- 2 (★ boundary corrected by the precision pass, zg8m2 2026-07-02: the margin "2" anchors *HERE*, at "And doe you beleve" — Art. 1 is the report alone, and Lloyd's answers 1–3 align with Arts. 1–3 exactly): **And doe you beleve in yo[ur] conscien[ce] that J[oh]n ap Ev[a]n Loyd yo[ur] brother was, [at] the last Sessions of the said Countie [of] Anglesey, wrongfullie indicted, condempned & executed for murtheringe of h[is]**

A[nn/m]i[s] [Annis (Agnes) / Amis (Amice) — minim-ambiguous at zoom] **or otherwise; And whether yo[u] were [ju]stlie or wrongfullie indicted for that fact, yea or noe:** And what [offences,] [un]kindnes or quarels was betweene yo[u] and **Willia[m] ap Res [ap W[illia]m? / by who[m]?] ... that was executed w[i]th yo[ur] said brother** (re-verified clean at q88) / [in? word[e?] [or?] of him selfe[?]] [interline, partially read — zg8art2]

3: And did not yo[u] ^[before?] [pre]ferre a bill into the Starrechamber agaynst **M[r] Justi[ce] [B]arker** and others, for a supposed wronge & iniurie done unto ^{W[illia]m ap Res ap Willia[m]} and to others, and for other supposed misdemeano[urs]; **And why did not you rather complaine of yo[ur] owne and yo[ur] said brothers wron[gs], if any yo[u] have receaved, [rather?] then of their wronge[s] /**

4: [It]em: who did [procure,] devise or intreate you to p[re]ferre the said bill, or gave you direction or instruction for the drawinge thereof: did **S[i]r R[i]chard Bulkeley knight, Daniell Bulkeley, Tristram Bulkeley, Launcelott Bulkeley his bretheren, or Willi[a]m Bulkeley his nephewe**, or any of them [] ... [pro]cure, advise or intreate yo[u] to p[re]ferre the said bill: Or who did yt; did you at any tyme acquainte them, or any of them, w[i]th the contents thereof, either before or after the exhibitinge thereof — **did not [one?] John Towneley, Councello[r] at Lawe, drawe or penne the said bill /**

5: Item: did not the said S[i]r R[i]chard, Daniell, Tristram, Launcelott and Willia[m] Bulkeley, or any of them, **write, send or speake to** ^{the} **said Towneley** in that behalf; or whether they or any of them did **give or send any direction or instruction for the framinge of the said bill.** **By whome** did they or any of them ^{[Harry?/Hugh?] Loyd [the _?] or Willm Ken[w/b]rick or} (*interline at zoom, z8art5_b2; the answer's "W[illia]m [K/P]enri[ck/th]e" converges on the skeleton Kenwrick/Kenrick** — zoom verdicts §(c))* so send the said instructions or directions: And from whome came the same: And whether any other p[er]son or p[er]sons ^{[B]efore[?]} gave any direction ^{to you or} to the said Towneley for the drawinge thereof, to yo[ur] knowledge, yea or noe: **And what be theire, & [ev]ery of their names /**

6: Item: **what some or somes of money did you receive, or shall yo[u],** of the said S[i]r R[i]chard & Willm Bulkeley, or of either of them, **& of Willm ap Rees himselfe**, or of any other p[er]son or p[er]sons, by their or any of their direction or appointm[en]t, directlie or indirectlie, sithence the vj[th] day of October last. Declare what yo[u] have so [or] ^{shall} [have] receaved; And what moved them thereunto: did they or any of them [re]quest yo[u] to be of [C]ouncell in the [drawinge? / behalfe?] of the said [bill / Rees?]: **did they or any of them give or promise yo[u] any fee for the same.**

7: And did not you, a litle before you were imprisoned, **resorte to the said S[i]r R[i]chard[s] house in Channell Rowe** (*✓zoom z8art7_b1 — "Newburgh Towne" retracted; matches the answer's "Channall Rowe," 005L*), or els where the said S[i]r R[i]chard laye or remayned: And did not yo[u] **keepe companie w[i]th his men, and diett yo[ur]self w[i]th them where they comonlie used to diett:** And did not yo[u][r]self keepe companie w[i]th the said **Willia[m]**

Bulkeley, and what conference had yo[u] w[i]th the said Willia[m] Bulkeley touchinge the proceedinge upon the said [bill] /

8: Item: what [lands?], goods and chattells [had] you **at the tyme you were [a]cquitted[?] of the said murther:** And where were they: And what some of money had you **sithence of yo[ur] father:** And what some or somes of money did you disburse or lay out sithence the said [vj]th of October, as well in suits of lawe as for yo[ur] o[w]ne expenses: And **howe many suites or accions have [you] dependinge in the Courts of Westm[inster] or els where, against the def[endan]ts in the said bill named,** or any of them, sithence the said vj[th] of October: And **who paied any p[ar]te of the said charges besides yo[ur]self:** And **who advised yo[u] to take the said [~~struck~~] accions, and what moved yo[u] soe to doe /**

9: And howe often did you conferr and talke w[i]th the said S[i]r R[i]chard Bulkeley & Willia[m] Bulkeley, or either of them, the last terme, touchinge the said bill in the Starrechamber. And did not y[ou], **upon thursdaye after you were lett at [large?] by the Warden of the ffleete[s] man, secretlie conferre w[i]th the said S[i]r R[i]chard Bulkeley in his chamber** about the same; And what did he [ad]vise you to doe therein /

10: And **who passed his worde to the Warden of the ffleete for yo[ur] appearance in the Starrechamber. Was yt not the said Towneley** ^{a[?] one of S[i]r R[i]chard[s] men in liverye} [interline, faded ink] that passed his worde for you. And at whose request did he yt. And did not the said S[i]r R[i]chard or Willia[m] Bulkeley, or any of their frends or followers, desire the said Towneley soe to doe. And **promise to save him harmeles, yea or noe. And is not the said Towneley of kynred w[i]th the said S[i]r R[i]chard /**

11: And whether did you **cary any letter or token,** sithence the said vj[th] of October, to any p[er]son or p[er]sons w[i]thin the Com[er]t[ie] of Anglesey, from the said S[i]r Richard [Bulkeley], **for any money to be payed or delivered you.** To whome did you cary any such l[ett]re or token. And what money did you receave of the said p[er]son or p[er]sons, and [by] whome any such l[ett]re or token was sent; or of any other **servant, bayliffe or frends** of the said S[i]r R[i]chard Bulkeley ^[interline], and of whome you receaved the same. And whether the said S[i]r R[i]chard & Willia[m] [B]ulkeley, or either of them, **did paye or promise to paye to the said Towneley any some or somes of money, reward or recompence, for his paynes and care taken, or to be taken, in the said suite in the Starrechamber /**

12: Item: did not you, **upon a petiron [petition] preferred to my Lo[rd] Chauncello[r] for the continuance of the said suite** upon the said bill, **offer suerties to pay the [whole?] charge yf the cause were decreed agaynst yo[u],** yea or noe: Whe[ther] the said suerties that yo[u] soe intended to putt in; **what be their [names] & [ev]ery of them;** [and who would have?] been [or?] promise[d] to be yo[ur] suerties in that behalfe, and what [moved them to?] the same ...

(torn foot — Article 13 began here and continues at the head of membrane 009.)

Modernized — the twelve articles on this membrane

1. Did you report, since 6 October, that **Barker "should be no more Justice"** — to whom, and what moved you? *(The report question alone — boundary corrected 2026-07-02.)*

2. Do you believe your brother **John ap Evan Lloyd** was wrongfully indicted, condemned and executed for murdering his **A[nn]is[?]** — were *you* justly or wrongfully indicted for that fact — and what quarrel or unkindness was between you and **William ap Rees**, "that was executed *with* your said brother"?
3. Did you not prefer the Star Chamber bill for a wrong done to **William ap Rees ap William** and others — and **why not complain of your own and your brother's wrongs rather than theirs?**
4. Who procured or devised the bill — the **five Bulkeleys** (Sir Richard, Daniel, Tristram, Launcelot, William)? Did you show them its contents before or after exhibiting? **Did John Towneley, counsellor at law, draw or pen it?**
5. Did the five Bulkeleys **write, send or speak to Towneley** — send **directions for the framing of the bill** — by whom ^{[Harry?/Hugh? Loyd, or William Ken[w]rick?]}, and from whom did they come? Did anyone else direct **you or Towneley**? Name them all.
6. What money **have you received — or shall you receive** — from Sir Richard, William Bulkeley, **or from William ap Rees himself**, or anyone at their direction, since 6 October? What moved them? Did they retain you "of counsel" — **any fee given or promised?**
7. Just before your imprisonment did you resort to **Sir Richard's house in Channel Row** [Westminster], keep company with **his men** and diet where they dieted; what conference had you with **William Bulkeley** touching the proceeding?
8. What lands, goods and chattels had you **at the time you were acquitted[?]** of the said murder — where? What money since from **your father**? What have you disbursed since 6 October in suits and expenses? **How many actions have you pending at Westminster against the bill's defendants — who paid any part besides yourself — who advised you?**
9. How often did you confer with Sir Richard and William Bulkeley last term — and on the Thursday after the Warden's man let you out, did you **secretly confer with Sir Richard in his chamber** — what did he advise?
10. **Who passed his word to the Warden of the Fleet for your appearance** — Towneley? ^[or one of Sir Richard's men in livery?] At whose request? Did the Bulkeleys promise to **save him harmless?** Is Towneley **kin to Sir Richard?**
11. Did you **carry any letter or token** from Sir Richard to anyone in Anglesey **for money to be paid you** — who sent it, what did you receive, from which **servant, bailiff or friend?** And did the Bulkeleys **pay or promise Towneley** any reward for his pains "taken, or to be taken," in the suit?
12. Did you petition the **Lord Chancellor** for continuance of the suit, offering **sureties** to pay the whole charge if the cause were decreed against you — who are the sureties, who promised to stand, and what moved them?

(Articles 13–16 continue on membrane 009 — see next section.)

Why it matters — this is the taproot's documentary core. The deposition answers were striking; the **questions** are decisive. Sixteen articles across two membranes (1–12 here, 13–16 on 009), now read **complete and line-by-line**, and **every one of them hunts the accuser**: who put you up to it, who paid ("or shall you" — even *future* money), who directed the lawyer, who couriered the letters, who stood surety, are you kin to your alleged backer, what "**maintenances**" have you received. **Not a single article asks whether Judge Barker actually did the wrong the bill alleged** — the one article that even recites the allegations (13)

asks only *who instructed their insertion*. The Star Chamber's own instrument *presupposes* that a bill against a judge **is** a conspiracy, and sets out only to find the conspirators. That is precisely the move Coke's report (*Floyd v. Barker*, 12 Co. Rep. 23, "Case of Conspiracy") later dresses as doctrine — a judge "is not to be drawn in question ... for any surmise of conspiracy." Here, *upstream* of the report, the principle is visible as **litigation tactic**: convert *accusation of the judge* into *conspiracy by the accusers*, and interrogate accordingly. At its origin the immunity taproot is not a considered constitutional principle — it is the shape of a **questionnaire**.

Phase-4 addendum (4A, 2026-07-07/08): first line census of the leaf = **86 lines** (3 caption + 79 article + 4 short runover tails). The leaf reads as ONE actively-revised draft: five insertion/strike events in the same orange/faded second-ink family — the squeezed «or» before William Bulkeley; a NEW interline "[or to?] be of Counsell" in Art. 4's predicate; the three-token Art-5 strike (incl. line-end "~~before?~~") + "to you or"; a probable "~~Counsell~~" strike inside the physically SQUEEZED fee clause; the liverye interline resolved ("~~and one of S[i]r Richard[e]s men in liverye~~" — a SECOND suspected word-passer, not a Towneley replacement). Corrections: Art. 4 opens "**And whoe** did p[ro]cure" (openers alternate And/Item); "**Trufram**" (scribal spelling); "vj^{te}"; "Cowrte" singular; "peticon"; the estate list has FOUR members; "acquitted" firmed; the second "[rather?]" is not on the leaf. NEW cast items → TNA: the Art-11 main-line tokens "**[Ro?]rland [T?]horp[?]**" (possible unrecorded intermediary; scan-limited at 3x) + the Art-5 interline "...[K/H]endr[i/y]ck **or**" trailing-or; the Art-11 interline middle token firms as "or of him selfe^"; the patronym (Ev[a]n vs Hu-class) conflicts between its two instances — TNA (names above all). "Coñ" = the standard Countie abbreviation (resolved).

MEMBRANE 009 — `8368179\_STAC\_8\_203\_38\_009.JPG` (TALL SINGLE LEAF) — THE INTERROGATORIES, CONTINUED: ARTICLES 13–16 (THE CONTINUATION LEAF OF THE 008 INSTRUMENT)

On this membrane: ★ RECHARACTERIZED in the 2026-07-02 dedicated sweep. This is **not a separate "second set" of interrogatories** — it is the **second membrane of the single 16-article instrument that begins on 008**. The evidence: (1) the leaf **opens mid-sentence** ("**ffrom** [who] gave you [I]nstru[ctions] to inserte in the ^{said} Bill..." — first word verified at magnification, crop_v9open2), with **no caption** of its own; (2) 008's foot is torn exactly where Article 13 began; (3) the scribe's **margin numbering continues** (margin "**14**" verified at magnification on the money article, crop_v9maint); (4) the prisoner's deposition (007) answers **Article 14 by number** (the money accounting — sum contested since Phase 4, ledger B1 — plus the letters clause, mirroring this leaf's Art. 14 "maynetenaunces or moneys" verbatim) and declines **13, 15, 16** as "not appointed to be examined." **The instrument was drafted against the whole enterprise — plaintiff and counsel — and administered selectively**: Articles 15–16 are **drawer-directed** (15: "besides the plaintiff, to draw and be of counsel"; 16: "the appearance of the said **Rees**" in the third person — the mirror-image of Art. 10, which asked *Lloyd* who passed *his* word), and those are exactly the articles Lloyd was "not appointed" to answer; their subject matter is covered instead by **Towneley's own deposition (001–003L)**. Only the upper portion of the leaf carries text; the lower half is blank (purple TNA stamp, pencil "8/48," circled "2").

As written (Articles 13–16, from the 009 bands + verification zooms)

13 (*tail; opens mid-sentence at the leaf head; Lloyd "not appointed"*): ... **ffrom** [who] gave you [I]nstru[ctions] to inserte in the ^{said} Bill or informac[i]on that [ro]beries [and] Burglaries were [favoured? / never so found?] in [those circuits?] since M[r] Justice Barker[']s] ridinge in those C[ircuits/ountries], and that he used to staie matters in

Chancerie after Judgment and execution, and that **M[r] Leighton the other Justice was used disgracefullie through his su[i]te**, and that **M[r] Leighton did deliver it Publikelie that he was wearie of his place: who gave yo[u] the[ir] or any of their [draught of their] instru[cti]ons: name him or them that did soe ...** ~~[struck through reward question]~~ ...

- 14 *(margin "14"; Lloyd ANSWERED this one — the final money accounting, membrane 007; the sum itself is a live Phase-4 conflict, ledger B1): Item: what maynetenaunces or moneys have you received from S[i]r R[i]chard Burkle, or of any of his [s]ervant[s], or of or from Willia[m] Burkle, since your imprisonment in the ffleete: did you write any l[ett]res to any p[er]son or p[er]sons since your imprisonment, and if you did, what was the contents thereof / (spellings conformed to the precision sweep, review pass 2026-07-08: "maynetenaunces or moneys" ✓✓✓ and this leaf's "Burkle" variant — the prior "monies"/"Bulke" were first-sweep normalizations; THE_TWO_LOCKS n. vst2 already quotes the precision forms)*
- 15 *(drawer-directed; Lloyd "not appointed"): Item: who did procure, advise or intreate you, or gave yo[u] any of the said Instru[cti]ons, besides the p[lain]t[iff] Rees, to drawe, and be a[s] Councelle in the drawinge of the said Bill — did S[i]r Richard Burkle knight, William Burkle, Daniell Burkle, Trustram Burkle, Launcellott Burkle, or any of them, intreate or wishe you to drawe the same Bill: did theie or any of them give you any ffees for the same, or promise yo[u] hereafter: name him or them that soe did / (conformed to precision-sweep bands 3–4 + 4B #4, review pass 2026-07-08: the interlined instructions-net, this leaf's "Burkle"/"Trustram"/"Launcellott" spellings, and the "yo[u] hereafter" parse — the prior rendering was first-sweep-normalized)*
- 16 *(drawer-directed; Lloyd "not appointed"; mirror of Art. 10): Item: did you you passe yo[ur] wourde so[e?] to the warden of the ffleetes mane, for the apparance of the said Rees ap Evan in the Starrche[/]chamber, the ffridaie after he was ffirst atached; and if you did, who did request you soe to doe: did S[i]r Richard Burkle promise to save you harmeles for the same; And doe you knowe, or doe you beleve in yo[ur] Conscience, that the said S[i]r R[i]chard, W[illia]m Buckley, or an[y] e[i]ther of them, were privie to the exhibitinge of the said Informac[i]on into this Honourable Court of Starrechamber against the said M[r] Barker and others, yea or no? (opening through "exhibitinge" conformed to precision-sweep band 5 + 4B #10, review pass 2026-07-08: "the said Rees ap Evan" in full; "ffirst atached" — single-t on the leaf; the "Starrche/chamber" line-break dittograph literal; the Burkle/Buckley same-leaf drift preserved; the tail rides the first-sweep render with "Informac[i]on" per the precision summary — band-6 letterforms not re-read)*

★ **"maynetenaunces" (Art. 14) verified at magnification** (crop_v9maint2) — the first-sweep reading "marriage-annuities" is **retracted**. The Court's own word is **maintenance** — the medieval offense of supporting another's litigation — asked of a prisoner about the Bulkeleys. This is legally load-bearing: the whole instrument is a maintenance/champerty hunt dressed around a murder-conspiracy frame.

Modernized (13–16)

- **13.** (*To whoever shaped the bill's contents — Lloyd not appointed to answer.*) Who instructed the insertion of the bill's claims — that robberies and burglaries fared better since **Barker rode those circuits**; that he **"used to stay matters in Chancery after judgment and execution"**; that **Justice Leighton was used disgracefully and said publicly he was weary of his place**? Who gave you the draft of those instructions — name them.
- **14.** (*Lloyd answered: the only money since imprisonment came from the living William ap Rees "his friend" — the sum a live Phase-4 conflict (answer-6 "thirtie[?]" vs the 007 ff-initial token, ffiftene-lean; ledger B1) — brought by the Warden's man (courier name likewise contested: the 007 interline leans "Anthonie," with "Humfrey" unsupported at that site), the balance to his attorney M[r] Jones.*) What **maintenances or moneys** have you received from Sir Richard Bulkeley, his servants, or William Bulkeley **since your imprisonment in the Fleet**? Did you write any letters since — and their contents?
- **15.** (*Drawer-directed.*) Who — **besides the plaintiff** — procured you **to draw and be of counsel** in the bill? Did any of the five Bulkeleys wish you to draw it — any **fee given or promised**? Name them.
- **16.** (*Drawer-directed; mirror of Art. 10.*) Did **you** pass your words to the Warden's man **for the said Rees's appearance**, the Friday after he was first attached? At whose request? Did **Sir Richard promise to save you harmless**? Were the Bulkeleys **privy to the exhibiting of the Information against Mr Barker**?

Why it matters: three things. First, the recharacterization strengthens the systemic point: not two parallel questionnaires but **one instrument engineered to work over every participant in the accusation** — the Court drafted a single conspiracy-map and then chose which questions each examinee would face ("he is not appointed to be examined"), the choreography of a **scripted examination**. Second — and rarely — **Article 13 is the one place in the whole file where the alleged judicial wrong is actually stated**: Barker **"used to stay matters in Chancery after judgment and execution."** Even there the wrong appears only as *matter whose provenance must be explained* — the question is "who gave you instructions to insert" it, never whether it is true. Third, Article 14's own noun — **"maintenances"** — names the Court's real theory: the accusation against the judge is treated from the outset as *maintained litigation*, a crime in search of its financier. The corroboration of **Justice Leighton's** removal ("weary of his place") also matches the prisoner's deposition (003R). Upstream of Coke's report, the whole apparatus is visible: a concrete allegation against a judge, deliberately **left un-investigated**, while the accuser and his lawyer are worked over for conspiracy and maintenance. That inversion — *never test the charge against the judge; always prosecute the charger* — is the immunity taproot in operation.

Phase-4 addendum (4B, 2026-07-07/08): line census = 31 lines. ★★ **THE ENDORSEMENT/DOCKET FOUND** — bottom-left corner, written ROTATED 90° along the leaf's edge (a zone no prior pass imaged): 4 lines, one clerk's hand — "Ex[?]^[?] Townley / et a^l p[er] ordin[em] / Ad sect[am]?/Adv[er]s[us]? Barker ar[migeri] / T . 5 . Ja[cobi]". The file self-dates **Trinity term 5 Jac. I (1607)**; Towneley is docketed by name "et al."; and the party-styling cluster leads **"ad sect[am] Barker"** ("at the suit of Barker") — which would docket the cause as **Barker's own counter-suit**, a THIRD styling stratum beside 001's caption (*Lloyd v. Barker*) and the TNA catalogue (*Lloyde v. Lewys*). ⚠️ Interpretation flagged for USER + TNA — not asserted anywhere. Other 4B results: "M[r] **Barker**" FIRM inside the struck reward question (the one probe at the judge's side of the ledger — two cramped lines added late, then struck entire); the fewer/favoured crux RE-OPENED → **"favor found"** now leads (and "[C]irc[uit]s" downgraded to unconfirmed); "through his **s[e]ruice**" leads over "suite";

"**L[a]ighton**" a-vowel firm at 3.5× (name-vowel flag); the Art-15 fee interline re-parses as "or promise ^{vo[u]} hereafter"; margin-numeral habit differs from 008's hand (two scribes corroborated); the endorsement is the leaf's only ink below the text (foot verified end-to-end).

MEMBRANE 010 — `8368179\_STAC\_8\_203\_38\_010.JPG` (GIANT SINGLE MEMBRANE, ~7357×7029, 45 MB)
— THE DEFENSE: A DEFENDANT'S ANSWER TO LLOYD'S BILL

On this membrane: the other side of the file — not a deposition or interrogatory but a **defendant's Answer**, engrossed full-width across one large membrane and read **line-by-line on a 4-column × 16-row grid** (64 cells at near-native resolution), then **rows 1–12 re-verified cell-by-cell in the 2026-07-02 precision pass** (48 recut cells under Fable 5 — the readings below incorporate that layer; per-cell provenance in `_WORKING_010_TRANSCRIPTION.md`). Caption: *"The Answer of [John Lewis], one of the Defendant[s], to the bill of complaint of [Rees / Rice ap Evan] Lloyd, Complainant."* The answering defendant is **John Lewis, High Sheriff of Anglesey** — his name is legible **four times in the body** ("this def[endan]t **John Lewis** was ... nomi[n]ated and appointed"; "the said def[endan]t **John Lewis** beinge then Highe Sheriffe"; "att the house of the said def[endan]t **John Lewis**"; "to his — the said def[endan]t **John Lewis**['s] — house"), matching the TNA catalogue title *Lloyde v. Lewys*. A counsel's flourished signature ("**Boyd**", or "**Boys**" with a crossed long-s) sits at the right foot beside a "**6d**" fee note.

⚠ **NAME/READING CAVEAT (010).** This is the hardest membrane in the file (large, faded, mid-leaf staining). **Resolved in the 2026-07-01 verification pass:** band 11's phrase is definitively "**the wiefte of the said Elder brother**" (w-i-e-f-f-e, clear at magnification — see the re-read block below); it does NOT displace "**Hughe ap William** named in the said bill" (verified separately at band 3) — the Answer describes **two different murder prosecutions**. "[Sebright?]" is retracted — the phrase reads "**his Maj[es]ties Chief Justic[e/es?]**," not personally named (and the 2026-07-02 precision pass adds a live parse question: "...Brereton and Richard Barker **esquiers**, in the said bill of compl[ain]t alsoe named, his maj[es]t[ie]s Chief Justic[e/es?] of the said greate Sessions" — singular/plural decides whether it names a third person, styles the PAIR as the court, or attaches to one; cf. 009's "**Leighton**"). ✓ **CASTLE-NAME CONFLICT RESOLVED (Pass-4 pilot, 2026-07-07, 2×-native + enhanced-blue render):** "**some p[ar]te of the Castell of Bewmar[e]s**" — the token's initial is the same double-curved secretary **B** as "Bulkeley" two lines below in the same frame, and visibly distinct from the single-bowl **p** of "p[ar]te" in the same line; the band-scale "Pen—" illusion (grid "[Pen__?]" ; precision cell "Penmar[d/k]e[?]") is explained — the B's double curve degrades to P+minim below native resolution. Beaumaris is now letterform-grounded as well as zoom- and history-supported (Sir Richard Bulkeley was Constable of Beaumaris); TNA confirm is routine, no longer load-bearing. **Still open for professional TNA transcription:** the counsel signature ("**Boyd**" / "**Boys**"); the second flourished foot subscription (scan-limited); the indictee list ("**Richard ap John, W[illia]m Prend[?], Richard ap Richard[?], Moris ap W[illia]m and Edward ap John**" — precision pass, b6–b7, incl. a **struck first-draft name zone** "**W[illia]m ap [?]el[?]ew[?]**"); the victim-token "**Hughe ap W[illia]m [P/]end[?]**" (×5 — "named" or a 4th name element, best candidate "P[ry]dd[e]"); the murder place "**the Rodwha[?]**"; the £-figure of the poverty interline ("xx li" vs "xl"); the marginal **cross at the Barker-denial line** (g1_b9); the g1_b1 superscript "[W]illm W[e/i]ll[?]" ; the archival pencil "63/38" (g1_b2).

As written — line-by-line (4×16 grid, rows keyed to `_WORKING_010_TRANSCRIPTION.md`; stitches across the four quarter-columns are provisional)

(caption, r1) The Answer of [John Lewis], one of the Defendant[s], to the bill of complaint of [Rees / Rice ap Evan] Lloyd, Complainant /

(the opening sentence + the contrivance/purpose clause + prayer, saving and general traverse, r1–r3 — rewritten from the 2026-07-02 precision cells) The said def[endan]t saieth that the said bill of compl[ain]t [exhibited?] against this def[endan]t [and others?] ... is for the most [p[ar]te?] [...] and in the ch[iefest?] and [...] and materiall matters and things therein conteyn[e]d **very untrue and scandalous**, and as this def[endan]t is by his [said?] learned Councell enformed, **[unc]ertereyne and insuffi[ci]ent in the lawes to be a[u]nswered unto by this def[endan]t, for sundrie imp[er]fec[i]ons** [therein appearing?]; **devised, framed and contrived by the Compl[ainan]t by the [instigac[i]on?] and direcc[i]on of the said W[illia]m Buckeley in the said bill named [and others?] (as this def[endan]t verelie beleveth and is p[er]swaded in his Conscience), of purpose not onlie to [vexe?], [gre]ve and trouble this def[endan]t w[i]th longe and tedious suits in lawe, w[i]thout anie matter or good grounde, of malice (as yt seemith); butt alsoe to stryke a feare into the h[ar]ts of all such freeholders of the said Countie of Anglesey [as] att the next greate Sessions to be holden for the said [Countie] shalbe retorned or impannelled for or upon the try[a]lls of the said W[illia]m Bullkeley (whoe standeth indicted att the said greate Sessions [as accessarie?] [for] the willfull murtheringe of the said Hughe ap W[illia]m [P/]end[?] [named?] in the said bill of compl[ain]t) and of other the frends of the said W[illia]m Bulkeley whoe stand [likewise?] indicted ... wherof this def[endan]t humblie praieth this Ho: Courte to have due considerac[i]on, and [that he] should [not?] be **ordered or compelled to make anie aunswere to the said fr[audulent?] [bill], [with] excep[c]i on to the incertaintie[s], insufficiencie and other the imp[er]fec[i]ons [and] defects thereof, to the said def[endan]t nowe and att all tymes hereafter saved and allowed. [And for aunswere to soe much of the said bill as doth anie waye concerne him, he saithe] That he is not guyltie of the said unlawfull and manifest plotte, practizes, confederacies, combinac[i]ons and misdemeano[u]rs in the said bill of com[plaint] menc[i]oned, nor of anie [the?] [assaults/exactions?], [extorc[i]on[?], sellinge of offices and other the offences ... as in and by the said bill of compl[ain]t is supposed ...****

(his office + the grand-jury return, r4–r5 — rewritten from the precision cells) ... is supposed. **Howbeit this def[endan]t for the further satisfacc[i]on of this Ho: Courte [and for] the declarac[i]on and manifestac[i]on of the truethe ... saithe that aboute the moneth of ffebruar[ie] Anno D[omi]ni 1605 this def[endan]t John Lewis was by vertue of his Ma[jes]ties Com[m]ission under the greate Seale of England nomi[n]ated and appointed [to] be Sheriffe of the said Countie of Anglesey for the yere then next followinge or duringe his Ma[jes]ties pleasure. And in or aboute the moneth of August last past ... beinge then Highe Sheriffe of the said Countie as [afore]said did, accordinge to his place and office, w[i]thout anie p[ar]cialitie, favo[u]r, affecc[i]on, hatred or malice towards anie p[er]son or p[er]sons therein [named?], retorne the said Graunde Jur[ie] of such sufficient p[er]sons, as well Esquiers as gent[lemen] and other good and substantiall freeholders**

of the said Countie of Anglesey, as was requisite for his Ma[jes]ties ser[vice] ... [nor could anie] (to this def[endan]ts knowledge) take anie lawfull excep[ti]ons to anie of them ... whereof he referreth himself[e] to the said retorne beinge of Record ...

(the indictment + the trial, r6–r8 — rewritten from the precision cells) ... And doth not knowe that the[y] were confederated together, or otherwise bound them selu[e]s each to other to hould[e] together in [a]ll acc[i]ons[?] ... aboute wh[at] tyme a bill of Inditem[en]t was p[re]ferred agaynste the said Richard ap John, W[illia]m Prend[?], Richard ap Richard[?], Moris ap W[illia]m and Edward ap John [— a first-draft name zone struck through on the first-written line —] for the murtheringe of the said Hughe ap W[illia]m [P/]end[?] ..., at a place called the Rodwha[?] ...; [and they] were then by the said graunde [Jury] indicted for the said murther, upon good and pregnant prooff[e]s ..., the said moneth of October last past att the greate Sessions holden for the said Countie of Anglesey before the said W[illia]m Brereton and Richard Barker esquiers, in the said bill of compl[ain]t alsoe named, his ma[jes]t[ie]s Chief Justic[e/es?] of the said greate Sessions ... This def[endan]t ... did retorne a Jury to passe upon the lief and death of such prisoners as were then appointed to take their tryalls, [returned] for the body of the said Countie, of good and substantiall gent[lemen] and freeholders of the said Countie of Anglesey w[i]thout anie such blott blemishe or disabilit[ie] as by the said bill is supposed ... And before anie of the said Jury upon lief & death [was sworne], their lawfull challenge were then by the said Justices allowed (as this def[endan]t beleveth); the prisoners (then att barre...) were warned to looke to their Challenge ... [and the prisoners appointed to take their tryalls were] openlie and publicklye [sworne/called?] ...

(the accessory finding + the TWO denials + the Barker praise, r9–r10 — rewritten from the precision cells) ... the said Examined Jury lastlie retorned by this def[endan]t did upon there evidence [find] the said William Bulkeley [acc]essarie to the said murther before the fact committed ..., [as was] declared in open Courte on his ma[jes]t[ie]s behalfe agaynst the said W[illia]m Bulkeley ... All wh[i]ch said [seve]rall retornes soe made by this def[endan]t were made w[i]thoute anie p[ar]cialitie, favo[u]r, [or] malice ... or respect of anie p[er]son or p[er]sons ... whatsoev[er] ... And this def[endan]t further saith that there was noe suche plott, practizes or confederacies betwene the said def[endan]t and the said M[r] Justice Bar[ker] *(a small cross sits in the left margin at this line)* nor anie other tyme or w[i]th anie other, for or touchinge the makinge & [im]pannelling of the [said Juries] ... Neither was there anie plott practize confederacie or combynac[i]on betwene this def[endan]t and the said M[r] Bar[ker] or anie other touchinge the callinge in question of anie of the said p[er]sons in the said bill of compl[ain]t named for the murther of the said Hughe ap W[illia]m [Prydde?] ... in or upon the said Inditem[en]ts ... And the said Justice Barker used and behaved him[self] soe uprightlie, indifferentlie and iustlie [in all the said severall p[ro]ceedinge[s]] ... [that none] — noe not the offenders them selu[e]s and suche [othe]r of their frends as earnestlie labo[u]red ... to save their l[i]v[e]s — [had] cause to mislike or thinke otherwise of his said [proceedinge[s]] (this def[endan]t thinketh) ... [and he had] did write his l[ett]res [un]to some spetiall frends of his ... in London [to make] some meanes that he should not be Sher[iffe] for that tyme [nor] for the yere then next followinge or otherwise ...

(the complainant's own indictment + the "private Adversary" + the bill against "that reverend Justice," r10–r11 — verification-pass parse, TRIPLE-VERIFIED and extended by the precision cells) ... And this def[endan]t thinketh in his conscience that **the Compl[ainan]t** — beinge of **s[u]re meane estate as he is** not worthe xx li in all the worlde to this def[endan]ts kn[o]wledg[e] (*scribal interlineation*), and one that (together w[i]th an elder brother of his hath ben indicted [as acc]essary[?] [for] ... **the wilfull murtheringe of the wieffe of the said Elder brother** ... [and] upon their tryall the said Elder brother was thereof found guiltie [and executed], and the said Compl[ainant] ... **hardly escaped and was found not guiltie**) — is countenaunced and mainteyned therein by some private Adversary that will not him self (as yt seemeth) be [k]nowne/[seene?] in this [busines?] ... wh[i]ch hathe caused the said Compl[ainan]t ... to p[re]ferre this scandalous and [?] and infamous bill into this Ho: Courte agaynst that **reverend Justice, by meanes of [the said Adversary?] ... [since] whose cominge into this Countrey [the] [e?]villes[?], enormities and oppressions [that] were before followed and worked at are nowe (god be prayesd) well reformed [and ?ab/b?]l[?]ished, and the whole Countrey much bettered and amended** ...

(the castle-gaol custody dispute, r12–r14 — keys narrative CORRECTED by the precision cells: Lewis asked, Bulkeley refused) ... And as touching the removinge to and keepinge of the said [prisoners] ... **att the house of the said def[endan]t John Lewis: this def[endan]t saith that forasmuche as the Sheriff gaole of the said [Countie was] w[i]th[i]n [the said] Castle [of Bewmares — see the castle-name conflict in the caveat], S[i]r Richard Bulkeley Knight whoe [was] and yet is Constable [thereof] ..., this def[endan]t did send to the said S[i]r Richard Bulkeley desiringe him that he might have the keys of the said Castell and Gaole to his hands, for the more [suretie?] [and] safe keepinge of the p[ri]soners that were remayninge or should be duringe his Shir[ie]fwike; and was enformed by the said messenger ... [Bulkeley having] (but) retorne[d] this aunswere ... that the said def[endan]t should not have the key of the Castell, but the Gaoler [ap]pointed by the said S[i]r Richard Bulkeley and not the Gaoler of this def[endan]t should from tyme to tyme attend the said def[endan]t or his deputie or anie his servaunts whensoever occasion [required] ... W[hi]ch answere this def[endant] did not well like of, in respect that many prisoners [within the said Cast]ell, being near friends to and dependents upon the said [Lord?] of the said Castell ... [and that certain prisoners had] lately before made escape out of [the said Gaol and Castle] ... [prisoners] might the more easily escape out of the said Gaole or prison, for want of [safe]tie and securitie therein — [he] being Sheriffe ... Whereupon this def[endant], for his better safe[ty] and dischargd ... removed the said Edward ap [?] and other [prisoners] to his — the said def[endant] John Lewis['s] — house, wherein [the said] prisoners remayned untill they were returned [and turned] over to the newe Sheriffe ... as lawfullie he might, in such convenient tyme and as by the lawes [and] statutes of this Realme [is] in such cases required ... (to his greate charge and expences, beinge dryven to finde & mainteyne men to watch them night and day, duringe the space of [blank — gap left in the MS]) ... where he might the better intend [their safe keeping] ...**

(the office-fees answer, r14–r15) ... And as touching the not makinge or appointinge [of under-officers] ... [and the dis]charge of **offices belonginge to the said Sheriffe ... for money or other valuable consideration** ... this def[endant] further saith that the Sheriffe, or his deputie

(for the tyme beinge) ... did appointe the said [bayliffs] [of] **the hundred[s] ... the keepinge of Courts w[i]thin the said [hundreds?]** ... [which] was sometymes avialle and beneficiall to the said [inhabitants?] ... [for] w[hi]ch **he did receive & take some small [fee / sum] ... w[hi]ch was lawfull for him so to do ... as [other] Sheriffs have used usuallie [to receive], and not otherwise ...**

(*aver-and-prove + the prayer, r16*) ... All w[hi]ch matters [this def[endant] is ready to aver and prove as this Ho[nourable] Court shall award?] ... [prayeth to be] **d[i]smised [from hence] w[i]th his reasonable [costs] ... [his] costs and charges in that behalfe most wrongfully [sustained] ...**

(*foot*) [unresolved flourished subscription, left-of-center]

6d · (*signed, counsel:*) **Boyd** [/ Boys?] (*with paraph*)

Modernized (the whole Answer, condensed)

The Answer of John Lewis, one of the defendants, to Rees ap Evan Lloyd's bill. **First, the objection:** the bill is very untrue and **scandalous**, and uncertain and insufficient in law to be answered for sundry **imperfections**; it was devised, framed and contrived by the complainant **at the instigation and direction of William Bulkeley** (as this defendant verily believes in his conscience), of purpose not only to vex and trouble this defendant with long and tedious suits without any matter or good ground, of malice; **but also to strike a fear into the hearts of all such freeholders of Anglesey as shall be returned or impanelled at the next great Sessions for the trials of William Bulkeley — who stands indicted as accessory to Hugh ap William's murder — and of Bulkeley's friends, also indicted.** He prays not to be compelled to answer, all exceptions saved; and for answer to so much as concerns him, he is **not guilty of the plot, practices, confederacies, combinations and misdemeanors** the bill supposes, nor of any extortion or selling of offices. **Then, the merits:** about **February 1605[/6]** he was **nominated and appointed Sheriff of Anglesey under the Great Seal, for the year then next following or during his Majesty's pleasure.** In August last he returned the **grand jury** — "as well Esquires as gentlemen and other good and substantial freeholders," as his Majesty's service required — **according to his place and office, without any partiality, favour, affection, hatred or malice toward any person**, none open to lawful exception, the return being of Record. At the **October** great Sessions a bill of indictment was preferred against **Richard ap John, William Prend[?], Richard ap Richard[?], Morris ap William and Edward ap John** for murdering Hugh ap William **at a place called the Rodwha[?]**, and the grand jury indicted them **upon good and pregnant proofs**, before **William Brereton and Richard Barker, esquires**, named in the bill, his Majesty's Chief Justice[s?] of the great Sessions. He then returned a **trial jury "upon life & death," from the body of the county**, without any such blot, blemish or disability as the bill supposes; **the prisoners were warned to look to their challenges, and their lawful challenges were allowed by the Justices**; the jury was openly and publicly sworn. That **Examined Jury, upon the evidence, found William Bulkeley accessory to the murder before the fact committed** — declared in open court on his Majesty's behalf **against Bulkeley.** All his several returns were made **without any partiality, favour or malice, or respect of any person.** There was **no plot, practice or confederacy between this defendant and Mr Justice Barker touching the making and impanelling of the juries** — nor any "touching the calling in question" of any of the persons indicted — and indeed he had **written letters to special friends in London seeking not to be Sheriff at all.** Justice Barker **used and behaved himself so uprightly, indifferently and justly that none — no, not the offenders themselves, nor such of their friends as earnestly laboured to save their lives — had cause to mislike or**

think otherwise of his proceedings. As for the complainant: a man of **sure mean estate** — "**not worth £20 in all the world,**" an interlined addition — **who together with an elder brother of his was indicted [as accessory?] for the wilful murdering of that elder brother's wife** — at their trial **the brother was found guilty** [and executed], while the complainant **hardly escaped and was found not guilty** — and he is **countenanced and maintained in this suit by some private Adversary who will not himself (as it seems) be known/[seen] in this business**; which has caused him to prefer this **scandalous and infamous bill against that reverend Justice**. Since whose [Barker's] coming into this country the evils, **enormities and oppressions** before followed are **now (God be praised) well reformed**, the whole country much bettered and amended. **On the gaol**: the sheriff's gaol lay within the castle [of Beaumaris?] whose Constable was and is **Sir Richard Bulkeley, Knight**; this defendant sent asking that **HE might have the keys of the castle and gaol to his own hands, for the more surety and safe keeping of the prisoners during his sheriffwick** — and was informed by the messenger that he should **NOT have the key of the castle**, but that Bulkeley's keeper, not the defendant's gaoler, would attend him. **Which answer he did not well like of**, because the prisoners were Bulkeley's **near friends and dependents**, prisoners had **lately escaped**, and more might; so, for his better safety and discharge, he **removed the prisoners** (Edward ap [John?] and others) **to his own house**, kept them **watched night and day at his own great charge** for the space of [blank], and duly turned them over to the new Sheriff as the laws require. **On the offices**: the small sums taken on appointing bailiffs of the hundreds and for keeping of courts were **lawful, customary fees such as Sheriffs have always taken, and not otherwise**. All which matters he is ready to aver and prove, and he prays to be **dismissed with his reasonable costs and charges, most wrongfully sustained**.

Why it matters — the taproot's defense mirror. Membranes 008–009 gave the Court's interrogatories, which *presume* a bill against a judge is a conspiracy and hunt the conspirators. Membrane 010 gives the *defendants'* answering move, and it is the same doctrine stated as **advocacy**: the bill against the judge is "**very untrue and scandalous ... an infamous bill against that reverend Justice,**" while the judge "**used and behaved himself so uprightly, indifferently and justly**" that "no, not the offenders themselves" could mislike his proceedings. And the precision pass recovered the Answer's two sharpest moves, both in the record's own words. **First, the fear argument — on the defense side.** The purpose clause charges that the bill was contrived "**to *stryke a feare into the harts* of all such freeholders ... as shalbe retorned or impannelled for ... the try[a]lls of the said W[illia]m Bullkeley ... and of other the frends**" — i.e., counsel argues that *accusations against the men who ran a prosecution terrify the fact-finders of the NEXT one*. That is the deterrence-by-fear rationale — the exact engine Coke's report generalizes ("those who are the most sincere, would not be free from continual calumniation") — deployed a year *before* the report, as a litigant's characterization, about **jurors**. The doctrine of fearfulness is already the defense theory of the case. **Second, the vocabulary lock.** The Answer denies any plot "**touchinge the *callinge in question* of anie of the said p[er]sons ... in or upon the said Inditem[en]ts**" — the same term of art Coke's report converts into the immunity formula ("the Judges ... ought not to be drawn in question"). In the manuscript the phrase belongs to the *bill's* theory (wrongfully procuring prosecutions); in the print it becomes the *judge's* shield. Here, upstream of the report, none of this is yet a rule — it is the **accused side's framing, signed by counsel** ("Boyd/Boys"), of an accuser as a libeler and jury-intimidator. Read from its own case file, *Floyd v. Barker's* immunity is the **crystallization of one litigant's defensive framing into doctrine** — the very "calibration-is-not-source" point at the heart of the genealogy. (*Both recovered phrases were adjudicated by the user 2026-07-03 and are now quoted in THE_TWO_LOCKS.md V.B on the author's authority with disclosure (nn. vst3–vst4); the commissioned TNA transcription, when it returns, governs — conform any variance there first.*)

Two further things the full line-by-line pass adds. **First, the feud is the case.** The Answer's longest factual passages are not about Barker at all — they are the sheriff-vs-constable fight over the castle gaol (Sir Richard Bulkeley holds the keys; the prisoners are his "near friends and dependents"; Lewis moves them to his own house under night-and-day watch) and the defense of customary shrieval fees. The grand jury Lewis returned found **William Bulkeley accessory to the murder** — and Lloyd's Star Chamber bill answers *that* by accusing the judge and sheriff of conspiracy. The "conspiracy against a judge" the Court would punish, and Coke would immortalize, sits on top of an Anglesey faction war in which **both sides** were maneuvering the machinery of justice. **Second, the asymmetry of scrutiny.** The Answer freely concedes facts (fees taken — "lawful"; prisoners kept in a private house — "for his better safety"), and no interrogatory in this file tests any of it; the only conduct interrogated (008, 009) is the *accuser's*. The one-way direction of inquiry — later frozen into doctrine as "the judge is not to be drawn in question" — is already fully operational at the pleading stage.

Phase-4 addendum (4C, 2026-07-08): completeness audit COMPLETE (seam strips ×3 + rows 13–16 spot pass + all standing-[?] re-renders + the all-membranes ink screen). **Verdict: the grid text SURVIVES; no lost text found.** ★ **A THIRD revision event READ:** the row-13 interline "and, some what[?] f[a]rre[?] distant from the said Castell" — the Answer's added explanation for moving the prisoners to Lewis's own house (the earlier "detained from the said Castell" fragment was this interline misread as baseline). ★ **"Sheriffewick"** recovered ("[the dis]charge of offices belonging to the said Sheriffewick[e], for money or other valuable considerac[i]on" — "writt"/"[reward?]" retracted). ★ **The foot-subscription mystery RESOLVED:** the flourished "[S_?]zand[?]" is the **engrossed PRAYER** ("dismissed by[?] th[e/is] ho[nora]ble Co[ur]te w[i]th ... costes and charges ... most wrongfullie susteyned") — a misparse of "[di]ssmised"; foot layout = prayer → "...[ack?]nowled[?] & 6d" note → counsel signature **"Boyd"** (initial-B firm; "Boys" possible) → paraph → corner clip. Fees answer sharpened: **"place & place[s]"** firm; the appointments were "avaliable and beneficiall to the said **Sheriff[e]**" (not "inhabitants"); "some smalle **rewarde**"; the payer's name stays scan-limited ("[Griffith?]" unconfirmed — ledger A12). NEW sense-flip flag: **"[no/as] other Sheriffe** [hath/shall?] [vs?]uall[ie] formerlie done" (if "no," Lewis claims a first — verb stain-crossed; TNA).

NAME-RECONCILIATION TABLE (STAC ↔ COKE ↔ HLS) — VERIFICATION PASS, 2026-07-01

Method: targeted maximum-magnification zooms (crops/crop_v*) on every contested name, read against Coke's print (77 Eng. Rep. 1305, corpus markdown) and the HLS MS 149 companion. "✓ **verified**" = **read clearly at magnification in this pass; every name still requires a professional TNA transcription before article or filing use.**

Person / item	STAC 8/203/38 (this pass)	Coke, 12 Co. Rep. 23	HLS MS 149 ff. 81r–83v	Status
---------------	---------------------------	----------------------	------------------------	--------

Person / item	STAC 8/203/38 (this pass)	Coke, 12 Co. Rep. 23	HLS MS 149 ff. 81r–83v	Status
Complainant	"Rees ap Ev[a]n Loyd," prisoner in the Fleet (008 caption ✓ zoom; 010 caption; deponent 003R–007)	"Rice ap Evan ap Floyd" (caption)	"the plt"	✓ Same man (Lloyd = Floyd). Verified at magnification —  Phase 4 (4A/4D-7): the patronym conflicts between its two 008 instances (Ev[a]n vs a Hu-class token), and the 007 autograph patronym is a three-way (Jhon/Ev[a]n). TNA, names above all
His elder brother — executed	"J[oh]n ap E[va]n Lloyd yo[ur] brother ... wrongfullie indict[ed] [condemned & executed]" (008 Art. 1 ✓ zoom); "the said Elder brother was thereof found guiltie " (010 r11 ✓)	omitted entirely	"The plts Brother was lately executed for Murder" (f. 82v — unnamed)	★ STAC supplies the name the print lacks: John ap Evan Lloyd . TNA confirmation needed
The brother's victim	"murtheringe of his A[nn/m]is [Annes?]" (008 Art. 1, possessive + short name, zoom); " the wieffe of the said Elder brother " (010 r11 — ✓ CLEAR at magnification, w-i-e-f-f-e)	not mentioned	not mentioned	★ Recovered fact absent from both later sources: the brother was executed for murdering his own wife. Her forename ("Annes"?) tentative
The complainant's own indictment & escape	008 Art. 1 "And whether you were justlie or wrongfullie indicted for that fact"; 003R "not in any sort privy or consenting"; 010 r11 "the said Compl[ainant] (as yt seemeth) [escaped]" ✓	not mentioned	" Ignoramus found for the plt by speciall favour " (f. 82v)	✓ Four-source convergence — the complainant was co-indicted with his brother and released

Person / item	STAC 8/203/38 (this pass)	Coke, 12 Co. Rep. 23	HLS MS 149 ff. 81r–83v	Status
The kinsman — the second executed man	Art. 3 (✓ zoom): wrong done "unto ^{w[illia]m} ap Res ap Willia[m] and to others" (full three-element form); short "William ap Rees" (Arts. 2/6; 004R; 005L); Art. 2 (✓ zoom): "that was executed w[i]th yo[ur] said brother" ; the dying-charge giver, "as you are my kinsman" (004)	"one William Price ," convicted "for the murder of Hugh ap William "; "the said W. P. " executed	" William Aprice received 30li to Murder one Griffith " (bill recital, f. 82v)	★ Coke's " William ap Rice " = STAC's William ap Rees ap William — the kinsman, NOT the brother . The old "conflation/error" theory is retracted; the HLS editorial equation of Aprice with "the plts Brother" was OUR inference, now corrected. Two men were executed (temporal "with," possibly different charges)
Victim of the kinsman's charge	"the said Hughe ap William named in the said bill" (010 r3 ✓ re-verified at magnification)	"the murder of Hugh ap William "	" Hugh ap Williams was drowned and his horse alsoe in An° 1600"	✓ Three-source match — the 1600 drowning prosecuted as murder ~5 years later
"one Griffith"	a "Griffith" appears in 004/005 contexts (first sweep)	not mentioned	the £30 murder-contract victim (bill recital)	OPEN — relation to Hugh ap Williams / the wife unresolved

Person / item	STAC 8/203/38 (this pass)	Coke, 12 Co. Rep. 23	HLS MS 149 ff. 81r–83v	Status
The prison-money sender (Fleet)	"sent unto W[illia]m ap Rees, HIS FREND, to borrowe lend" (005L answer 6 ✓); "the ^{s[ai]d} Som of thirtie[-odde?] pownd & some shillings ... received ffrom the ^{s[ai]d} W[illia]m ap Rees himselfe ... brought him by Humfrey ^{Anthonie Leadman} the Warden of the ffleets Man; & the other delivered unto M[r] Jones, this ex[aminan]ts Atturrie in this Courte" (007 answer 14 ✓ zooms z7sum/z7cour/z7atty)	—	—	★ RESOLVED (re-sweep): the sender is a LIVING friend with the two-element name — the manuscript's three-element form for the executed kinsman exists to distinguish them. Jones = Lloyd's Star Chamber attorney of record. The Warden himself is unnamed ("Mr George?" stays retracted). ⚠ SUPERSEDED IN PART by Phase 4 (4D-7; ledger B1): the SUM — the 007 re-citation token is ff-initial ✓✓ (ffiftene-lean), EXCLUDING "thirtie"/"thirtene" as written there; against answer-6's "thirtie[?]" that means different figures or one misread — sum UNRESOLVED, TNA mandatory. The COURIER — the 007 interline is an INSERTION after "by" ("Humfrey" unsupported at that site; "Anthonie"-leaning); two courier-name events (cf. 005's baseline "Humfrey") to reconcile. Names → professional confirmation

Person / item	STAC 8/203/38 (this pass)	Coke, 12 Co. Rep. 23	HLS MS 149 ff. 81r–83v	Status
Bulkeley cast	004R Interr. 5 (✓ zooms): " Richard Bulkley ... Launcelott Bulkley ... Tristram ... nor Daniel Bulkley ... " ^{w^m} "; 008: Sir Richard (kt), Daniel, Tristram, Launcelot (brothers), William (nephew); 010: Sir Richard "and yet is Constable" of the castle (r12 ✓), William found "accessory ... before the fact" (r9)	not mentioned	Bulkeleys appear (Towneley context)	✓ All five forenames verified at magnification
Lewis defendants	"against Howell [Lewis]"; "against John Lewis in the Kings Benche "; Crown-bhalf action ^{"since the tyme aforesaid} against Howell..."; possible co-defendant "& Res ap Hugh[e]?" (005R ✓ zooms); John Lewis = the answering defendant, High Sheriff (010 caption + 4× in body ✓)	"other defendants" (unnamed)	"procured John Lewes esquire to be made Sheriff" (f. 81v)	✓ John Lewis (Sheriff) is triple-source; Howell ✓ STAC-only; "William Lewis" still provisional; "Res ap Hugh[e]" new & unconfirmed
The judge	"Mr Justice Barker"; " William Brereton and Richard Barker esquires " (010 r7); " that reverend Justice " (r11 ✓)	"Richard Barker, one of the justices of the grand sessions in the county of Anglesey"	"Barker" / "Sir Richard Barker"	✓

Person / item	STAC 8/203/38 (this pass)	Coke, 12 Co. Rep. 23	HLS MS 149 ff. 81r–83v	Status
The bench	trial bench = Brereton + Barker; precision-pass stitch: "...before the said W[illia]m Brereton and Richard Barker esquiers , in the said bill of compl[ain]t alsoe named, his ma[jes]t[ie]s Chief Justic[e/es?] of the said greate Sessions" — not personally named ("[Sebright?]" retracted), and the sing./plural now an open parse (third person? the pair as the court? one of them?); "the said Justices allowed" is plural (b8)	Star Chamber bench: "Popham and Coke, Chief Justices, the Chief Baron, and Egerton, Lord Chancellor"	co-Justice Leighton removed with Barker (STAC 009)	Brereton is STAC-only; distinguish trial bench from Star Chamber bench; Justic[e/es] parse → TNA (cross-check 009 "Leighton")
Other indicted persons (010)	precision pass (b6–b7, list read twice): " Richard ap John, W[illia]m Prend[?], Richard ap Richard[?], Moris ap W[illia]m and Edward ap John " + a struck first-draft name zone ("W[illia]m ap [?]ellew[?]"); prisoner "Edward ap [__?]" (r14) = Edward ap John ; victim-token "Hughe ap W[illia]m [P/J]end[?] " ×5 (formula "named" OR a 4th name element — best candidate " P[ry]dd[e] ," which would make the victim kin to indictee W[illia]m Prend/Prydd)	only "William Price"	—	△ provisional; the "Prydd = Price" hypothesis is superseded (Art. 3's full name accounts for Coke's Price); struck zone + victim-token → TNA

Person / item	STAC 8/203/38 (this pass)	Coke, 12 Co. Rep. 23	HLS MS 149 ff. 81r–83v	Status
010 foot subscriptions	counsel signature "Boyd" / "Boys" (terminal crossed by paraph — irreducibly ambiguous at this scan, ✓ re-zoomed); "6d" fee note; second flourished subscription left-of- center "[Strange? / Stroud?]" (unresolved — likely commissioner/examiner)	—	—	⚠ professional verification

Person / item	STAC 8/203/38 (this pass)	Coke, 12 Co. Rep. 23	HLS MS 149 ff. 81r–83v	Status
Places	"Castell of Bewmares" — — Beaumaris, verification-zoom ✓ (and 004L re-sweep: the kinsman "in the prison at [B]ewmar[i]s") — but △ REOPENED as a conflict by the precision pass: both band-scale reads of the 010 clause see "Pen—" ("[Pen___?]") grid / "Penmar[d/k]e[?]" precision cell); zoom + external history (Bulkeley = Constable of Beaumaris) keep "Bewmares" leading; Sir Richard's house "in Channall Rowe" (005L) = Art. 7 "Channell Rowe" (✓ zoom z8art7_b1) — Channel/Cannon Row, Westminster; "Newborough (Towne)" for the Bulkeley-house clause RETRACTED; "Newborough" as the <i>murder locale</i> (first- sweep 004) NOT confirmed — and the precision pass now reads the murder place as "at a place called the Rodwha[?]" (b6, new strokes); Amlwch ✓✓ ("parishe of Amblowghe," z5tydd_b2); tenements "Ty[d]in Lla[y]th[y]n[?]" & "Tyddyn [K/H]iew[?]" (scan-limited)	—	—	Amlwch closed; △ the Bulkeley-house token REOPENED by Phase 4 (4D-5): crop-firm rival "(C)ornwall (R)owe" vs "[Ch]annall Rowe" at 005L (surfaced to user; 008 Art-7's "Channell Rowe" zoom stands) — TNA; castle name resolved Beaumaris (Pass-4 pilot, letterform- grounded; TNA confirm routine); "the Rodwha[?]" + tenement names → professional

What the pass changed: (1) the "Coke conflated the brother's name" theory is **retracted** — Coke's William Price was a real, distinct second executed man (the kinsman, full name William ap Rees ap William); what the print *does* suppress is the **brother** (John ap Evan Lloyd), the **wife-murder** prosecution, the complainant's **own**

co-indictment and escape, and the **faction war**. (2) The 010 row-11 sentence was re-parsed: "the Com[mission]" → "**the Compl[ainant]**" — it is the Answer's attack on the complainant (mean estate; co-indicted with his brother for the wife's murder; acquitted; "**countenanced and mainteyned ... by some private Adversary that will not himself [be seen]**"). (3) Beaumaris, the five Bulkeley forenames, the two-executions clause, the Lewis suits, and the money chain are now **verified at magnification**. (4) "[Sebright?]" and "Mr George?" (warden's name) are **retracted** as misreads; the second foot subscription remains open.

What the 2026-07-02 FABLE-5 RE-SWEEP + ZOOM QUEUE added/changed (001–007 read line-by-line; verdicts in `_WORKING_REZOOM_VERDICTS_2026-07-02.md`):

- **New names:** Serjeant ~~Edward~~^{Henry} **Montague** (the scribe's own correction, ≥4×); the Art-1 hearer "**George Ll[ewell?]en**" (suspension; "Lloyd" disfavored); the Art-5 intermediary "**W[illia]m Ken[w]rick[e]**" (article-interline ⇌ answer converged; "Penrithe"/"Kendrick"/"Hendrick" superseded); the courier "**Humfrey**
Anthonie Leadman", **the Warden of the ffleets Man** (in-line/interline direction corrected); "**M[r] Jones, this ex[aminan]ts Atturrie in this Courte**" (role recovered); a **third, living Lloyd brother** (the Channel-Row lease); the living money-sender "**W[illia]m ap Rees, his frend**."
- **Changed readings:** the prison money = "**thirtie[-odde?]**" (£30-odd), not £13; Sir Richard's house = **Channel Row, Westminster**, not "Newburgh Towne"; the brother's victim = "**his wife**" in the complainant's own sworn answer (third attestation; "supposed murdering"); the wife's name "**his A[nn/m]is**" = **Annis (Annes/Agnes) or Amis (Amice)**, minim-ambiguous at zoom.
- **New substance:** the **dying charge verbatim + the VOW** ("make knowne to the state ... as you are my kinsman"); "**as innocent ... as the child new borne**"; the brother "**still denied it to the deathe**"; kinship = "**cousins of cousin-germans removed**"; the **standing answer** ("because he was dead"; own wrongs already in Common Pleas); the **Bulkeley loan with a bond**; Sir Richard's quoted words ("**if you dost bringe me as a wittnes, I will speake the truthe**"); Bulkeley truth-vetting + the **examiner's marginal note**; Montague's "**examinable in the Starrechamber**" if true opinion, three-week perusal, **one-third cut in his own hand**, and subscription; Towneley's Art-13 answer "**by the instructions of ... Loud, & of no other person**" + his scope objections; answer 14's "**maynetenauce or monie**" mirror of Art. 14; the **interlocking selective administration** (Towneley 3,4,5,6,¹³,15,16 ⇌ Lloyd 1–12,14); **both deponents' autographs** (Towneley; "Res ap Ev[a]n[?] Lloid[e]"); the struck-zone recovery "**acqu[ainted]**" (004R); the file's own Latin caption (*Lloyd v. Barker & al.*) and June-1607 dating clause.
- **Scan-limited (professional imaging):** the 010 left-of-center foot subscription (three zoom attempts incl. autocontrast — ghost strokes only); Boyd/Boys; "Tyddyn [K/H]iew"; the 004R struck line's full text; 007's verso (show-through = possibly unscanned writing — request with the TNA order).

What the 2026-07-02 PRECISION PASS (third pass) added (009 line-by-line under Fable 5, `_WORKING_009_TRANSCRIPTION.md`; the gap-ledger zoom campaign, `_PRECISION_PASS_LEDGER.md`):

- **Boundary correction:** the 008 margin "2" anchors at "And doe you beleve" — **Art. 1 = the report alone; Art. 2 = brother + own-indictment + quarrels** — Lloyd's answers 1–3 now align with Arts. 1–3 exactly.
- **009 recoveries:** "Bill or **informac[i]on**" (Arts. 13/16); the crime claim "robberies & burglaries were **fewer found[?]**"; ★ the **struck reward question partially recovered** ("**anie r[e]ward [tendred?] or [promised] ... the said M[r] Bar[ker?]**" — the one probe pointing at the judge's side, deleted in drafting); Art. 15's interlines ("or gave yo[u] any of the said Instruc[i]ons", "hereafter"); "the said **Rees ap Evan**"; "ffirst **attached**"; margins 15/16 read directly; **the instrument is UNSIGNED** (blank foot to the stamp zone).

- **Gap-ledger resolutions:** "came from his **Councell**" (001 — "Countrey" retired; Lloyd had already consulted counsel, cf. "besides those w[i]th whome he had ben"); the bill "was drawne up in pap[er] by this ex[aminan]t [&/or?] his [man?]" (Towneley drew it); the 002L examiner's marginal note framed whole — **with a struck quantifier** ("in ~~some~~ of the materiall points to bee true"); the recurring struck forename reads "**Edwardes**" (001 + 002, 5+ occurrences before "Montague"); the answer-side Bulkeley list completes ("**Tristram**"); the March loan = "the som of **ffortie[?] [s?]**" (forty shillings?) with the bond; the father's money = "[] pownd & **seaven Shillings**" (pounds figure scan-limited); the 008 order date's ordinal ends "**-tenthe**" ("twent[ie]th" disfavored — best: "the tenthe daie of June," giving order 10 June → examinations 11 June); answer-12's "be→was" strike + the kinsmen interline's anchor.
- **Phase B (010 rows 1–12 re-verified, 48 recut cells — COMPLETE):** ★★ the "institutional-stakes clause" is RETRACTED and replaced — the bill's purpose clause is a **jury-intimidation charge**: "of purpose ... **to stryke a feare into the h[a]rts of all such freeholders** of the said Countie of Anglesey [as] att the next greate Sessions ... shalbe **retorned or impannelled for or upon the try[a]lls of the said W[illia]m Bullkeley (whoe standeth indicted...) and of other the frends...**" ("officers of the Chamber of England ... questioned or imprisoned" was a misread of "freeholders ... retorned or impannelled"); ★★ the second Barker-denial contains the phrase "**touchinge the callinge in question** of anie of the said p[er]sons ... in or upon the said Inditem[en]ts" — the manuscript uses the very term of art Coke's report converts into the immunity formula; ★★ scribal interlineation "not worthe xx li in all the worlde to this def[endan]ts kn[o]wledg[e]" (the complainant's poverty quantified at £20); ★★ the keys narrative REVERSED (Lewis asked Bulkeley for the keys "to his hands"; Bulkeley refused — "should not have the key of the Castell"); ★ dated appointment "**ffbruar[ie] Anno D[omi]ni 1605**" (chronology locks: Feb 1605/6 → Aug 1606 return → Oct 1606 sessions → 1607 report); ★ the indictee list doubled (Richard ap John, W[illia]m Prend[?], Richard ap Richard[?], Moris ap W[illia]m, **Edward ap John**) + murder place "**the Rodwha[?]**" + a struck first-draft name zone; ★ the impartiality formula complete x2 ("w[i]thout anie p[ar]cialitie, favo[u]r, affecc[i]on, hatred or malice..."); ★ trial-fairness detail (prisoners "**warned to looke to their Challenge**"; "Jury upon lief & death" "for the **body of the said Countie**"; "Graunde Jury" and "Examined Jury" verified as distinct terms); ★ the Barker praise at full strength ("soe uprightlie, indifferentlie **and iustlie**" — "noe not the offenders them selu[e]s"), the reform Barker-specific ("**whose cominge into this Countrey**"), and a **marginal cross at the Barker-denial line**; ★ "hardly escaped and was found not guiltie" now a DIRECT read; △ castle-name conflict logged (band "Penmar[d/k]e[?]" vs zoom "Bewmares").
- Remaining professional items are consolidated in _PRECISION_PASS_LEDGER.md (the commission brief). **All three phases complete — every membrane now rests on Fable-5 readings; the record is ready for user adjudication + the TNA commission.**

Provenance/availability delineation: ../THE_FOUR_STRATA_OF_THE_FLOYD_RECORD.md sets this file in the four-strata record of *Floyd v. Barker* — what courts have ever had (Coke's print alone), what academics surfaced 2022–2025 (Williams; Kesselring), and what only this research recovered (the full HLS + STAC transcriptions).

★ **FIRST SWEEP + VERIFICATION PASS + 008 DEDICATED SWEEP + FABLE-5 RE-SWEEP OF 001–007 + ZOOM QUEUE + PRECISION PASS + PHASE-4 LINE-INDEX CAMPAIGN — ALL COMPLETE (2026-07-01/02; Phase 4 2026-07-07/08 — see the header status update for its yields: per-leaf line indexes, the rotated 009 ENDORSEMENT/docket, the recovered 006R line, the revision stratum).** All ten membranes are transcribed

line-by-line via the crop-zoom method, and membranes 001–007 were **re-swept in full under Fable 5** (user-directed; the first sweep was digest-level): two depositions (Towneley 001–003L, autograph; Rees ap Jevan Lloyd 003R–007, autograph — working files `_WORKING_TOWNELEY_DEPOSITION_001-003L.md` / `_WORKING_LLOYD_DEPOSITION_003R-007.md`), **one 16-article interrogatory instrument spanning membranes 008–009** (`_WORKING_008_TRANSCRIPTION.md`; the earlier "two separate sets" characterization is superseded), and the **Answer of John Lewis, High Sheriff of Anglesey (010, 4×16 grid; `_WORKING_010_TRANSCRIPTION.md`)**. Verification crops: crops/crop_v* (2026-07-01 pass); 008 bands crops/crop_s8_*; the 2026-07-02 re-sweep + zoom-queue crops were cut payload-lean to the session scratchpad (disposable; recut commands in `_RESUME_TRANSCRIPTION_NOTES.md`), with verdicts in `_WORKING_REZOOM_VERDICTS_2026-07-02.md`. Remaining: **the professional TNA transcription (commissioned 2026-07-03, pending; `_PRECISION_PASS_LEDGER.md` is the brief) — on return, conform every STAC reading (names above all; variances to the user first), FIRST the 4B endorsement's party-styling cluster ("Ad sect[am]? Barker" — if confirmed, the examinations were docketed as taken in Barker's own counter-suit: a third styling stratum beside the file's caption and the TNA catalogue, and a material strengthening of the conversion thesis), then the answer-14 sum (ledger B1), the Channall/Cornwall Rowe house token, and the complainant's 008 patronym; plus the scan-limited items (the 010 foot subscriptions, "Tyddyn [K/H]iew," the 004R struck line, and the possibly-unscanned 007 verso).** *[[GATE UPDATED, review pass 2026-07-08: this block's former "fold nothing into THE_TWO_LOCKS.md until then" directive was SUPERSEDED on 2026-07-03 — the user adjudicated, and the V.B fold-in is EXECUTED (nn. vst1–vst4 + vr9; quotations ride on the author's transcription with disclosure, n. vst1). The standing rule is conform-on-return, not fold-nothing. The 2026-07-08 review pass verified every folded quotation against the deepest authority layer (working transcriptions + Phase-4 letterform notes): all match — including "moneys"/"Burklie"/"attached," where THE_TWO_LOCKS n. vst2 carries the precision forms this companion's 009 block had left first-sweep-normalized (now conformed above).]]*