

**CANONICAL TRANSCRIPT — MEMBRANE 001 (TNA STAC
8/203/38)**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CANONICAL TRANSCRIPT — MEMBRANE 001 (TNA STAC 8/203/38).....	1
STATEMENT OF EDITORIAL METHOD.....	1
THE LATIN CAPTION — c1–c8 · tiles b1–b2.....	2
THE DEPONENT — L1–L1b · tile b2.....	3
ANSWER TO THE 3rd INTERROGATORY — L2–L9 · tiles b3–b4.....	3
ANSWER TO THE 4th INTERROGATORY — L10–L32 · tiles b4–b8.....	3
REVISION STRATUM AND PHYSICAL RECORD.....	5
OPEN ITEMS ON THIS MEMBRANE.....	5
CROSS-REFERENCES.....	6

CANONICAL TRANSCRIPT — MEMBRANE 001 (TNA STAC 8/203/38)

Corpus: TNA STAC 8/203/38 (record copy RC8368179) — catalogued *Lloyde v. Lewys*, Anglesey, June 1607; the surviving Star Chamber file behind *Floyd v. Barker*, 77 Eng. Rep. 1305 (1607)

Membrane: 001 of 010 — the deposition of John Towneley (the counsel who drew the bill), opening leaf: Latin dating clause + caption, answers to the 3rd and 4th interrogatories (continues on membrane 002)

Master image: 8368179_STAC_8_203_38_001.jpg · 2787×4140 px · sha256 ee090a2477bd5098d71a4e915d4f9fed55c34aae489e35c1debecc459e658be0 (verify: `shasum -a 256 -c \_FIXITY\_SHA256\_SOURCES.txt`)

Canonical tiles: crops/canon/crop_canon_m001_L_b1..b8 and _R_b1..b8, each in nat + eB renders (32 tiles) · manifest crops/canon/_manifest.jsonl (per-tile source rectangle, parameters, CLI command, master sha256) · coverage proven y 82–4140 by ../_coverage_check.py; the 82 px above the y=0.02 cut is the torn head margin, verified text-free on the recto by the Phase 4C full-extent ink screen (parchment-bbox basis, 16×16 cell grid, B/M channels, eyes on every flag — 001's only flags were the verso docket-class writing, a dorse-imaging order standing with TNA, and a left-margin zone resolved as show-through/stain; `\_WORKING\_P4C\_AUDIT.md`)

As-read record: the readings below were made on the working series (crops/stac_p4d/crop_p4d001L/R_b1..b8 and prior passes) — see _WORKING_001_LINE_INDEX.md; the canon series is a deterministic re-derivation from the same master for citation, NOT the tiles-as-read (methodology §15.4)

Transcription level: strict diplomatic (methodology §6, §18.1); the Modernized layer is an editorial aid and is never quotable

Authority: the author's working transcription, first-hand method (methodology §2.1), quoted only with disclosure; professional verification transcription (2026-07-02 TNA-route ask closed by TNA 2026-07-15 — not a TNA service; independent professional commissioned via TNA's researchers list, engaged 2026-07-17) RETURNED IN FULL 2026-08-06 and conformed — CORRECTIONS_LOG #31–#32

Pass history: first sweep 2026-07-01 · line-by-line re-sweep 2026-07-02 · precision zooms 2026-07-02 · Phase 4D-1 line index 2026-07-08 · this transcript assembled 2026-07-09 (assembly only — no new readings)

Status: professional return RECEIVED + CONFORMED (2026-08-06/07, CORRECTIONS_LOG #31–#32); letter-exact sites carry in-line [VERDICT] annotations; readings without a letter-exact verdict remain provisional (names above all, §1.7); physical-class residue awaits imaging (per ledger/log)

STATEMENT OF EDITORIAL METHOD

(a) What this document is. The reader-facing edition of membrane 001: every census line of the leaf, line by line, each tied to the image tile that shows it, with the author's diplomatic determination and a modernized rendering. It is assembled from the corpus's adjudicated layers — the Phase 4D line index (_WORKING_001_LINE_INDEX.md), the baseline deposition transcription (_WORKING_TOWNELEY_DEPOSITION_001-003L.md), and the precision-pass zoom verdicts (_PRECISION_PASS_LEDGER.md) — with **every uncertainty flag preserved**. It introduces no new readings. Where layers disagree, the disagreement is either shown in the text itself (true contests carry both readings) or resolved by the method's escalation ladder (zoom outranks band level, methodology §9) with the losing layer's reading cited in the entry's note — and where the resolving zoom belongs to a regeneration-class series (tiles-as-read lost, methodology §15.2), the entry says so.

(b) Conventions. The full table is the renderer's legend page and methodology §6. In brief: [?] uncertain · [...] / [__] supplied/illegible · ^{word} scribal interlineation · struck text is struck in the manuscript · <x> expanded letterform ·  lean /   contested · ✓/✓✓/✓eB sighted/double-sighted/survives enhancement · ✕ scan-limited. Scribal spelling is preserved exactly; nothing is silently normalized. One declared exception, in

the Modernized layer only: the complainant's surname, which the leaf spells variously (the Ll/FI variance is itself a live arbitration item — Open Items, no. 5), is normalized to **Lloyd** in the aid layer; the diplomatic layer preserves each site's form.

(c) How to read a line entry. The label is `membrane.line` (`001.L18` = membrane 001, deposition line 18; `c1-c8` = the Latin caption block; `L1b` = a right-half-only formula line). Joint entries (`001.L8-L9`) are the addressable unit where two physical lines carry one unbroken clause; a single-line ID inside a joint range resolves to the joint entry. The reading is the stitch of the left and right half-column tiles for the band named in the note: **b3** means `crops/canon/crop_canon_m001_L_b3.jpg || crop_canon_m001_R_b3.jpg` (add `_eB` for the enhanced render). Open any named tile and the line is before your eyes; the manifest row for that tile gives the exact pixel rectangle of the master it was cut from, and the master's checksum is in `_FIXITY_SHA256_SOURCES.txt` — the chain from this page to The National Archives' record copy is verifiable at every link.

(d) Authorization state. The author adjudicated and authorized quotation with disclosure on 2026-07-03 (`THE_TWO_LOCKS.md` n. `vst1` is the disclosure formula). Only the diplomatic layer may ever be quoted;  readings only with flags intact;  readings are described, never quoted as readings. All names remain provisional until the commissioned TNA transcription returns.

THE LATIN CAPTION — c1–c8 · tiles b1–b2

CAPTION BLOCK (center-right of the leaf head; grand flourished E):

- **001.c1:** `Exam[inati]o capt[a] [v/x?][i]j die mens[is] Juni[j] — b1 · day-number contested {vij, xj}; the 003R margin reads x[v?][j] — ledger B6, TOP TNA item`
- **001.c2:** `[An]no regni d[omi]ni n[ost]ri Jacobi — b1`
- **001.c3:** `[An]glie, ffrancie, et Hib[er]nie Reg[is] — b1`
- **001.c4:** `[qui]nto et Scotie Quadrage[si]mo[?] — b1 · external-record ranking (§17.3): James VI's 41st Scottish year opened 24 July 1607, so a June examination falls in the 40th — the baseline's supplied "[primo?]" tail is date-disfavored and has no stroke support in the 4D view; England's 5 Jac. concurs (= 1607). Ledger B9`
- **001.c5:** `Sup[er] Interr[ogatoriis] [ex?] ordine[m] Cur[ie]? min[i]strat[is] — b1–b2`
- **001.c6:** `[in ca[usa]? nup[er]? or infra?] exhibit[a] p[er] Rees ap Jev[a]n — b2`
- **001.c7:** `[Ll]oud, con[tra] Ric[ardu]m Barker Ar[migerum] — b2 · the file's OWN caption styles the cause against Barker — not the catalogue's Lloyde v. Lewys`
- **001.c8:** `& al[ios?] — b2`

Modernized (editorial aid — never quotable): Examination taken the [7th or 11th — contested] day of June in the fifth year of the reign of our lord James, King of England,

1 France and Ireland, and of Scotland the fortieth[?] — June 1607 — upon interrogatories
2 ministered by order of the Court, in the cause lately exhibited by Rees ap Jevan Lloyd
3 against Richard Barker, esquire, and others.

4 **THE DEPONENT — L1–L1b · tile b2**

- 5 • **001.L1:** John Towneley of [C]raue[n?] [in the Countie of ____?] [?]
6 g[ent?] [aged ____?] — b2 · huge flourished oval J; county/age unread (supplied
7 brackets)
- 8 • **001.L1b:** [?] exam[inan]t[?] sworne &c[?] — b2 · right-half-only formula line

9 **Modernized (editorial aid — never quotable):** John Towneley of Craven [county not
10 read], gentleman, sworn.

11 **ANSWER TO THE 3rd INTERROGATORY — L2–L9 · tiles b3–b4**

- 12 • **001.L2:** To the 3[d?] Interr[ogatorie] this exam[inan]t saieth that he
13 ~~[E?]dward[?]~~ ^{E[?]} — b3 · struck word at the answer head = the "Edwardes"-
14 before-Montague anticipation error at first occurrence (zg1struck; delta #1)
- 15 • **001.L3:** was a[s/t] a [C]ounsello[r] at Lawe of [C]ounsell, togethere w[i]th [?] Recorder
16 of London — b3 · interline attachments contested between passes — text identical,
17 attachment to TNA (delta #11)
- 18 • **001.L4:** Mountague [?] two others [C]ounsello[r]s at — b3
- 19 • **001.L5:** Lawe w[i]th, a Bill lattely exhibited into his ma[jes]t[ies] hono[rable]
20 — b3
- 21 • **001.L6:** Courte of S[ta]rre chamber by Rees ap — b3 · Chancery/Star
22 Chamber flag resolved to Starre chamber (delta #1)
- 23 • **001.L7:** Jevan Ll[o]ud againste m^r [?] Barker es[q?] — b3–b4 · horizontal
24 stroke through "Ll[o]ud" — crossbar vs strike vs underline unresolved; bears on the
25 Floyd/Lloyd name-form (delta #14) · struck token before Barker
- 26 • **001.L8–L9:** for & [c]on[c]er[n]inge [such misdemeanours?] as a[re]
27 [me]nt[i]oned in the [s[ai]d?] Bill — b4 ·  zone; follows a large left-
28 sweeping paragraph

29 **Modernized (editorial aid — never quotable):** To the 3rd interrogatory: he was of
30 counsel — as a counsellor at law, together with [Serjeant] Montague, the Recorder of
31 London, and two other counsellors at law — with the bill lately exhibited into his
32 majesty's honourable Court of Star Chamber by Rees ap Jevan Lloyd against Mr Barker,
33 esquire, and others, for and concerning such misdemeanours as are mentioned in the said
34 bill.

35 **ANSWER TO THE 4th INTERROGATORY — L10–L32 · tiles b4–b8**

- 36 • **001.L10:** To the 4 Interr[ogatorie] this exam[inan]t saieth that
37 Re[es] [ap?] — b4
- 38 • **001.L11:** Jevan [Ll/Fl]oud came vnto [him/this ex[aminan]t?] [?]
39 bring[in]g[e] [?] — b4 · "bringing" now eyes-read, was supplied (delta #2)

- 1 • **001.L12:** w[i]th him a greate Rolle of p[ar]chm[en]t[?] [?] [con]te[y]ninge
2 — b4 · "parchment" = letterform lead over the baseline's "[writings?]" (delta #3,
3 TNA)
- 4 • **001.L13:** the substaunce of divers ff[oule?] [?] m[i]sdemen[o]rs — b4—
5 b5 · the interline itself unread (delta #4, TNA)
- 6 • **001.L14:** againste the s[ai]d m^r Barker , [the effe?]cte[?] wher[e]of
7 — b5 · partial read, was supplied (delta #5)
- 8 • **001.L15:** were afterward[es] compri[s]ed in the s[ai]d[/ame?] bill —
9 b5 · said/same variant (delta #16, minor)
- 10 • **001.L16:** [?]ote omitted[?] & [?] [at?] w[hi]ch tyme[?] the said — b5 ·
11  zone assignment provisional (delta #16, TNA)
- 12 • **001.L17:** Jevan Ll[o]ud [sai]d[?] [vn]to this ex[aminan]t that he came
13 from — b5
- 14 • **001.L18:** his [C]ounsell &[?] that he had a purpose to have — b5 · 
15 "Councell" leads "Countrey" — tall double-l terminal, no y-descender (zoom
16 zglcountrey2 + delta #8); Lloyd arrived having ALREADY consulted counsel;
17 TOP TNA
- 18 • **001.L19:** a bill drawne a[cc]ordinge[?] to [tho]se instruc[i]ons — b5
- 19 • **001.L20:** & to retaine two oth[er] [C]ounsello[u]rs besides — b6
- 20 • **001.L21:** those w[i]th who[m]e he had ben , whereupon — b6
- 21 • **001.L22:** this [dep[onen]t?/ex[aminan]t?] [p[er]us?]ed[?] [&?] read
22 over the instruc[i]ons[?] — b6 · gap candidates (delta #6, TNA)
- 23 • **001.L23:** conteyned in the s[ai]d pap[er]s , & then told the — b6
- 24 • **001.L24:** [s[ai]d?/to?] Jevan Ll[o]ud ^{to this exami[nan]t} [re?]p[?]ied[?] that
25 it did not appeare — b6–b7
- 26 • **001.L25:** thereby ^{that} he was a p[ar]tie [g]r[i]eved & that — b6–b7 · the
27 "not a party grieved" warning — the standing objection at the origin, verbatim with
28 caret
- 29 • **001.L26:** the substaunce [of?] [the?] [c]ontent[es?] of the bill to
30 be drawne — b7
- 31 • **001.L27:** for these matters would be especiallie — b7 · ladder-resolved:
32 the zglwill zoom read the adverb clean (✓, flag lifted); the losing band-level
33 alternates are [e]spe[ci]?/[sev[er]?]allie (4D view). Disclosure: the
34 resolving zoom is regen-class — its tiles-as-read were lost to scratchpad cleanup
35 (§15.2); the graded regeneration is in crops/stac_regen/
- 36 • **001.L28:** in th[e?] [?]e[?]t nature of a [C]onspiracie , &
37 ther[e]fore — b7 · the "nature of a conspiracie" warning, verbatim; short token
38 before "nature" — candidates ver[i]e / [dir]ect (delta #7, TNA)

- 1 • **001.L29:** th[i]s [ex[aminan]t?] ~~{?}~~ willed ~~eh{?} {?}e{?}a{?}~~ [?] Mr[?]
2 Mountague[?] to be of his — b7–b8 · double revision stack (strike + struck
3 interline); letterforms read the advice as TO RETAIN MONTAGUE, chaining into
4 002L (delta #9, TOP TNA)
- 5 • **001.L30:** [C]oun[s]ell[?] [?]me [?] the [?]eul[?]ey[?] [s]ome o[?] [?]
6 [C]o[?]ell — b8 ·  name-class token — candidate [B]ulk1[e]y[?], would
7 be Bulkeley's first entry on 001 (delta #12, TOP TNA); NOT firmed
- 8 • **001.L31:** & w[i]th, whome this ex[aminan]t [?] might conferre — b8
- 9 • **001.L32:** for the drawinge vp of the [s[ai]d?] Bill — b8 · leaf foot; low-
10 weight variant "fram[in]ge" noted (delta #15); the narrative continues on membrane
11 002L

Modernized (editorial aid — never quotable): To the 4th interrogatory: Rees ap Jevan Lloyd came to him bringing a great roll of [parchment] containing the substance of divers [foul] misdemeanours against the said Mr Barker, the effect whereof was afterwards comprised in the said bill. At which time Jevan Lloyd told this examinant that he came from his [counsel — leading reading], and that he had a purpose to have a bill drawn according to those instructions, and to retain two other counsellors besides those with whom he had been. Whereupon this examinant read over the instructions contained in the said papers, and then told the said Jevan Lloyd [or, per the L24 interline: replied to this examinant] that it did not appear thereby that he was a party grieved, and that the substance of the bill to be drawn on those matters would be especially in the nature of a conspiracy; and therefore this examinant advised [him — per the leading reading, to retain Mr Montague as his counsel], with whom this examinant might confer for the drawing up of the said bill.

REVISION STRATUM AND PHYSICAL RECORD

Census: 8-line Latin caption + 32 deposition lines (+ the right-half-only formula line L1b). Interlineations: a[s/t] a Counsellor at Lawe (L3) · [?] Recorder of London (L3/L4) · his ma[jes]t[ies] hono: (L5) · [con]te[y]ninge (L12) · [?] (L13) · to this exami[nan]t (L24) · that caret (L25) · ~~eh{?} {?}e{?}a{?}~~ struck interline (L29). Strikes: ~~{E?}dward{?}~~ (L2) · before Barker (L7) · at L12 · the L29 stack · the stroke through Ll[o]ud (L7, classification open). Census agrees across both half-column sweeps and with the baseline — **no line lost or gained; membrane 001's text is COMPLETE.**

Physical: ragged torn top edge with repair patch (upper-left); circled graphite "2" = modern foliation (left margin, b3); wax/repair residue at extreme left edge (b4); torn notch + repair tab at the foot (b8). The leaf's verso carries docket-class writing (Phase 4C ink screen) — a TNA dorse-imaging order stands; this transcript is the recto only.

OPEN ITEMS ON THIS MEMBRANE

1. **OPEN — the caption day-number (c1):** this leaf reads {vij, xj}; the 003R margin reads x[v?]j Junij — one minim decides whether the two examinations were same-dated. Ledger B6; TOP TNA.

2. **LEAN — L18 "his [C]ounsel" over "Countrey"**: clear double-l terminal, no y-descender, corroborated by the following clause ("to retaine two other Councillors besides those w[i]th whome he had ben"); the Marches-Council and Welsh-idiom readings retire. Professional confirm.
3. **OPEN — L29 the willed-clause**: letterforms read the advice as retain-Montague, chaining into 002L's opening; the double revision stack (strike + struck interline) is unresolved. TOP TNA.
4. **OPEN — L30 the foot name token**: candidate [B]ulkl[e]y[?] — would be Bulkeley's first entry on this leaf; not firmed. TOP TNA.
5. **OPEN — L7 the Lloud stroke**: crossbar vs strike vs underline; the same phenomenon class as the baseline's ~~Fleue~~; bears on the Floyd/Lloyd anglicization the print caption made canonical. TNA.
6. **CONFLICT — interline attachments (L3–L5)**: two insertions attach differently between the 07-02 and 4D views; no word differs. TNA.
7. **VARIANT — low weight**: L15 s[ai]d/[sam?]e; L16 zone assignment; L32 drawinge/fram[in]ge. TNA sweep-up.

CROSS-REFERENCES

Line-grain authority: `_WORKING_001_LINE_INDEX.md` (census, band blocks, 18-item delta log). Baseline text: `_WORKING_TOWNELEY_DEPOSITION_001-003L.md` (001 section, fold-in complete). Uncertainty ledger / TNA commission brief: `_PRECISION_PASS_LEDGER.md`. Reader companion: `READING_COMPANION_STAC_8_203_38.md` (001 section). Reviewer package: `README_FOR_REVIEWERS.md`. Method: `../TRANSCRIPTION_AND_ANALYSIS_METHODOLOGY.md` (v1.3).

[FOOTNOTE: Canonical tiles cut 2026-07-09 with `../_crop_stac_v3.py` from the fixity-pinned master (sha256 ee090a2477bd...); manifest crops/canon/_manifest.jsonl; tile hashes appended to crops/_FIXITY_SHA256_CROPS.txt (corpus-wide, append-only; 1658 entries verify as of 2026-07-09 — re-verify live from inside crops/). The canon series is a citation layer: deterministic, re-derivable, uniform — the tiles-as-read for each verdict are the working series cited in the line index and ledger.]