
CANONICAL TRANSCRIPT — MEMBRANE 002 (TNA STAC 8/203/38)

Canonical transcript (edition layer: diplomatic determination + modernized aid; the working files remain the audit stratum)

Corpus	01_Transcripts
Source	TRANSCRIPT_M002.md
Integrity	sha256 d129618c42b1 · rendered 2026-08-26
Status	<i>Derived render for review. The markdown source file governs; the modernized layer is never quotable; all readings are provisional pending the commissioned professional transcription (names above all). Canonical apparatus: _PRECISION_PASS_LEDGER.md; method: TRANSCRIPTION_AND_ANALYSIS_METHODOLOGY.md.</i>

HOW TO READ THIS RENDER (CONVENTIONS LEGEND)

strikethrough	struck in the manuscript (source: <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 ✕ ★	sigla printed verbatim per methodology \$6/\$9

CONTENTS

STATEMENT OF EDITORIAL METHOD.....	3
LEFT PAGE — THE RETAINER AND THE BULKELEY KINDRED WARNING — L1-L10 · tiles L·b1-b3.....	4
LEFT PAGE — THE TRUTH-VETTING PLAN — L11-L26 · tiles L·b3-b5.....	4
LEFT PAGE — BULKELEY'S AFFIRMATION AND THE EXAMINER'S MARGINAL NOTE — L27-L38 + m1-m4 · tiles L·b6-b8.....	5

RIGHT PAGE — "EXAMINABLE IN THE STARRECHAMBER" AND THE PARLIAMENT-HOUSE PLAN — R1-R11 · tiles R·b1-b3.....	6
RIGHT PAGE — THE BILL DRAWN, PERUSED, DELIVERED — R12-R21 · tiles R·b3-b4.....	7
RIGHT PAGE — THREE WEEKS, THE ONE-THIRD CUT, THE SUBSCRIPTION — R22-R38 · tiles R·b5-b8.....	8
REVISION STRATUM AND PHYSICAL RECORD.....	9
OPEN ITEMS ON THIS MEMBRANE.....	9
CROSS-REFERENCES.....	10

Corpus	TNA STAC 8/203/38 (record copy RC8368179) — catalogued <i>Lloyde v. Lewys</i> , Anglesey, June 1607; the surviving Star Chamber file behind <i>Floyd v. Barker</i> , 77 Eng. Rep. 1305 (1607)
Membrane	002 of 010 — deposition of John Towneley, continued (double opening, two pages): the Montague retainer, the Bulkeley truth-vetting, "examinable in the Starrechamber," the drawing, three-week review, one-third cut, and subscription of the bill
Master image	8368179_STAC_8_203_38_002.jpg · 5013×4110 px · sha256 3e81992d0e6e50c135bc4940aa101e6c15904b645e40304565fdfb05e6d402aa (verify: shasum -a 256 -c _FIXITY_SHA256_SOURCES.txt)
Canonical tiles	crops/canon/crop_canon_m002_{La,Lb,Ra,Rb}_b1..b8, nat + eB (64 tiles) · manifest crops/canon/_manifest.jsonl · coverage proven full height, no gaps (../_coverage_check.py)
As-read record	crops/stac_p4d/crop_p4d002{La,Lb,Ra,Rb}_b1..b8[_eB] + the 2026-07-02 re-sweep bands — see _WORKING_002_LINE_INDEX.md; the canon series is a deterministic re-derivation 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 · Phase 4D-2 line index + eB checks 2026-07-08 · this transcript assembled 2026-07-09 (assembly only — no new readings)
Rights	transcription text publishable under the Open Government Licence v3.0 — attribution "Contains public sector information licensed under the Open Government Licence v3.0" · cite: The National Archives, ref. STAC 8/203/38 (record copy RC8368179) · membrane images NOT reproduced in this edition (TNA Image Library licence = separate application, pending) · quotation discipline per QUOTATION_CONCORDANCE.md unchanged
Status	professional return RECEIVED + CONFORMED (2026-08-06/07, CORRECTIONS_LOG #31-#32); letter-exact sites carry in-line <i>VERDICT</i> 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) This is the reader-facing edition of membrane 002, assembled from the corpus's adjudicated layers — the Phase 4D-2 line index (`_WORKING_002_LINE_INDEX.md`, whose stitched composites are the line-grain authority), the baseline deposition transcription (`_WORKING_TOWNELEY_DEPOSITION_001-003L.md`), and the ledger — with every 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 escalation ladder with the losing layer's reading cited in the note; regen-class resolutions are disclosed. This membrane carries an unusually live contested stratum (the Edward/Henry forename events and the instruments/instrucions crux): contested entries below carry their  flags in the text, and the Open Items section is the arbitration list.

(b) Conventions per methodology §6 (the renderer's legend page reprints them): [?] uncertain · [...]/[] supplied/illegible · ^{word} scribal interlineation · struck text is struck in the manuscript · «or» in-line insertion · [■■■] an obliterated strike of estimated extent ·  lean/contested · ✓ eB survives enhancement. Scribal spelling preserved exactly. Declared aid-layer exception: the complainant's surname is normalized to **Lloyd** in the Modernized layer (the leaf spells Lloud/Lloude/Lloyd; each site's form is preserved in the

diplomatic layer), and Serjeant Montague's forename is rendered **Henry** in the aid layer per the scribe's own repeated corrections (the correction stratum itself is the diplomatic record below).

(c) Labels are membrane.line: 002.L7 = left page line 7; 002.R28 = right page line 28; 002.m1–m4 = the examiner's four-line marginal note. Joint/range entries are the addressable unit. Tile references: this is a double opening, so each page has a line-starts strip and a line-ends strip — **L·b2** means crops/canon/crop_canon_m002_La_b2.jpg (starts) || crop_canon_m002_Lb_b2.jpg (ends); **R·b5** means ...Ra_b5 || ...Rb_b5 (add _eB for the enhanced render). A line's full width is the pair read together; the manifest row of any tile gives its exact source rectangle on the checksummed master.

(d) Authorization: quoting authorized on the author's authority with disclosure (2026-07-03); diplomatic layer only;  readings only with flags;   readings described, never quoted as readings. Names with a letter-exact verdict from the commissioned professional transcription (returned in full 2026-08-06; CORRECTIONS_LOG #31–#32) are conformed; the rest remain provisional (§1.7).

LEFT PAGE — THE RETAINER AND THE BULKELEY KINDRED WARNING — L1–L10 • TILES L·B1–B3

- 002.L1] And so thereuppon the saied Jevan Lloud *L·b1 · large clean Ll-crossbar form (the Lloud/Floud phenomenon, cf. 001 open item 5)*
- 002.L2] retayned the s[ai]d [?] Edw: Mountague [to?] *L·b1 ·  FIRST MENTION: "Edw:" apparently UNSTRUCK — a long horizontal stroke crosses the zone at mid-letter height; three candidate readings (unstruck + flourish / struck without replacement / struck first attempt rewritten); TOP TNA (Open Items 1)*
- 002.L3] be of his [C]ounsell , *L·b1*
- 002.L4] And also at the same [tyme] this ex[aminan]t told [the?/him?] *L·b2*
- 002.L5] the s[ai]d Jevan Lloude that the matters *L·b2*
- 002.L6] menc[i]oned in the s[ai]d instru[me?]nts[?] did [c]on[cerne] *L·b2 · instruments/instrucons crux site 1 of 8, -nts lean (Open Items 6; never silently resolved)*
- 002.L7] [?] ^{some} of S^r Richard Bulkleies [k]in[re]d[e?] *L·b2 · interline over strike; round ink blot with tail in the left margin at this level*
- 002.L8] ~~ffra~~[?] [?] by reason thereof the sa[id/me] *L·b2 · struck head-token (baseline candidate "ffrends?"); left-margin insertion mark (N/caret-form)*
- 002.L9] more [c]on[c]erned[?] the s[ai]d S^r Rich: Bulklei[es?] *L·b2*
- 002.L10] then him the s[ai]d Jevan Lloud , & that *L·b2–b3*

Modernized (editorial aid — never quotable): And so thereupon the said Jevan Lloyd retained Serjeant [Henry] Montague to be of his counsel. And at the same time this examinant told Lloyd that the matters mentioned in the instructions concerned some of Sir Richard Bulkeley's kindred, and by reason thereof concerned Sir Richard Bulkeley more than Lloyd himself.

LEFT PAGE — THE TRUTH-VETTING PLAN — L11–L26 • TILES L·B3–B5

- 002.L11] th[is?] ex[aminan]t[?] hauinge[?] occasion to repayre v[nto?] *L·b3*
- 002.L12] the s[ai]d S^r Rich[ard] about Law[e] bu[si]nes[?] *L·b3*

- 002.L13] w[i]th th[is?] [ex^{tz}] had to deale in ffor[?] [the?] L·b3
- 002.L14] S^r Rich[ard] woulde then conferre w[i]th h[im?] L·b3
- 002.L15] [the?] s[ai]d S^r Rich[ard] about the s[ai]d instrum[?] L·b3–b4 · crux site 2 (m-form before the cut)
- 002.L16] to know of him whether he could wo[uld?]/[a]vo[we?] L·b4
- 002.L17] iustifie the matters of the s[ai]d instrum[ents?] L·b4 · crux site 3
- 002.L18] to be true , And that then i[f?] th[is] ex[aminan]t [?] L·b4
- 002.L19] the s[ai]d S^r[?] Rich[ard] to affirme these[?] ma[tters] L·b4
- 002.L20] that then th[is] ex[aminan]t would con[fesse?/ferre?] [?] L·b4
- 002.L21] the s[ai]d E[~~dw~~]^{[?] Mountagues «/» touching[?] [?] L·b4–b5 · correction event: eB confirms "Edw:" as the STRUCK token (2–3 strokes); the baseline had read "Ew:" as the interline — arbitration (Open Items 2)}
- 002.L22] the[?] drawinge[?] «?» of the course of the L·b5 · struck in-line insertion
- 002.L23] Starrechamber ffor the parliam[en]t[?] [busines?] L·b5 · part of the struck Star-Chamber clause (the scribe's restructured drafting-advice sentence)
- 002.L24] [?] drawinge[?] [vp?] of a Bill vppon L·b5 · stroke under "Bill" — underline vs strike 
- 002.L25] instru[ci?]ons or [w]ordes to the same effecte L·b5 · crux site 4, -cions lean at this site
- 002.L26] whereof the s[ai]d Jevan Lloude the[n/y?] lik[ed?] L·b5 · large decorative flourish off "whereof" (not an insertion)

Modernized (editorial aid — never quotable): This examinant, having occasion to repair unto Sir Richard about law business he had to deal in, would then confer with Sir Richard about the said instructions, to know of him whether he could and would justify the matters of the instructions to be true; and if this examinant found Sir Richard to affirm those matters, then this examinant would confer with Serjeant Montague touching the drawing up of a bill upon the instructions, or words to the same effect — whereof the said Jevan Lloyd liked well.

LEFT PAGE — BULKELEY'S AFFIRMATION AND THE EXAMINER'S MARGINAL NOTE — L27–L38 + m1 –m4 · TILES L·B6–B8

- 002.L27] well , And saith that afterwards th[is/e] L·b6
- 002.L28] ex[aminan]t repa[yri]nge[?] [?] to the s[ai]d S^r Rich[ard] Bul[keley?] L·b6 · small strike
- 002.L29] about [h]is[?] other cau[s]es ^{on/ou a[?]h[?]} [h]ad[?] , conference L·b6 · floating interline — P4D reads «or a[?]», baseline read ^{on a day}; contested (Open Items 3)
- 002.L30] w[i]th him about the s[ai]d instru[?]ons L·b6 · crux site 5, -ts lean at eB ("-ts w[hi]ch")
- 002.L31] then affirmed to th[is?] ex[aminan]t[?] the same [to be?] L·b6
- 002.L32] be true in the materiall points thereof L·b7 · clean — echoes the marginal note
- 002.L33] And afterwards th[is] ex[aminan]t re[s]orted[?] to the L·b7 · re[s]orted/re[paired?] 
- 002.L34] the s[ai]d ^{henrie} E[~~dward~~][?] Mountague (he being L·b7 · correction event with the leaf's first EXPLICIT CARET below the baseline (✓eB)

- 002.L35] before retayned [by] the s[ai]d Jevan Lloude L-b7 · eB supports "reteyned/retayned" over "rehearsed"
- 002.L36] to be of his [C]ounsell) & did conferre w[i]th [him?] L-b7-b8
- 002.L37] the s[ai]d [?] ^{henrie} Edward[e?] [Mountague? △] about the same instrum[?]ons L-b8 · correction event ✓eB; crux site 6
- 002.L38] the[y?] then affirmed that i[f?] the same wer[e?] L-b8 · the sentence continues onto the right page; page-turn junction ✓eB ("he then affirmed" → R1-R2)
- 002.m1] [?]' p[?] 2[7/8]· affirmed i[t?] L-b7 margin · △△ contested: P4D reads a cross-reference-like "E[x?] p 2[7?];"; baseline read "S[ir] R[ichard?] [B.?] — changes WHO/WHAT the note references; TOP TNA (Open Items 4)
- 002.m2] [?] slaunderous in [?] of L-b7 margin · △△ contested: "[s]launderous"/"[sub]stance" (P4D) vs "[in]strucions in [some?]" (baseline); the companion also records a STRUCK QUANTIFIER in this zone ("in [~~some?~~] of") — load-bearing either way; TOP TNA
- 002.m3] the m[ateri]all points L-b7 margin · SECURE
- 002.m4] to bee true· L-b7 margin · SECURE

Modernized (editorial aid — never quotable): ...and saith that afterwards this examinant, repairing to Sir Richard Bulkeley about his other causes, had conference with him about the instructions — who then affirmed to this examinant the same to be true in the material points thereof. (An examiner's or clerk's hand flags exactly this admission in the margin: "...affirmed [it] ... the material points to be true," the note's opening words and quantifier being contested readings.) And afterwards this examinant resorted to Serjeant [Henry] Montague — he being before retained by Lloyd to be of his counsel — and conferred with him about the same instructions, who then affirmed that if the same were true... (completing on the right page).

RIGHT PAGE — "EXAMINABLE IN THE STARRECHAMBER" AND THE PARLIAMENT-HOUSE PLAN — R1-R11 · TILES R-B1-B3

- 002.R1] [t?]yme[?] , that then the same matters were examinab[le] R-b1 · head token contested: "[t?]yme[?]" (P4D) vs "[were] true" (baseline) — Open Items 5; torn top corner above
- 002.R2] in the Starrechamber , And thereuppon the [s[ai]d?] R-b1 · engrossed S
- 002.R3] [the?] s[ai]d Edwad[?] that if it pleased him th[at?] [?] R-b1 · △△ the right page's FIRST MENTION mirror of L2: "Edwad" apparently unstruck at nat; heavy tangle above in eB, unresolved — baseline's struck-plus-^{henrie} reading left OPEN, not overturned; TOP TNA (Open Items 1)
- 002.R4] the ^{henrie} ~~■■■■~~ [Mountague?] [tha]t the[y?] might at his next [?] R-b1-b2 · correction event R-1 (interline over heavily obliterated strike)
- 002.R5] m[ee?]t[i]nge[?] w[i]th the [?] [S^r] Richard Bulkley R-b1-b2 · small strike
- 002.R6] ^{at the} [?] at the parliament howse , [to?] conferre w[i]th him R-b2 · △ interline stack — two close baselines + left-margin caret; assignment unresolved
- 002.R7] touch[inge?] [?] the truthe of th[e]se[?] instru[?]ons th[at?] R-b2 · crux site 7 (△△ minim forms)
- 002.R8] so re[cea?]ued from him such satisfacc[i]on [as?] R-b2

- 002.R9] [the?] sa[i]d th[i]s depo[ne]nt[?] [?] done , whereby the *R·b2 · «deponent» form appears beside the ex^t forms*
- 002.R10] [s[ai]d?] ^{[h]enrie} ~~[-■-]~~ Mountague then determ[in]ed *R·b2-b3 · correction event R-2 · "determ[in]ed" (P4D) vs baseline "seemed [to be fully satisfied]" — possibly BOTH in successive clauses; contested (Open Items 5)*
- 002.R11] [?] ^{by th[i]s Exam[ina]t[?]} [?] tyme the [?] *R·b3 ·   the agent interline — resolves the baseline's open drawn-by target ("the Bill was drawne ^{by this ex[aminan]t [t [s/or?] his [man?]] up in pap[er]"), anchor word still }*

Modernized (editorial aid — never quotable): ...that if the same were true, then the same matters were examinable in the Star Chamber. And thereupon this examinant replied that, if it pleased him, Serjeant [Henry Montague] might at his next meeting with Sir Richard Bulkeley at the Parliament House confer with him touching the truth of those instructions, and so receive from him such satisfaction as this deponent had done — whereby Serjeant Montague then [determined / seemed fully satisfied; both readings live]. The bill was then drawn up in paper [by this examinant — the agent interline].

RIGHT PAGE — THE BILL DRAWN, PERUSED, DELIVERED — R12-R21 · TILES R·B3-B4

- 002.R12] th[at?] th[e] Bill was drawne vpp in paper *R·b3 · engrossed B; clean at Rb*
- 002.R13] & then [per?]used[?] by th[e/i]s ex[?]t[?] , & afterwarde *R·b3*
- 002.R14] the s[ai]d Jevan Lloude [re]ceaued[?]/[deliue?]red[?] the s[ai]d *R·b3 ·   verb dual*
- 002.R15] [B?]ille[?] vnto the ^{henri[e]} *R·b3 ·  seam zone*
- 002.R16] the s[ai]d Edward , w[?] [?] the ^{henrie} [?] [?]do (as *R·b3-b4 · correction event R-3 — the boldest strike on the leaf, single long stroke through engrossed "Edward"; comma follows the struck name; parenthesis opens*
- 002.R17] the s[ai]d , Lloud tol[d] [?]ued[?] havinge a [?] [?] *R·b4 · horizontal stroke above "told" — otiose? *
- 002.R18] that he[?] des[ired?] [him?] to come to [?] told th[i]s ex[?]t) [&?] requested [him?] ^{henrie} ~~[-■-]~~ *R·b4 · parenthesis closes (the hearsay marker "as the said Lloud told this examinant"); correction event R-5 at the margin edge — possibly doubled (one event rewritten into the margin, or two adjacent events);  TNA*
- 002.R19] who[?] [the?]y [instru?]m[en]ts[?] vnto [him?] [?]ed to him the s[ai]d [?] *R·b4 ·   crux site 8 (minim forms); seam-risk zone*
- 002.R20] And in th[i]s [?] vnto him th[e?] [?] the s[ai]d [?] *R·b4 ·  seam-risk zone*
- 002.R21] And in th[i]s [ex[aminan]ts?] presence [r]ead over most [of the s[ai]d Bill?] *R·b4-b5 · "presence read over most" clean ✓eB*

Modernized (editorial aid — never quotable): The bill was drawn up in paper and perused by this examinant, and afterwards the said Jevan Lloyd [received/delivered] the bill unto Serjeant [Henry] Montague — who (as the said Lloyd told this examinant — the deponent marks this link as hearsay) requested this examinant to come to him, and in this examinant's presence read over most of the said bill.

RIGHT PAGE — THREE WEEKS, THE ONE-THIRD CUT, THE SUBSCRIPTION — R22-R38 • TILES R·B5-B8

- 002.R22] & then also the s[ai]d [Serjeant?]? willed that the s[ai]d ~~Bill~~ migh[t] R·b5 · the FIRST willed-clause; struck token Bill/Sute — eB leans Bill
- 002.R23] be lefte w[i]th him [further?] to [per?]u[s]e , w[hi]ch R·b5
- 002.R24] was [accordinglie?] lefte w[i]th him b[y?] the R·b5 · ✓eB
- 002.R25] space of ^{aboute} three [w]eeke together , And R·b5-b6 · ✓eB; interline "aboute" with caret below
- 002.R26] [afterwards?] the ^{henrie} ~~E[dward]~~ [Mountague?] willed that R·b5-b6 · the SECOND willed-clause (correction event R-4); line order corrected by the Rb-b5/b6 overlap — follows R25, not R21 (two willed-clauses, exactly as the baseline recorded)
- 002.R27] the s[ai]d bill ^{brought by the s[ai]d Lloyd[e?]} [to bee ingrossed?] R·b6 · small-script interline insertion ✓; the engrossment phrase is the baseline's reading, not independently re-read (Open Items 7)
- 002.R28] [the?] s[ai]d [Ll?]oyd [v?]nto ~~E-■■■■~~ he mi[s]liked ^{[sett?][downe?]} R·b6 · correction event R-6: long heavy strike through a name-form; eB vowel-check leans "misliked" over "mistaken" — what Montague disliked he had put out; NEW vs baseline
- 002.R29] w[i]th the [h]and[?] of the ^{henrye[?]} [?] his R·b6 ·  seam-risk zone
- 002.R30] owne [h?]and And the [w]hereof , & then [?] R·b6-b7 ·  — "with his own hand did put out" (baseline) zone
- 002.R31] [?] or [?] the [?] [s/p]ett owt , & the[?] [about?] R·b7 · "[s/p]ett owt" (P4D, initial cut at strip edge) vs "putt owt" (baseline); ✓eB on "...ett owt , &"
- 002.R32] [?] of the s[ai]d puttinge owt of a th[ir]d[e?] R·b7 · ✓eB clean — the one-third cut; small mark below (caret? )
- 002.R33] the s[ai]d Bill , and afterwarde[s] R·b7 · ✓eB
- 002.R34] was newlie [?] cop[i]ed [&?] [brought to?] the ~~E-■~~ Mountague R·b7 · correction event R-7 (bold blot-strike before Mountague) ✓eB — the recopying after revision
- 002.R35] who then ^{again} after he ^{had} r[e]ad over the same & the[y/n]  R·b7 · interlines "again" and "had" with visible carets ✓eB; "they" (P4D) vs "then" (baseline) contested
- 002.R36] ^{made} some question o[f?] the R·b7-b8 · caret under "made" ✓eB; baseline continues "question of the truth of the" — "the truth of" not independently re-read (Open Items 7)
- 002.R37] matters therein conteyned R·b7-b8 · ✓eB
- 002.R38] [did sett his?] [h]and to the s[ai]d Bill R·b8 · ✓eB — the subscription; the stroke through engrossed "Bill" is likely the B's bowl flourish
- 002.R38-foot] ...to the [?] Ju[l/n]ij + [?]ramo[?]t — R·b8 ·  NEW foot date + subscription fragments: "Junij" would cohere with 001's June dating clause, "Julij" would be a later date; the final fragment's candidates include "[iu?]ram[en]t[?]" (a Latin oath/subscription token); TNA (Open Items 8)

Modernized (editorial aid — never quotable): Serjeant [Henry] Montague willed that the bill be left with him further to peruse, which was accordingly left with him by the space of about three weeks together. And afterwards he willed the bill — [with amendments] brought by the said Lloyd — to be engrossed; what he disliked he, with his own hand, put out, and gave order for the putting out of about a third part of the said

bill. The bill was newly copied and brought to Montague, who then again, after he had read over the same, made some question of the [truth of the] matters therein contained — and set his hand to the said bill. (At the page foot: a date fragment reading June or July 1607, and a possible oath/subscription token — both scan-limited.)

REVISION STRATUM AND PHYSICAL RECORD

Census: Left page 38 text lines + the 4-line examiner's marginal note (at the L32–L36 level); right page ~38 text lines + foot date/subscription fragments; both feet torn. Interlineations (left): ^{some} (L7) · ^{the} (L8) · on a day / or a[?] △ (L29) · ^{henrie} (L34, explicit caret; L37). Interlineations (right): at the (R6) · ^{[h]enrie} (R10) · by th[i]s Exam[ina]t (R11 △) · ^{henri[e]} (R15) · ^{henrie} (R18, possibly doubled) · ^{s[ai]d} (R21) · ^{aboute} (R25) · ^{henrie} (R26) · brought by the s[ai]d Lloyd[e] (R27) · ^{[sett?][downe?]} (R28) · ^{again}, ^{had}, ^{made} (R35–R36, carets visible). **The Edward→Henry correction stratum: 9–11 events across the leaf** (L2 △△, L21, L34, L37; R-1...R-7), against the baseline's "≥4" — the fullest census yet of the scribe's systematic forename confusion, caught mid-line most times and apparently missed at both pages' FIRST mentions (L2 "Edw:", R3 "Edwad") △△.

Physical: wide double opening (bifolium spread), gutter x≈0.47–0.53; graphite foliation numeral top-right of the right page; round ink blot with tail in the left margin at L7; gutter fold-line (text does not cross); repair/tape fragment at the top gutter edge; white tape/repair strip crossing the gutter at the foot; parchment patch at the lower-left corner; both feet torn.

OPEN ITEMS ON THIS MEMBRANE

- 1. OPEN** — the two FIRST-MENTION forename sites (L2 "Edw:", R3 "Edwad"): apparently unstruck where every later mention is corrected to ^{henrie} — stroke/tangle ambiguity at both; △△ TOP TNA. The scribe's target (Serjeant HENRY Montague, Recorder of London 1603–16) is fixed by the correction stratum itself.
- 2. CONFLICT** — L21 strike-vs-interline: eB shows "Edw:" as the struck token; the baseline read "Ew:" as the interline over an unread strike. TNA.
- 3. CONFLICT** — L29 insertion: «or a[?]» (P4D) vs ^{on a day} (baseline). TNA.
- 4. OPEN** — the examiner's marginal note m1/m2: "E[x?] p 2[7?]: affirmed..." vs "S[ir] R[ichard] [B.?] affirmed..."; "[s]launderous/[sub]stance in [par?]te of" vs "[in]strucions in {some?} of" (with the struck quantifier) — the readings change who/what the note references and how much Bulkeley affirmed; m3–m4 SECURE. △△ TOP TNA.
- 5. CONFLICT** — three wording sites: R1 head ("tyme," vs "were true,"); R10 ("determ[in]ed" vs "seemed [fully satisfied]" — possibly both, in successive clauses); R35 ("they" vs "then"). TNA.
- 6. OPEN** — the instruments/instrucions crux, per-site (8 sites: L6, L15, L17, L25, L30, L37, R7, R19): the baseline normalizes to "instrucions" throughout; the P4D per-site letterform leans SPLIT (-nts at L6/L30, -cions at L25). Per methodology §1.5 the split IS the finding; never silently resolve. TNA.
- 7. VARIANT** — baseline readings not independently re-confirmed (not contradicted): "further to p[er]use" (partial), "to bee ingrossed w[i]th some [amendments]", "fully satisfied", "question of the truth of the matters". Strip gaps/line slope; TNA sweep-up.

8. **OPEN** — the foot fragments: the date "Ju[l/n]ij" △△ (June coheres with 001; July would be later) and "[?]ramo[?]t" △△ ("[iu?]ram[en]t[?]" candidate). TNA.

9. **LEAN** — R28 "he mi[s]liked": eB vowel favors misliked over mistaken; the struck name-form before it ({E■■■■■}) unread. Professional confirm.

CROSS-REFERENCES

Line-grain authority: _WORKING_002_LINE_INDEX.md (strip records, stitched composites, eB check results, 4-part delta log). Baseline text: _WORKING_TOWNELEY_DEPOSITION_001-003L.md (002L/002R sections, fold-in complete). Ledger: _PRECISION_PASS_LEDGER.md (esp. D3 drawn-by — resolved by R11's interline; D4 marginal note — m1/m2 contested here). Companion: READING_COMPANION_STAC_8_203_38.md (002 section + Phase-4 addendum). Method: ../TRANSCRIPTION_AND_ANALYSIS_METHODOLOGY.md (v1.3, §18.5).

Canonical tiles cut 2026-07-09 with ../_crop_stac_v3.py from the fixity-pinned master (sha256 3e81992d0e6e...); manifest crops/canon/_manifest.jsonl; hashes in crops/_FIXITY_SHA256_CROPS.txt. Coverage proven full height, no gaps. The canon series is the citation layer; the tiles-as-read for each verdict are the working series cited in the line index and ledger.