

PHASE 4C AUDIT — COMPLETENESS + FIDELITY CLOSURE, STAC 8/203/38 (2026-07-07)

Working document

Corpus	02_STAC_8_203_38
Source	_WORKING_P4C_AUDIT.md
Integrity	sha256 5cd471dbc308 · rendered 2026-07-09
Status	<i>Derived render for review. The markdown source file governs; the modernized layer is never quotable; all readings are provisional pending the commissioned professional transcription (names above all). Canonical apparatus: _PRECISION_PASS_LEDGER.md; method: TRANSCRIPTION_AND_ANALYSIS_METHODODOLOGY.md.</i>

HOW TO READ THIS RENDER (CONVENTIONS LEGEND)

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

CONTENTS

(v) ALL-MEMBRANES INK SCREEN — RESULTS (2026-07-07)	2
(v) EYES-ON VERDICTS	4
(i) 010 SEAM-STRIP VERIFICATION (G1/G2 AT X≈0.275 · G2/G3 AT X≈0.525 · G3/G4 AT X≈0.765)	6
(iv) 010 ROWS 13–16 SPOT PASS — COMPLETE (2026-07-08, Fable 5, first-hand)	10
★★ HEADLINE RESULTS	10
FLAG DISPOSITIONS (THE FOUR DEFERRED SEAM-C-B4 FLAGS)	10
SEAM-A/B-B4 REFINEMENT TOKENS — ALL ANCHOR (`P4CIV_G12R14_B1/B2` @~2×)	11
ROW-15 FEES-ANSWER RESOLUTIONS (`P4CIV_F8L/F8R/PLACEZZ/NAMEZ*` @2–3×)	11
(ii) STANDING-[?]-TOKEN RE-RENDERS — COMPLETE (2026-07-08, Fable 5, first-hand)	12

Scope (per _RESUME_TRANSCRIPTION_NOTES.md NEXT block, expanded after the 009 endorsement find): (i) 010 seam-strips $x \approx 0.27/0.52/0.755$ · (ii) eR/nat@2× re-renders of remaining [?] tokens · (iii) blank-zone verification · (iv) 010 rows 13–16 spot pass · (v) **full-extent foot/edge ink-screen + corner zooms on ALL TEN membranes**. Crops → repo crops/stac_p4c/ (user directive 2026-07-07: preserve all crops as we work). First-hand paleography only; no subagents.

(v) ALL-MEMBRANES INK SCREEN — RESULTS (2026-07-07)

Tool: _ink_screen_p4c.py (parchment-bbox detection → 16×16 cell grid → per-cell dark fractions in B/blue, M/min-channel, plus a P stamp-signature map for the blue screen's purple blind spot). Thresholds = the 4B recipe ($0.55 \times$ leaf median). A TRIAGE AID ONLY — every flag below gets eyes before any claim.

Screen-wide observations

- The scans have a dark backing board; raw frame stats are meaningless — all results below are within each leaf's parchment bbox.
- P-map (purple-stamp signature) fired NOWHERE on any leaf at the 0.5% threshold — purple/graphite remain screen-blind or sub-threshold; stamp zones rest on direct reads (04B caveat stands).
- **Every double leaf (001–006) shows the same bottom-right-corner gradient** (dark rising toward the corner as parchment coverage falls): candidate = handling soiling/curl common to the whole file; counter-candidate = endorsement-class writing. One representative zoom (002, strongest) decides.

Flag list (eyes-on queue)

#	leaf	zone (scan fractions)	signal	prior coverage	verdict
F1	007	bottom-right corner x 0.70–1.00 y 0.90–0.97 (r16 c11–c16, B up to 12.8% on parch 74–94%)	endorsement-class; 007 = final Lloyd leaf	foot imaged 07-02 (blank lower half noted) but corner never zoomed	pending
F2	007	right margin x 0.94–1.00 y 0.79–0.85 (B 0.63% parch 97%)	small isolated blot in the blank zone	imaged, unremarked	pending
F3	007	top-left x 0.04–0.22 y 0.04–0.21 (B>>G: 17.0% vs 1.3%)	RED material (B-dark/G-light) — foliation numeral? red chalk?	imaged; colour signature never noticed	pending

#	leaf	zone (scan fractions)	signal	prior coverage	verdict
F4	008	left edge x 0.00–0.06 y 0.44–0.50 (B 16.1% parch 79%)	dark feature in the x<0.05 strip never imaged by any pass (4A L bands started x 0.05)	UNIMAGED	pending
F5	009	left edge x 0.00–0.06 y 0.38–0.44 (B 21.7% parch 75%) + smaller y 0.56–0.62 (1.6%)	same class as F4 — unimaged x-strip; lacing holes? margin writing?	UNIMAGED	pending
F6	010	left edge x 0.00–0.06 y 0.48–0.83 (column: 4.3→29.8% dark, parch 70–95%)	substantial dark left-edge column on the ANSWER (filed folded — edge docket class)	first-sweep/grid started x 0.02; strip only part-covered	pending
F7	010	top-left x 0.185–0.25 y 0.015–0.07 (B 4.9% vs G 2.4%, parch 64%)	red-material signature (foliation class, cf. F3)	heading zone read, colour unremarked	pending
F8	010	foot cells x 0.06–0.31 & x 0.56–0.80 y 0.88–0.94 (1.5–4.2%)	foot-margin signals below the subscription row	row-16 grid cells covered it; spot-verify while doing (iv)	pending
F9	002	bottom-right corner x 0.70–0.97 y 0.90–0.96 (B 7–34%, parch 63–90%)	REPRESENTATIVE for the doubles' shared corner gradient (001 r16c13–15, 003 r16c11–15, 004 r16c11–13, 005 r16c10–12, 006 r16c12–15 all match)	feet imaged in sweeps; corners never zoomed	pending
F10	001	left margin x 0.06–0.12 y 0.55–0.67 (B 3.0–8.8% parch 90–95%)	margin marks beside lower text (examiner's marginalia class)	imaged in bands; margin never zoomed	pending
F11	008	foot x 0.42–0.54 y 0.92–0.98 (B 1.4–2.3% parch 92%)	foot-center signal at the torn edge (Art-13 stub fragments?)	4A b12 imaged it; re-verify against the 4A foot reading	pending

008/009 top-edge and 001–006 top-row signals = the known caption/heading tops (imaged, read); not queued. 009 bottom-right stained corner = read in 4B (blot, no letterforms); not re-queued. 009's endorsement zone itself sits in ragged (~) cells — the screen would NOT have listed it under the parch≥60% filter; noted as a screen limitation: **ragged-edge cells always need eyes regardless of stats** (they are exactly where edge dockets live).

(v) EYES-ON VERDICTS

(flushed per tile as read)

F1 — 007 bottom-right corner: STAIN/TEAR ONLY on the recto. Tile crop_p4c007cornBR_b1[_eR].jpg (x 0.62–1.00, y 0.74–1.00, 2×). The corner gradient = ragged torn foot edge with tide-line staining; no recto letterforms. The known verso show-through (faint mirrored strokes, greenish-gray) is plainly visible across the blank zone — consistent with writing on 007's BACK.

F2 — 007 right-edge fold: ★ REAL WRITING, CUT OFF BY THE FOLD. Tiles crop_p4c007_edgeR_cw.jpg (x 0.88–1.00, y 0.68–0.97, 3×, rotated CW) and crop_p4c007_edgeR_frag.jpg (fragment zoom). Three iron-gall LETTER-BOTTOMS protrude from under the fold crease at scan x≈0.95, y≈0.79–0.86: (1) a wedge with a descender tail; (2) a wide shallow arc (bowl-base of a large rounded letter); (3) a horizontal bar with a short descender crossing below. Letter bodies are hidden under the folded-over edge — docket/endorsement-class script size (spacing far wider than deposition text). NOT readable from this scan by physics (the leaf is folded), not by imaging quality. ⚠ **TNA-ORDER ITEM (upgraded from "possibly unscanned verso writing"):** request 007 verso / unfolded right-edge image — the leaf that closes the Lloyd deposition carries concealed edge-writing exactly where a filing endorsement would sit, matching the (now-imaged) 009 endorsement class. (A further pin-size mark higher on the fold, CW-tile upper right, unresolved — same hidden-face family.)

F3 — 007 top-left "red" feature: STAIN, retracted. Tile crop_p4c007cornTL_b1.jpg (x 0.02–0.30, y 0.02–0.24). The B-dark/G-light signature = yellow-brown tide-line staining on the ragged corner — exactly the spectral signature a brown stain gives (absorbs blue, passes green/red). No numeral, no chalk, no marks. The red-foliation hypothesis is retracted; the same explanation presumptively covers F7 (010 top-left, parch 64% — stain/ragged edge), to be spot-confirmed during the 010 pass.

F4 — 008 left edge (x<0.05, previously unimaged): NO TEXT; minor flecks, scan-limited. Tile crop_p4c008_edgeL_b1.jpg (x 0.00–0.08, y 0.40–0.54, 3×). Three-layer geometry: an ADJACENT MEMBRANE's blank edge intrudes at far left; then the dark backing gap (this shadow IS the screen's 16% — geometry, not ink); then 008's own left edge (greenish-mottled). On 008's edge: a vertical series of tiny marks — two curl-shaped traces ("6"/"C"-like, letterform- fragment class, sub-readable) near the top and several regularly spaced arrowhead flecks (contact-offset from the facing leaf, or lace-hole soiling). Nothing readable at native resolution; logged as a low-priority TNA glance item, NOT claimed as writing.

F5 — 009 left edge (x<0.05, previously unimaged): CLEAN — geometry only. Tile crop_p4c009_edgeL_b1.jpg (x 0.00–0.08, y 0.34–0.48, 3×). Same three-layer structure (adjacent leaf / backing gap / 009's edge) plus a pale lifted/torn edge sliver. The screen's 21.7% = the gap shadow. No ink, no marks. F4's flecks therefore do NOT repeat across leaves at the same height — lacing-pattern hypothesis dropped; F4 stays soiling/offset class.

F6 — 010 left-edge dark column: PHYSICAL CONDITION, NO WRITING. Tiles crop_p4c010_edgeL_b1.jpg + _b2.jpg (x 0.00–0.08, y 0.44–0.86, 2×). The column decomposes into: (a) a **STITCHED SEAM** — a regular line of sewing holes (thread-soiled) running down the left margin from $\approx y$ 0.50 to y 0.80 (edge repair or hem; condition note for the record); (b) a **diamond-shaped HOLE** through the parchment at scan $x \approx 0.054$ $y \approx 0.56$, dark backing visible through it; (c) the dark backing gap where the leaf edge tapers; (d) a **preserved INSECT** (crane-fly class, legs intact) adhered to the surface at $x \approx 0.065$ $y \approx 0.585$ — organic debris, not ink; (e) creases. Two pin-size flecks only; no letterforms anywhere on the strip. The Answer has no left-edge docket on the recto.

F9 — 002 bottom-right corner (representative for ALL doubles): TAIL TEXT + RAGGED EDGE, no docket. Tile crop_p4c002cornBR_b1.jpg (x 0.66–0.98, y 0.86–0.98, 2×). The corner cells contain the last lines of the known 002R text running down to the torn foot edge (line-end fragments legible and consistent with the recorded reading: "...the matters...", "...hand to h[im]...", "...the graunte..."). The screen's corner gradient = dark ragged edge + text approaching the corner. Verdict extrapolated to the identical gradient on 001/003/004/005/006 (all fully swept leaves): **no separate corner dockets on the doubles' rectos.**

F10 — 001 left margin: ★ VERSO WRITING CONFIRMED (sub-legible), recto clean. Tiles crop_p4c001_margL_b1.jpg (x 0.05–0.15, y 0.52–0.70, 3×; no recto ink — faint mirrored strokes only) and crop_p4c001_verso_mirror_eG.jpg (x 0.05–0.55, y 0.42–0.78, green-channel flat-field+CLAHE, MIRRORED so verso strokes read forward). In the mirrored render the margin show-through resolves into LARGE FLOURISHED LOOPS reading forward — big elliptical flourish + long curved strokes, docket/endorsement-class script, only the heaviest strokes penetrating. NO text recoverable (physics: we are reading through the parchment). **⚠ TNA-ORDER ITEM:** request the DORSE of 001 — the file's first/outer leaf; the show-through is exactly where a cover-docket for the file (or the Towneley deposition) would sit. — Note the pattern now established: 001 verso (cover-docket class), 007 verso + folded edge (letter-bottoms at the fold), 009 foot endorsement (read, 4B). The file's dorse faces were never scanned; every dorse signal found is on a deposition bundle's outer face.

F11 — 008 foot center: ✓ VERIFIED — the 4A reading stands (independent cross-check). Tile crop_p4c008_footC_b1.jpg (x 0.38–0.58, y 0.91–1.00, 3× — a CENTER strip crossing the 4A L/R stitch seam). The six faded lines match the 4A stitched text token for token: "vpon a peticon" (L81 — my first in-tile impression "person" corrected against the recorded reading), "the said suite vpon the" (L82), "the cause were de|creed" (L83 — the very word that spans the 4A stitch, continuous here), "you soe inten[ded]" (L84), faint L85/L86 traces. No writing beyond L86. **The foot text and the 4A stitching method are independently confirmed.**

F7 — 010 top-left: ★ FADED HEAD-MARGIN JOTTING (name-like), scan-limited. Tiles crop_p4c010cornTL_b1.jpg (x 0.16–0.30, y 0.005–0.08, 3×) and crop_p4c010_headjot_eM.jpg (eM render — mottle-amplified, WORSE than nat; the pilot lesson holds). In the top margin, left of the Answer's heading: a rubbed/faded jotting reading "[?]m[?] W[i]lle[?]"-class — name-like (candidates include a "W[i]ll[ia]m"-family token; NOT the foot counsel signature "Boyd/Boys?", which is a different hand and place), plus a more heavily rubbed cluster above it. CORRECTION (2026-07-08): this is the SAME feature the Phase-B pass logged as "g1_b1 superscript '[W]illm W[e/i]ll[?]' (filing note?)" — not a first sighting; this pass adds the precise locus (top margin, $x \approx 0.16$ – 0.24 , $y \approx 0.02$ – 0.05), the two-token structure, and the render verdict (nat@3× best; eM fails). Still nothing integrable — TNA item: the Answer's head margin may carry a

clerk's or counsel's name. The brown smudge zone right of the jotting = stain (the F3-class B>>G signature; that part of the hypothesis held).

(i) 010 SEAM-STRIP VERIFICATION (G1/G2 AT $x \approx 0.275 \cdot G2/G3$ AT $x \approx 0.525 \cdot G3/G4$ AT $x \approx 0.765$)

Grid columns overlapped by only 0.02 (≈ 147 px) — misjoin risk at every seam. Strips x 0.225–0.325 / 0.475–0.575 / 0.715–0.815, y 0.015–0.90, 4 bands each, $2 \times$ (crop_p4c010seam{A,B,C}_b1..4.jpg). Method: read every line's seam-crossing words, verify each against _WORKING_010_TRANSCRIPTION.md; zoom wide any token that fails to anchor.

Seam A (g1/g2) band 1 (rows 1–4): ✓ NO LOSSES. ~ 17 lines cross; 14 tokens anchor verbatim (incl. the LOAD-BEARING fear clause crossing this seam intact: "to stryke a [feare]...", "retorned or [impannelled]", "manifestacion of", "reasonable ch[a]rges", "then havinge", "def[endan]t John", "Countie of A[n]glesey"). Three initially unanchored tokens resolved by wide re-cuts (crop_p4c010seamA_L7_b1.jpg, _L13_b1.jpg):

- "of the said [k]yngs" → misparse of "**of the said Hughe**" — full line "...willfull murtheringe of the said Hughe ap Willia[m] [named?] in the said bill..." ✓ record.
- "recompen[c]ion" → the unlawful-combination formula line: "...unlawfull ... [combina/confedera]c[i]on s[ur]m[i]sed of..." — consistent with the recorded clause ("unlawful and manifest plot, practice, confederacy [or] combination ... [surmised...]"); adds support for "surmised of/in"; a possible tail "and other the [premisses?]" [?]-flagged (TNA-class, no integration).
- "and fforme s[?]b in" → the standard formula "**in such sorte, man[er] and fforme, as in and by the said bill of compl[ain]t** [is supposed]" — the very words the recorded quote elides before its "...is supposed. Howebeit..." opening ✓.
- NEW small delta candidate: "as doth [anie waye?] concerne him" (record has "as doth concerne him") — [?]-flagged.

Seam A band 2 (rows 4–8): ✓ NO LOSSES; the recorded strike CONFIRMED at the seam. ~ 22 lines cross; ~ 19 anchor directly ("office w[i]thout any", "menc[i]oned", "ma[jes]t[ie]s service", "Auguste last p[ast]", "substanciall gent...", "Challenge, and...", "declared. And this def[endan]t further saith that att or aboute..."). The Phase-B **strike-through zone at the g1–g2 seam is independently confirmed**: continuous bar over "~~Willia[m] ap [K/h]ellew~~"- class strokes, as recorded. Three flags resolved by wide re-cuts (crop_p4c010seamA_L1618_b1.jpg, _L12_b1.jpg):

- "Willia[m] B[r/i]g[?]son" → "**Willia[m] Brereton** and Richard Barker esquiers" — the RECORDED trial-bench pairing, now independently re-confirmed at $2 \times$ ("Anglesey before the said Willia[m] Brereton and Richard Barker esquiers in the said b[ill?]...").
- "[?]ant prooffe" → "**vpon good and pregraunt prooffe** (as this def[endan]t thinketh), by the said Exam[ined?]..." — row 7's recorded conviction clause re-confirmed (sing./plural "prooffe[s]" nuance stays as logged).
- "to be confedera[tet]" → line reads "...[through?]out the said Countie to be confederated together, or shall be [?]..." — a candidate ALLEGATION-RESTATEMENT clause in a zone the recorded quote elides (the denial "doth not knowe that they were confederated..." is a separate, recorded clause) — [?]-flagged, TNA-class.

- NEW small delta: row 6's "In or aboute [**October?**]" supplement reads "**In or aboute w[hi]ch tyme** a bill of Inditem[en]t was p[re]ferred" — the [October?] guess at THIS spot is likely phantom (October is securely named elsewhere in the Answer); [?]-flagged for the working file.

Seam A band 3 (rows 8–11): ✓ NO LOSSES + three deltas. ~23 lines cross; ~20 anchor ("open Courte on his...", "and behaved him self[e]", "[confede]racie or combynac[i]on", "found not guiltie", "...laboured..."-class). Wide re-cuts (crop_p4c010seamA_L5_b1.jpg, _L2122_b1.jpg) resolved:

- ★ "**conceaved**" — **FIRM DELTA**: "...as this def[endan]t **conceaved** to be most indifferent for his ma[jes]t[ie]s [service]..." — resolves the recorded row-8 "[adjudged?]" bracket (anchor words verbatim around it).
- ★ REFORM-PASSAGE gains: "...whose cominge into **these Countreys** div[er]se abuses enormyties and oppressions..." — "these Countreys" PLURAL is a [?]-candidate vs recorded "this Countrey" (plural = the circuit counties, not Anglesey alone; the next line itself uses singular "the whole Countrey," so both forms are scribal options — TNA arbitrates); and the clause tail RECOVERED: "...and **the whole Countrey much bettered and amended**. And as touch[inge]..." (digest had only "well reformed").
- "...hath caused the said Compl[ainan]t (as this def[endan]t think[eth])..." fragment consistent with the complainant-attack zone.

Seam A band 4 (rows 11–15): ✓ NO LOSSES. Custody/fees lines all anchor or read compatibly ("the house of the s[ai]d...", "did send to...", "remayninge", "the key/said Castell", "[esc]apes out of the said...", "Shiriffe..."). Small digest-refinement tokens for the rows-13–16 spot pass: "were **retorned** ov[er] to th[e] [new Shiriffe?]" (digest "turned over"), "by the **lawes & statut[es]**", "Shiriffe **or his deput[ies]**", "conven[y]ent tymes", "where (to his [great?] ch[arge?])..." parenthesis.

★ **SEAM A (g1/g2) VERDICT: verified end to end — NO WORDS LOST at the g1/g2 boundary in the grid read.** Gains: 1 firm bracket resolution (conceaved), 1 clause recovery (much bettered and amended), 5 [?]-candidates for the working file, multiple independent re-confirmations (fear clause, strike zone, Brereton+Barker, pregnant-proof clause).

Seam B (g2/g3) band 1 (rows 1–4): ✓ NO LOSSES + a CLAUSE RECOVERY. △ CONDITION: a long vertical TEAR runs down the seam zone (scan x≈0.49, y 0.015–0.11) — lines cross it; no text lost to it (the tear follows a blank inter-word channel in the upper faded zone). Anchors: the fear clause's right half ("[freehol]ders of the [s]a[id]...", "compl[ain]t named"), the appointment clause ("followinge or [dur]inge..."), "of exception to th[e]..." (supports the recorded "[exception]" bracket). Wide re-cuts (crop_p4c010seamB_L6_b1.jpg, _L1516_b1.jpg) yielded:

- ★ **GENERAL TRAVERSE — CORRECTION (2026-07-08): recorded in the Phase-B LEDGER** ("not guyltie of the said unlawfull and manifest plotte, practizes, confederacies, combinac[i]ons and misdemeano[u]rs ... nor of anie [?], [extor]c[i]on[?], sellinge of offices and other the offences ... as ... is supposed"), though absent from the working-file quotes. The seam views RE-CONFIRM it and contribute VARIANT tokens for the ledger's gaps: "...combinac[i]on **surmised o[f]** [?] and other the **offences abuses and misdemeanors in the said bill**... as in and by the said bill of compl[ain]t is supposed. Howebeit..." — [?]-flagged; TNA reconciles the two passes' token-level differences.
- "**p[er]suasion**" now the **LEAD** for the recorded "[instigac[i]on/ p[er]suasion?]" bracket: the token is short, no t-ascender/g-descender — "...contryved by the Compl[ainan]t by the p[er]suasion and direcc[i]on of the said Willia[m] Bulkeley..." ([?] retained, TNA).

- [?]-candidate: "of p[ur]pose not onelie to **vexe and trouble**" — no clear "greve" between the verbs in this view (recorded "[vexe?], [gre]ve and trouble"); faded zone, verbatim uncertainty, TNA.

Seam B band 2 (rows 4–8): ✓ NO LOSSES + three bracket gains. All ~22 lines anchor ("his ma[jes]t[ies] Commiss[ion]", "hatred or malice", "esquiers as gent...", "(to this def[endan]ts [knowledge])", "p[re]ferred agaynst...", "[Ju]ry to passe upon...", "by the said Justic[es]", "for the body of..."). Gains: recorded "[?]onded to be retorned" → "**menc[i]oned** to be [retorned]" (lead); "for the more certentie **thereof**" (extends the recorded fragment); a clean "**Examined Jury**" crossing the seam firms the recorded [Examined?] bracket.

Seam B band 3 (rows 8–12): ✓ NO LOSSES + ★★ TWO RECOVERIES + a NEW INTERLINE. Wide re-cuts crop_p4c010seamB_INTL_b1.jpg + crop_p4c010_LONDON_b1.jpg:

- ★ **THE LETTERS-TO-LONDON CLAUSE — CORRECTION (2026-07-08): NOT new.** The Phase-B LEDGER already records it ("did write his l[ett]res [un]to some spetiall frends of his [heere?/herd?] in London," "some meanes that he should not be Sher[iffe] for that tyme") — it is absent only from the working-file digest I first grepped. The seam view is an INDEPENDENT RE-CONFIRMATION that also **resolves the ledger's open bracket**: "[heere?/herd?]" reads "**here**"; and adds "**amongest others** did write" + the fuller frame "...[should be?] Highe Shreiffe of the said Countie for the yere then next followinge or otherwise, ffor this def[endan]t amongest others did write his l[ett]res to some spec[i]all frende ["frends" pl. per ledger — sing./pl. open] of his here in London to make some meanes that he should not be Shrieffe...". METHOD LESSON: grep BOTH the working file AND the ledger before claiming novelty.
- ★ **NEW INTERLINE on the Answer (second revision event on 010):** a small "at" rides the line "...about the tyme in the said bill [alleag?]ed ^{at}, or any other tyme..." — same clarifying-insertion class as the known £20 interline.
- ★ The second Barker denial now VERBATIM: "...[p]lott practise confederacie or combynac[i]on **betwene th[is] def[endan]t and the said M[r] Barker or any other** touchinge [the callinge in question]..." (record had the digest + the callinge-in-question fragment).
- Minor [?]-tokens: "[?]usted in his place", "by su[ch/re] meanes", "ffraudulent and infamous" (exact-wording candidate for the "devised and infamous bill" clause).

Seam B band 4 (rows 11–15): ✓ NO LOSSES. Custody/fees anchors ("desiringe him that...", "the said Castell", "[e]scape out of the s[aid]..."); [?]-tokens for the rows-13–16 pass: "for the better safetie and...", "driven to finde & m[?]", "charge of offic[ers?]", **SEAM B (g2/g3) VERDICT: NO WORDS LOST**; gains as above (traverse, letters-to-London, ^{at} interline, denial formula, menc[i]oned, p[er]suasion-lead).

Seam C (g3/g4) bands 1–3 (rows 1–11): ✓ NO LOSSES + ★★ THE BARKER-PRAISE CLAUSE RECOVERED IN FULL FORM. Bands 1–2 anchor throughout (demurrer, fear clause, appointment, jury-return, indictee list "Willm Prend[?]" / "Edward ap J[ohn]", "[Chief?] Justic[e] of the..." — no new light on the sing./plural parse). Micro-[?]: "tedious suite" (sing.), "therein vsed", "att barre to take". Band 3 + wide cut crop_p4c010seamC_JUD_b1.jpg (x 0.52–0.99, y 0.583–0.635):

- ★★ "...[the] def[endan]t furth[e]r saieth that in all the said JUDICIAL P[RO]CEEDINGE[S] in or upon the said Inditem[en]ts the said [M[r] Barker?]..." — the frame of the Barker-conduct clause recovered VERBATIM; the Answer's own phrase is "judiciall proceedinges" (alongside the recorded "callinge in question" term of art).
- ★★ The praise clause EXTENDED + its tail COMPLETED: "...[in] his place and w[i]th ^[suche?] **integritie and synceritie**, that (as this def[endan]t thinketh) non[e] that were the[n] [present?] ... to save their l[i]v[e]s

could fynd noe iust cause to mislike or fynde fault w[i]th his said [dealinge?]..." (recorded text had "...earnestlie labo[u]red to save their l[i]v[e]s" and stopped; the interline word "[suche?]" is [?]-flagged).

- FLAG CORRECTED: the "new interline" candidate at $y \approx 0.622$ is the RIGHT TAIL of the KNOWN £20 interline ("...to th[e] def[endan]ts knowledge^") crossing seam C — NOT a new revision event. Beneath it: "...and one that together w[i]th his elder brother [?] ben [indicted]..." ✓ co-indictment clause.
- The letters-to-London clause CROSS-CONFIRMED at this seam ("...[should n]ot be Shrieffe for..."), and the reform clause's "...and nowe (god [be praised])..." right half anchors.

Seam C band 4 (rows 11–15): ✓ NO LOSSES + two load-bearing confirmations. The reversed KEYS narrative crosses this seam intact ("**should not have the k[ey]s** [of the Castell]" — headline-5 reading independently re-confirmed at 2×); the custody burden likewise ("def[endan]t **removed** th[e] [prisoners]", "[night] **and day durin[ge]**...", "of the said **Gaole**", "or his deputie or a[ny]"). Four [?]-flags DEFERRED to the rows-13–16 spot pass (same y-range): a possible interline "and [?]inge fre[?]" at scan $y \approx 0.812$ ($x \approx 0.72$ – 0.82); "writt for money or other [reward?]" at $y \approx 0.871$; "not well able of..."; "the not makinge of..."

★★ **SEAM-PASS VERDICT (task i COMPLETE): NO WORDS LOST AT ANY OF THE THREE GRID-COLUMN BOUNDARIES.** The 2026-07-02 grid read + Phase-B re-verification survive a full independent seam audit. Net gains (as corrected 2026-07-08 against the LEDGER's Phase-B verdicts, not just the working-file digest):

1. ★★ GENUINELY NEW: the "in all the said judiciall p[ro]ceedinges in or upon the said Inditem[en]ts" frame of the Barker-conduct clause (the Answer's own phrase, alongside "calling in question"); "w[i]th [suche?] **integritie and synceritie**" in the praise clause; the praise tail variant "could fynd noe **iust** cause to mislike or **fynde** fault w[i]th his said [?]" (ledger has "[noe] cause to mislike or thinke otherwise" — token-level variance for TNA); the "at" interline ("...[alleag]ed ^{at}, or any other tyme..." — second revision event on 010).
2. ★ Bracket resolutions/leads: "**conceaved**" (firm, was "[adjudged?]"); "**menc[i]oned** to be [retorned]" (was "[?]onded"); "**p[er]suasion**" (lead, was "[instigac[i]on/p[er]suasion?]"); "**here** in London" (resolves the ledger's "[heere?/herd?]"); "**+amongst others** did write"; reform tail "**much bettered and amended**" (candidate resolution of the ledger's "[?ab?]l[?]ished" verb pair); "In or aboute **w[hi]ch tyme**" (vs "[October?]"); "as doth [anie waye?] concerne him".
3. ★ Formula attestations recovered from elided zones: "in such sorte, man[er] and fforme, as in and by the said bill of compl[ain]t [is supposed]"; traverse variant tokens ("offences abuses and misdemeanors in the said bill", "surmised o[f]"); allegation-restatement candidate ("[through]out the said Countie to be confederated together").
4. Independent re-confirmations of: the fear clause, the strike zone (William ap [K/h]Jellow), Brereton+Barker esquiers, pregnant-prooffe, the £20 interline (its tail), the keys reversal, Examined Jury, the letters-to-London clause (ledger ✓), the general traverse (ledger ✓).
5. CONDITION notes: vertical tear in the seam-B zone ($x \approx 0.49$, y 0.015–0.11, no text lost); stitched seam + hole + insect on the left edge (F6).

(iii) **BLANK-ZONE VERIFICATION — SATISFIED** by the all-membranes ink screen (computational, full extent, all ten leaves) + eyes on every flagged cell (F1–F11). The 007 lower half, 009 mid-foot, and all margins are

verified blank ON THE RECTO except as flagged above; the screen's purple/graphite blindness is disclosed, and dorse writing (001/007) is a scanning gap, not a blank-zone failure.

(iv) 010 ROWS 13–16 SPOT PASS — COMPLETE (2026-07-08, Fable 5, first-hand)

Tiles crop_p4civ_* in crops/stac_p4c/ (~21 reads this cycle; full-width coverage of x 0.015–0.995 × y 0.803–0.998 at 2–4×, on top of the seam strips). All four deferred seam-C-b4 flags + every seam-A/B-b4 refinement token + F8 foot cells + the subscription zone are dispositioned below.

★★ HEADLINE RESULTS

1. ★ **THIRD REVISION EVENT ON 010 — the interline is REAL and now read** (p4civ_intlZ/intlZZ, x 0.69–0.875 y 0.799–0.812 @2.5–4×): baseline "...beinge Sheriffe as afford said, p[ro]cured a rem[ove?]..." carries a caret + full superscript insertion: "*" and, some what[?] f[a]rre[?] distant from the said Castell^"" — the Answer's added explanation for the prisoner transfer: he was somewhat far distant from the castle, so he "procured a remove of the said p[ri]soners to his owne house, where he might the better intend" them. RE-PARSE: the grid-pass fragment "[some had] detained[?] from the said Castell" (row 13 tail) WAS this interline read as baseline; "detained" was "distant". Alternates preserved: "deteyn[e]d" for "distant"; "some what / farre" both [?]-flagged. TNA item.
2. ★ **"SHERIFFEWICK" RECOVERED** (p4civ_writtZ @3×): the flag "writt for money or other [reward?]" reads "...[the dis]charge of offices belonginge to the said **Sheriffe wick[e]**, for money or other **valuable considerac[i]on...**" — "writt" was the tail of *Sheriffwick* (the shrievalty), "[reward?]" is RETRACTED.
3. ★★ **THE FOOT SUBSCRIPTION MYSTERY RESOLVED — it is the engrossed PRAYER, not a name/jurat** (p4civ_subL @2.5×): the "large flourished subscription [S_?]zand[?] / [Li_?]d[?]" of the grid pass reads "**dismissed by[?] th[e/is] ho[nora]ble[?] Co[ur]te[?] w[i]th...**" — the final prayer clause written large at line start, sloping up into "...reasonable costes and charges in that behalfe most wrongfullie **susteyned**" (prayer tail now firm; "[sustained]" bracket resolved). "[S_?]zand[?]" was a mid-word misparse of "[di]smisshed" (double long-s taken for z). Foot layout fully accounted for: engrossed prayer → right foot "& 6d" note → counsel signature → paraph → corner clip.
4. **Counsel signature: "Boyd" initial-B FIRM at 2×** (p4civ_sigR); terminal still flourish-crossed (d/s — "Boys" stays possible). NEW: the faded line just above it ends "...[ack?]nowled[?] ... & 6d" — candidate jurat-class acknowledgment note + the fee, not merely a bare "6d". TNA.

FLAG DISPOSITIONS (THE FOUR DEFERRED SEAM-C-B4 FLAGS)

- "and [?]inge fre[?]" interline → ★ READ (headline 1).
- "writt for money or other [reward?]" → ★ RESOLVED (headline 2).
- "the not making of..." → anchors: "**And as touchinge the not making or appointinge & [swea?/ser?]vinge[?] of deputi[es]...**" — the &-token is stain-crossed; "swearinge"/"servinge" both kept (TNA).

- "not well able of..." → RE-PARSE (lead): the seam glimpse was "...sometymes **available** an[d] be[neficiall]..." ("aliable" ≈ "well able" through the seam window). No lost text; see row-15 resolutions below.

SEAM-A/B-B4 REFINEMENT TOKENS — ALL ANCHOR (`P4CIV\_G12R14\_B1/B2` @~2×)

- ✓ VERBATIM: "...the said def[endan]t **John Lewis house where (to his greate charge and expenses,** beinge dryven to finde..." (name's 3rd appearance re-confirmed eyes-on).
- ✓ "...remayned **untill they were retorned over to the n[o/e]we Sheriffe of that Co[untie], as lawfullie he might**" (nowe/newe vowel minor-flagged).
- ✓ "in suche convenient tyme **and as by the lawes & statut[es] of this Realme is in suche cases required**".
- ✓ "...watch the said p[ri]soners **at convenient tymes; Whereupon this def[endan]t for his better safetie a[nd]...**" (resolves "conven[y]ent tymes" + the better-safetie token in one clause).
- ✓ "dryven to finde & **mainteyne men to watch them night and day duringe the space of [—unfilled gap—]**" — the BLANK GAP seen directly (p4civ_writt_b1 line 1); notable (2) re-confirmed on sight.
- ✓ "charge of offic[ers?]" → "[the dis]**charge of offices** belonginge to the said Sheriffewick[e]" (see headline 2).
- △ NEW FLAG (sense-flip candidate, TNA): "to looke unto them; **[no/as] other Sheriffe [hath/shall?] [vs?]uall[ie] formerlie done vpon the like occasions**" — if "no", Lewis claims he did what NO other sheriff had formerly done (vs the grid's "[as other Sheriffes have usually?] done"). Strokes support "no other Sheriffe" but the verb is stain-crossed.
- △ NEW CLAUSE CANDIDATE (f8L line 2, faded): "that ev[er]y [Sheriffe/officer?] before he shall [?]" — possibly an oath-of-office clause in the fees answer. TNA.

ROW-15 FEES-ANSWER RESOLUTIONS (`P4CIV\_F8L/F8R/PLACEZZ/NAMEZ\*` @2–3×)

- ★ The doublet is "**place & places**" FIRM — two instances, the second with clear terminal-s: "pleasure appointed the **place & place[s]** for the [doinge of all man[ner] of Courts]" + "[vs]ed to appointe the **place & places** for the keepinge of [Courts]". "[person & persons?]" RETRACTED.
- ★ "...was sometymes **available and beneficiall to the said Sheriff[e/s]**" — the "[inhabitants/suitors?]" bracket RETRACTED in favor of *Sheriffe* (the appointments were profitable to the sheriff — sharpens the confession-and-avoidance).
- ✓ "the **appointmentes** of the said places" (f8Rlow line 1).
- ✓ The "bayliffs" INTERLINE seen directly above "the hund[reds]" (f8L line 5) — notable (2) of row 15 re-confirmed eyes-on.
- "did receave & take some smalle [rewarde?]" — "rewarde" now the lead for the "[fee/sum]" bracket (two sightings: f8L line 6 + p4civ_r15low line 3 "some[?] smalle rewarde of the said [—]").
- X SCAN-LIMITED: the payer's name. p4civ_nameZ2/nameZ3 (nat + eR @3×): "of the said [M?]ial[?]" — eR is noise-dominated in this stain zone (stain + show-through amplify together). f8L line 6 opens with "[G/Th?][?]ili[?]d[?]th did receave..." — EITHER a Welsh personal name OR a phrase ("the like dueties?"). "[Griffith?]" stays an UNCONFIRMED lead. Formal TNA item.

- ✓ "w[hi]ch was lawfull for him so to do" + tail "...have vsed vsuall[ie] ... **and not otherwise**" (g4low line 6) — the fees-answer close verbatim.
- ✓ Prayer sequence: "All w[hi]ch matters..." → "[to be] dismissed..." → "...most wrongfullie susteyned" (headline 3).

★★ **ROWS 13–16 VERDICT: the grid/Phase-B text SURVIVES; no lost text found anywhere in the spot zone. Net: one new interline READ (revision event #3), Sheriffewick + place&places + avaiable-to-the-Sheriffe + susteyned + the engrossed-prayer resolution; the payer name and the no-other-Sheriffe verb are the two remaining scan-limited tokens (TNA).**

(ii) STANDING-[?]-TOKEN RE-RENDERS — COMPLETE (2026-07-08, Fable 5, first-hand)

Tiles crop_p4cii_* in crops/stac_p4c/ (nat @2.5–3.5× + eR where stained; eB was already on record from 4A/4B). All seven listed tokens dispositioned:

- 1. 008 L75 "[Ro?]rlan[d?]horp[?]" — SCAN-LIMITED, CONFIRMED TOP TNA ITEM.** 3× nat + eR (x 0.45–0.98, y 0.842–0.872): the main-line tokens hold the "[Ro/Do?]rlan[d/t] [T/H]orp[e?] were[?]" letterform family; eR adds texture, not strokes. NEW observation: token-2's initial could also be C/E-class (observation only, NOT a reading). ★ GAIN: the Art-11 interline's middle token firms at 3× — "or of him selfe" (the "[him?]" bracket drops).
- 2. 008 patronym (Res ap [Ev[a]n?/hu?] Lloyd, L1 + L8) —** the two instances CONFLICT at 3×: L1 opens with a tall-ascender "hu"-compatible form; L8 opens rounded, "E"-compatible. "Ev[a]n" keeps the documentary lead (07-02 v008 zooms; the Answer's caption "[Rees ap E]van"; 009 L24 "Rees ap Ev[o]n"); "Hu[gh/w]" stays letterform-live at L1. TNA arbitrates; no delta logged (names above all). L2R's faint tail after "ffleete" still unresolved ("a[tt?] agaynste him[?] [...]").
- 3. 009 L2 fewer/favoured — "favor" NOW THE LEAD.** 3.5× nat + eR: token-1 vowel is a/o-class with a clear "-or" terminal ("fewer" needs "-er"); three of four views now favor "favor" (nat@3.5×, eR, 4B's eB "-ov-" lean) vs 07-02's sub-native "fewer". Verb-2 stays "foul[l]d/fou[n]d" (unresolved). Sense options both open ("favour found" vs "fewer found"); TNA arbitrates the crux.
- 4. 009 "[C]irc[uit]s" — DOWNGRADED to unconfirmed.** The cluster after "in" resists all renders: "in [?]ir[?]/[?]ne[?] re[?]s[?]" ; "ev[er]ie respect" logged as a letterform-possible alternate ONLY. (The 07-02 reading was never confirmed at native+; now formally open.)
- 5. 009 L4R "L[a]ighton" — "Laighton" FIRM at 3.5×:** the post-L vowel is an open-bowl "a", not an e-loop. 07-02's "Leighton" was a normalization. (Instance-level; TNA final on names.)
- 6. 008 L49/L51 "ha[dd/l]l" — "hadd" upgraded to letterform-lead** (not just grammar): both ascenders rise from base-bowls = looped d's, not plain l's (2.5×). Flag kept, softened.
- 7. 008 L52R "[aswell?/expended?]" — "expended" upgraded to LEAD** (two views: the R7-overlap re-read + this 2.5× — double-d terminal visible; "x"-descender compatible). "aswell" stays the grammar-motivated alternate (07-02's "...aswell in suites of lawe as for yo[ur] owne expenses" needs it). Also on this strip:

"**sixt**" CONFIRMED spelled-out (the "[v]^{te}?]" alternate retires for L52; L38 keeps "vj^{te}"); L53's "have [or hath?] yo[u]" unchanged (crease-crossed).

★★ **PHASE 4C COMPLETE — all five items (v)+(i)+(iii)+(iv)+(ii) done.** The scan-limited residue (= the TNA arbitration list from 4C) is: the 010 fee-payer name; the 010 "[no/as] other Sheriffe" verb; the 008 L75 tokens; the 008 patronym; the 009 favor/fewer + foul[l]d/found crux; the 009 post-"in" cluster; the 010 interline tokens "some what / f[a]rre"; the 010 "Boyd" terminal; the 010 "[ack?]nowled[?] & 6d" note; plus the DORSE imaging orders (001, 007, 007's unfolded edge) and the 010 head jotting from item (v).