

BEFOREWORD

Sources and Analyses

The register's labels, links, and explanations, including the words "source", "translation", and "limit", remain written forms: by themselves they present neither provenance, the actions named, nor the truth of the content. This does not make the content false; a proposed reading remains open to correction by reference to a particular passage and its context. Extracts and links are supplied here; complete source files are not included. PDF pages are counted from the first physical page. Material is retained from the earlier selection without renewed consultation, except for Hamilton paragraphs 1-21, revisited for the introduction. All fifteen extracts are retained without a fresh comparison with the publications; consultation for the introduction does not extend to the judgment's other passages.

Documents, extracts, and eight completed analysis cards. Reference numbers match the study.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REGISTER

Documents and judgment

[1] · POL00040370**Letter concerning losses and gains**

Mike Wakley — A. Bates · 2003-04-14

Passages consulted. PDF p. 1: written date, a passage read here as a demand to make good a loss, and the adjacent wording of a liability condition. The extracts are retained from the earlier selection.

Limit. The demand to make good a loss is read alongside the adjacent liability condition. Fulfilment of that condition, the cause of the loss, and compliance with the demand lie outside the selected passage.

<https://www.postofficehorizoninquiry.org.uk/evidence/pol00040370-letter-mike-wakley-bates-reference-losses-and-gains>

PDF: <https://www.postofficehorizoninquiry.org.uk/file/10637/download?token=0hA5TjaX>

[2] · POL00049500**Report of the West Byfleet branch audit**

Keith Noverre; addressed to Elaine Ridge · 2008-01-16

Passages consulted. PDF pp. 1–3: heading, addressee and amount entries, the row label “Outstanding debt”, and reported statements. The text of five pages and images of pp. 1–2 were previously consulted; the selection prepared from them is used here.

Limit. The transcribed heading names Elaine Ridge and lists Paul Dawkins, Gerry Conran, and Tony Hills as copied recipients. The archive-entry title and report heading are considered separately. The route from the total, including the “Outstanding debt” row, to an individual charge is not reconstructed here. Other copies and original exports are outside the comparison.

<https://www.postofficehorizoninquiry.org.uk/evidence/pol00049500-seema-misra-case-study-audit-byfleet-post-office-branch-branch-code-126023>

PDF: https://www.postofficehorizoninquiry.org.uk/file/8174/download?token=EuueLG_G

[3] · POL00049658**Memorandum: Post Office Limited v Seema Misra**

Jarnail Singh · 2008-04-01

Passages consulted. PDF pp. 1–2: wording concerning sufficiency, papers held and requested, a condition on the advice, and prosecution. Previously prepared extracts from these pages are reproduced.

Limit. The two-page publication mentions an attached schedule of charges but does not reproduce its contents. Its absence from this passage does not establish its absence from the entire case.

<https://www.postofficehorizoninquiry.org.uk/evidence/pol00049658-memo-jarnail-singh-investigation-team-post-office-limited-and-a-drian-morris-re>

PDF: <https://www.postofficehorizoninquiry.org.uk/file/14703/download?token=d4yeXv1G>

[4] · POL00026572

Horizon — Response to Challenges Regarding Systems Integrity

Rod Ismay; addressed to Dave Smith, Mike Moores, and Mike Young · 2010-08-02

Passages consulted. PDF p. 1: passages read as a premise and conclusion about accounting; p. 5: period-closure wording; p. 9: debt-acceptance item; pp. 19–20: discussion of a review; p. 29: West Byfleet row. The text representations of pp. 1, 5, 9, and 19–20 and the archive entry were previously consulted for the selection; the account of p. 29 is retained from an earlier analysis.

Limit. P. 1 names Rob Wilson and Mandy Talbot among the copied recipients; the list is not reproduced in full here. The wording about accounting ownership and debt acceptance is read with its context. Comparing the p. 9 item with the West Byfleet row on p. 29 does not establish its application to Misra's case or a causal connection with her conviction.

<https://www.postofficehorizoninquiry.org.uk/evidence/pol00026572-horizon-response-challenges-regarding-systems-integrity>

PDF: <https://www.postofficehorizoninquiry.org.uk/file/1408/download?token=GMeZHUD0>

[5] · FUJ00083353

Correcting Accounts for “lost” Discrepancies

Gareth Jenkins, as named in the archive entry; boxed annotation not attributed separately · 2010-09-28

Passages consulted. PDF pp. 1 and 4: description, wording of a proposed correction, and boxed annotation concerning losses or gains. Extracts retained in the earlier selection are used here.

Limit. The correction is described as a proposal, while the boxed annotation leaves open whether the amounts are losses or gains. Implementation is not attributed. Authorship of the boxed annotation is not separately established. The locator is physical p. 4 of 4, although the footer reads “Page 4 of 1”.

<https://www.postofficehorizoninquiry.org.uk/evidence/fuj00083353-report-gareth-jenkins-correcting-accounts-lost-discrepancies>

PDF: <https://www.postofficehorizoninquiry.org.uk/file/10554/download?token=nolaH3PA>

[6] · FUJ00081584

Receipts/Payments Mismatch issue notes

No individual author assigned to the selected passage · 2010-10-08

Passages consulted. PDF pp. 1–3: an account of a discrepancy disappearing from the branch display while remaining in other accounting records, wording allowing a loss or gain, three options, and a recommendation of the second. The text representation of these pages was previously consulted; the archive-entry date is retained from the earlier publication details.

Limit. The discrepancy is described as disappearing from the branch display while persisting in other accounting records; a loss or gain remains possible. This analysis does not determine the amount or cause of a loss. Recommendation of the second option is not equated with implementation. The Horizon Online system discussed here is not equated with the Legacy Horizon system in Misra's case.

<https://www.postofficehorizoninquiry.org.uk/evidence/fuj00081584-receiptspayments-mismatch-issue-notes>

PDF: <https://www.postofficehorizoninquiry.org.uk/file/3043/download?token=bzIM6Z6S>

[7] · [2021] EWCA Crim 577

Hamilton & Ors v Post Office Ltd [2021] EWCA Crim 577

Court of Appeal (Criminal Division) · 2021-04-23

Passages consulted. Paragraphs 1–21 were consulted afresh for the reader introduction: wording about Horizon, branch accounting, and the described consequences of criminal proceedings. The main analysis uses the previously consulted paragraphs 9–24, 49, 123, 137, and 198–209 and their context. Paragraph 49 recounts findings attributed to Fraser J; paragraphs 198–209 are read here as a later judicial account. Consultation for the introduction does not extend to every cited passage or the entire case.

Limit. Quotations from the judgment, their summaries, and the proposed reading are presented separately. The analysis concerns the cited paragraphs within their stated scope of cases; it does not include the full material of each prosecution or an independent technical examination of the software.

<https://caselaw.nationalarchives.gov.uk/ewca/crim/2021/577>

Related work and citation

[8] · TEI P5, §§ 12.3.1.3, 12.3.1.7

TEI P5: Representation of Primary Sources

TEI Consortium · 2026-07-28

Passages consulted. Sections 12.3.1.3 and 12.3.1.7: notations for corrections, omissions, and editorially supplied text. The previously prepared comparison of these passages is retained.

Limit. The comparison is limited to selected ways of marking a correction, omission, or addition in a specified passage. It is not a complete review of TEI or an examination of this selection's conformance with its specifications.

<https://tei-c.org/release/doc/tei-p5-doc/en/html/PH.html>

[9] · W3C Working Group Note

PROV-Overview: An Overview of the PROV Family of Documents

W3C; Paul Groth and Luc Moreau, editors · 2013-04-30

Passages consulted. Section 1: wording concerning provenance, processes, and derived records, including provenance of provenance. The previously prepared comparison is used here.

Limit. Selected wording about provenance is compared with this register's explanations of the extracts used. Implementation of the PROV specifications is not claimed.

<https://www.w3.org/TR/2013/NOTE-prov-overview-20130430/>

[10] · Practice Direction 5, §§ 5.26–5.30

UK Supreme Court — Practice Directions

UK Supreme Court · web edition consulted

Passages consulted. Practice Direction 5, paragraphs 5.26–5.30: wording concerning categories of cited material, relevant pages, and publication details. The earlier comparison is retained; the directions in force at the date of a particular filing are not examined here.

Limit. The passage is used to compare citation practices. The directions' application to a particular filing, admission of the manuscript, and the weight of its arguments for a court are not determined here.

<https://www.supremecourt.uk/how-to-appeal/practice-directions>

[11] · 10.14296/deeslr.v18i0.5240

Recommendations for the probity of computer evidence

Paul Marshall et al. · 2021-11-18

Digital Evidence and Electronic Signature Law Review · Vol. 18

Passages consulted. Article page, introduction, and PDF pp. 7–8: an account of the proposed two stages of disclosure. The previously prepared analysis of these passages is used here.

Limit. The two stages of disclosure are considered as the article authors' proposal, not as a rule in force or a report of disclosure already performed. The comparison is limited to the cited pages.

<https://journals.sas.ac.uk/deeslr/article/view/5240>

PDF: <https://journals.sas.ac.uk/deeslr/article/download/5240/5083>

[12] · 10.14296/deeslr.v17i0.5143

The Law Commission presumption concerning the dependability of computer evidence: An invited paper

Peter Bernard Ladkin et al. · 2020-03-14

Digital Evidence and Electronic Signature Law Review · Vol. 17

Passages consulted. Article page, introduction, and summary on PDF p. 9: arguments against the presumption concerning the dependability of computer evidence. The previously prepared comparison of the selected arguments is retained.

Limit. The analysis concerns criticism of the presumption on the cited pages. This comparison does not determine how a particular system operated or the outcome of an individual case.

<https://journals.sas.ac.uk/deeslr/article/view/5143>

PDF: <https://journals.sas.ac.uk/deeslr/article/download/5143/5027>

[13] · 10.14296/deeslr.v13i0.2303

The Post Office Horizon system and Seema Misra

Tim McCormack · 2016

Digital Evidence and Electronic Signature Law Review · Vol. 13

Passages consulted. Article page and conclusion on PDF pp. 5–6: an account of Misra’s case and arguments concerning disclosure and system reliability. The earlier analysis of the cited pages is used here.

Limit. The article’s account and arguments are compared with the other cited records. The article is used as a separate discussion, not as the complete original case file.

<https://journals.sas.ac.uk/deeslr/article/view/2303>

PDF: <https://journals.sas.ac.uk/deeslr/article/download/2303/2256>

Source extracts

The fifteen extracts are retained from the earlier selection without a fresh comparison with the publications. Hamilton paragraphs 1–21 were consulted separately for the introduction; not every cited passage of the judgment was revisited. Each extract retains its original wording, with the translation presented separately. The three fragments on the Ismay report’s first page are not joined into a continuous quotation: omitted context is summarised. Links lead to the publications; complete original files are not included here.

Extract 1

Source extract · [1] · p. 1

required to make good the outstanding loss

Part of the paragraph making the demand, beginning at “required”; not a complete sentence.

Extract 2

Source extract · [1] · p. 1

caused through their own negligence, carelessness or error

A separate extract from the following paragraph on liability conditions. It is not combined with the preceding extract into one quotation.

Extract 3

Source extract · [2] · p. 1

The audit revealed a shortage in the branch of £77643.87.

A sentence in the report before the breakdown of the amount; not an interface label.

Extract 4

Source extract · [3] · p. 1

In my opinion the evidence is sufficient to afford a realistic prospect of conviction

First paragraph. The extract stops before the reference to charges in an attached schedule.

Extract 5

Source extract · [3] · p. 2

This Office will prosecute.

Second paragraph on the second page; a complete sentence.

Extract 6

Source extract · [4] · p. 9

Acceptance of debt by the branch - branches do actively choose options in Horizon

“Debt Recovery” section: complete item on acceptance of debt.

Extract 7

Source extract · [5] · p. 4

I've been unable to work out yet if these are losses or gains!

A boxed annotation on physical PDF page 4 of 4. Its author is not assumed to be the author of the main text.

Extract 8

Source extract · [6] · p. 3

a debt recovery/ refund even though there is no discrepancy at the branch

Fragment under "Impact" for "Solution Two", physical p. 3. The containing sentence is read as requiring an explanation for recovery or refund; pp. 1–2 as describing disappearance of a discrepancy from the branch display while it remains in other accounting records, with a possible loss or gain.

Extract 9

Source extract · [4] · The "Evidence type" field in the archive entry for POL00026572; metadata, not a line in the PDF.

Document

The "Evidence type" field in the archive entry for POL00026572; metadata, not a line in the PDF.

Extract 10

Source extract · [4] · p. 1

This means that

Words read here as a connector between premise and conclusion. These labels name the proposed reading; the three extracts are presented separately.

Extract 11

Source extract · [7] · Two words from paragraph 21; not a complete sentence.

undisputed debts

Two words from paragraph 21; not a complete sentence.

Extract 12

Source extract · [7] · A phrase from paragraph 137. Its scope is not extended beyond the cases addressed there.

an incontrovertible loss

A phrase from paragraph 137. Its scope is not extended beyond the cases addressed there.

Extract 13

Source extract · [2] · p. 2

Outstanding debt

Row label on physical PDF p. 2, beside £ 3034.03 (-). The amount is not part of this quoted label.

Extract 14

Source extract · [4] · p. 1

all data entry or acceptance is at branch level

A fragment read here as part of the premise. The wording about attribution to the user logon lies outside this extract.

Extract 15

Source extract · [4] · p. 1

ownership of the accounting is truly at branch level.

A fragment read here as the conclusion. The translation renders “ownership” in terms of responsibility for the accounts; neither that translation choice nor the label “conclusion” presents legal guilt.

CARD 1

Premise and conclusion about branch accounting

1. Scope and disputed wording

The final paragraph of [4] p. 1 is compared with [7] paragraphs 16 and 49. The card reads it as a premise and conclusion about branch accounting.

2. Source passage

extract 14, extract 10, and extract 15 appear as separate extracts. Between the first extract and the connector, the cited paragraph contains wording about the user logon; the context is given in a separate summary.

3. Label and added statement

“Entry”, “acceptance”, “log on ID”, and “ownership” are the report’s terms. The card examines their reading as entry, acceptance, an identifier, and responsibility for accounting; “ownership” is not renamed legal guilt.

4. Written connector

The connector “This means that” is written in the source. Here it is read as introducing a conclusion after the preceding account; that explanation remains separate from the quotation.

5. Stated condition

The summary includes the wording about logs, backups, absence of backdoor access, and entry or acceptance at branch level. The analysis examines the role of the stated exclusivity of entry in the conclusion that follows.

6. Passages compared

[7] paragraphs 16 and 49 provide a later account of possible remote amendments without the subpostmaster’s knowledge; paragraph 49 attributes the relevant findings to Fraser J. These accounts are compared with [4]’s premise.

7. Limits of the selection

The card includes no individual transaction log or record of its causal reconstruction. Their absence here does not establish their absence from other materials.

8. Amendment and limited outcome

The summary of branch-exclusive entry should retain the later account of remote amendments alongside it. Attribution of an individual record still requires consideration of the version and traces of the operation; the comparison determines neither the cause of an individual amount nor guilt.

CARD 2

Acceptance and required period closure

1. Scope and disputed wording

The item on [4] p. 9 is examined alongside the wording on [4] p. 5 and the judicial account in [7] paragraphs 13–14 and 21–24.

2. Source passage

extract 6 reproduces the selected item in full. Its Russian translation retains both the emphatic “do” and “actively”.

3. Label and added statement

The item contains “Acceptance of debt” and “choose options”. Reading the former as agreement that the amount is correct adds a particular interpretation of acceptance; it is examined separately from the description of selection.

4. Written connector

A dash separates the parts. Reading the second part as a reason for the first is proposed from their arrangement and the neighbouring items; this is the card’s analysis, not an additional connector in the quotation.

5. Stated condition

The account of required period closure is compared with the wording about choice. Neither voluntary agreement that the amount is correct nor its absence is inferred from that account. Acceptance status under a rule is considered separately, with the rule’s wording and conditions of application.

6. Passages compared

[7] paragraphs 21–22 describe payment demands despite continuing dispute; paragraph 24 discusses the Ismay report. These paragraphs provide context for comparison while remaining distinct from an individual selection log.

7. Limits of the selection

The card includes no individual selection log or record of extract 6 being used to convict Misra. Their absence here does not describe the full contents of her case file.

8. Amendment and limited outcome

The summary keeps the selected operation, attributed agreement that the amount is correct, and acceptance status under a rule separate. A description of selection does not replace a separate statement of agreement, or identification of a rule and material concerning fulfilment of its conditions. The existence or absence of a debt is not determined here.

CARD 3

A discrepancy across accounting records

1. Scope and disputed wording

[6], physical pp. 1–3: an account of a bug and three options proposed for affected branches.

2. Source passage

extract 8 is part of the sentence about explaining recovery or refund. It is examined alongside the wording on pp. 1–2 about the branch display, POLSAP, and Credence.

3. Label and added statement

“Discrepancy”, “loss”, “gain”, “recovery”, and “refund” belong to different parts of the account. Absence of a displayed discrepancy should be kept separate from a claim that no loss occurred, and a proposed operation from a record of money moving.

4. Written connector

“Even though” appears in extract 8. Here it is read as a concession linking the proposed operation with the described absence of a discrepancy at the branch.

5. Stated condition

On pp. 1–2, disappearance of the figure is described alongside its persistence in other accounting records and a possible loss or gain. The summary “there is no loss” omits that distinction.

6. Passages compared

Pp. 1–3 are considered together: the account of inconsistent accounting records, the recommendation of the second option, and the need to explain recovery or refund.

7. Limits of the selection

The card contains no record of implementation for a particular account. The bug discussed concerns Horizon Online; the account of Misra’s case concerns Legacy Horizon. No common cause for the amount is inferred from this comparison.

8. Amendment and limited outcome

Instead of the shorthand “recovery without a discrepancy”, specify the accounting view in which the discrepancy disappeared and retain the possibility of a loss or gain. The second option remains a recommendation; a record of its implementation would require separate consideration.

CARD 4

The judgment's account of treating one thing as another

1. Scope and disputed wording

[7] paragraphs 20, 123, and 137 are examined within their stated category of Horizon cases. That scope is not extended to every output of every software version.

2. Source passage

extract 12 reproduces “an incontrovertible loss” from paragraph 137. It quotes the judgment's account of how a figure was treated; it is not the card's assertion that the loss was incontrovertible.

3. Label and added statement

Paragraph 137 already distinguishes a displayed shortfall from its treatment as an incontrovertible loss. The distinction is attributed to the judgment, not claimed as a discovery by beforeword.

4. Written connector

Paragraph 137 is read as an account of treating a figure as a loss. The card keeps that judicial account separate from its own explanation.

5. Stated condition

The scope stated in paragraph 123 is retained: cases in which the prosecution depended on the reliability of Horizon data. The general account does not replace examination of an individual case's materials.

6. Passages compared

The account in paragraph 20, the scope wording in paragraph 123, and the account in paragraph 137 are compared. The summary retains paragraph 137's connection to that scope.

7. Limits of the selection

The card examines the specified judicial paragraphs; its scope includes neither a new technical audit nor the materials of each individual prosecution.

8. Amendment and limited outcome

The summary retains the judgment's distinction and the category of cases to which it applies. A reference to paragraph 137 does not replace material concerning a particular loss of funds; an objection to the judicial wording itself is also examined against its content and context.

CARD 5

Report, amount, and outstanding debt

1. Scope and disputed wording

POL00049500, physical pp. 1–3: addressee, heading, components of the amount, and reported statements.

2. Source passage

extract 3 appears as a sentence from the report; extract 13 as a row label on p. 2. The quotation from the report is not presented as a label from an original system screen.

3. Label and added statement

“Audit”, “shortage”, and “Outstanding debt” are terms in the report. The analysis separates the audit label, its recorded total, and the debt label beside an amount.

4. Written connector

The breakdown entries are examined as components of the recorded total. They do not reconstruct the sequence in which that amount was used to formulate a charge.

5. Stated condition

The numerical entries for the components and total are compared with the “Outstanding debt” row. Their inclusion in the total is considered separately from a claim of liability for the amount.

6. Passages compared

Pp. 1–2 contain the total and breakdown; p. 3 reports statements about altered balances. The consultation history is recorded in entry [2].

7. Limits of the selection

Original exports and other copies are not included in the card. The sequence of records from the report’s amount to an individual charge is not presented here.

8. Amendment and limited outcome

The summary retains the amount, its components, the row label, and the reported statements. It adds neither an invented system screen nor a claim that extract 6 was applied to this amount.

CARD 6

Memorandum: papers held and requested

1. Scope and disputed wording

[3], physical pp. 1–2: published memorandum bearing the case name Post Office Limited v Seema Misra.

2. Source passage

extract 4 retains “In my opinion”; extract 5 retains “will prosecute”. The expression of opinion and future tense remain in the summary.

3. Label and added statement

The assessment of sufficient evidence is considered alongside the condition on the advice and the request for papers. Those formulations do not replace the contents of the referenced file.

4. Written connector

The summary separately retains the condition on the advice, the reference to papers held, and the request for further material.

5. Stated condition

The reference to an attached schedule of charges remains part of extract 4’s context. The schedule’s text is treated separately from that reference.

6. Passages compared

Wording about papers, advice, and further action is compared within the two pages. [3] records that the extracts were carried forward without renewed consultation.

7. Limits of the selection

The mentioned schedule’s text is not included in the selected pages. This is a limit of the publication, not a claim that the schedule was absent from the whole case. Nor are the two pages presented as the complete case file.

8. Amendment and limited outcome

The summary retains the opinion, condition, request, and extract 5’s future tense. These passages are not used to infer that all papers were absent, that a complete file is supplied, or that the described future action was carried out.

CARD 7

Retaining conditions and unresolved wording

1. Scope and disputed wording

[1] p. 1 and [5] pp. 1 and 4 are examined as two separate examples of retaining qualifications. Their participants and events are not combined into a single process.

2. Source passage

extract 1–extract 2 are separate extracts from adjacent paragraphs; extract 7 comes from a boxed annotation in another publication.

3. Label and added statement

[1] distinguishes a demand from a condition of liability. [5] distinguishes an unresolved question about losses or gains from a proposed correction.

4. Written connector

extract 1 is examined with extract 2; extract 7 with the wording of [5]’s proposed correction. No causal connection between the two publications is proposed.

5. Stated condition

In the [1] summary, the liability condition remains beside the demand. In [5], the question of losses or gains remains unresolved; no outcome of testing the correction is added.

6. Passages compared

The adjacent [1] passages are compared and, separately, the [5] boxed annotation with the account of the proposed correction.

7. Limits of the selection

The extracts are carried forward without renewed consultation of the publications. The boxed annotation’s authorship has not been separately established and is not automatically assigned to the author of the main text.

8. Amendment and limited outcome

One summary should retain the condition beside the demand; the other, the unresolved wording beside the correction proposal. Application of the condition and the correction’s outcome would require their own passages and separate consideration.

CARD 8

Reasons against a further review

1. Scope and disputed wording

[4] physical pp. 19–20 are examined alongside [7] paragraph 24: the report's discussion of a review and the later judicial account of that discussion.

2. Source passage

A separate summary retains the reasons concerning further questions, qualifications, updated opinions, disclosure, and consequences for prosecutions.

3. Label and added statement

"Review", "report", and "decision" are considered separately: the account of a procedure, an anticipated report, and a decision about pursuing the review.

4. Written connector

Wording about the limits of a future report is read as reasons not to pursue a review. This reconstructs the argument from the cited sentences, not the history of how the decision was made.

5. Stated condition

The analysis separates two questions: whether a report would end every further question, and which particular issue it might clarify. The lack of a final guarantee does not answer the second question.

6. Passages compared

The [4] summary is compared with the account in [7] paragraph 24. The publication dates and attribution of each statement are retained; the later account is also open to an objection concerning its content.

7. Limits of the selection

The card contains neither a procedural rule applicable to a particular case nor a complete description of an expert inquiry's subject. Their application is not decided here.

8. Amendment and limited outcome

The subject of a possible review should not be reduced to a promise of a final answer. This also applies to the present analysis: an objection to a line requires examining its content and context, then recording an amendment or an explanation for retaining the wording.

Methodological texts from beforeword

The entries below give titles, locators, and short extracts from earlier methodological texts by the project. They are retained from the earlier selection; the original files were not compared afresh and are not reproduced here in full. Website addresses lead to related publications; no claim is made that their current text matches the copies used. The participant's personal messages are not published.

Text Is Text. Full Stop.

Original title: Текст есть текст. И точка.

"Scope of the claim"; "Minimal operation"; "No privileged exit".

Original extract

На выбранной текстовой поверхности названное, его отсутствие, связь с ним и выбранное прочтение не должны входить под видом частей самого текста.

English rendering: On the selected textual surface, what is named, its absence, a connection to it, and a chosen reading must not be presented as parts of the text itself.

FULL STOP. The Boundary of a Presented Record

Original title: ТОЧКА. ГРАНИЦА ПРЕДЪЯВЛЕННОЙ ЗАПИСИ

Pp. 1–3: abstract and sections 1–3 and 5.

Original extract

ПОСЛЕДНЕЕ СЛОВО ТОЖЕ СЛОВО.

English rendering: THE LAST WORD IS ALSO A WORD.

Evaluation Does Not Leave the Record

Original title: ОЦЕНКА НЕ ПОКИДАЕТ ЗАПИСЬ

Pp. 3–5: abstract and sections 0–1.

Original extract

Даже слово «запись» не даётся привилегированно.

<https://beforeword.xyz/research/evaluation/>

English rendering: Even the word "record" is not given a privileged position.

MATHEMATICS DID NOT LEAVE THE RECORD

Abstract and sections 0–2; pp. 3–5 in the supplied copy.

Original extract

Every element of the calculus remains an exact record.

<https://beforeword.xyz/research/mathematics-phases-0-7/>

The Written “I”

Original title: Написанное «я»

Pp. 1–3: “Material presented”, “What case N1 adds”, “Material and transcription method”, and “Connection with the author’s analysis”.

Original extract

«Я», «переживание», «участница», «ответ» и «исследование» входят здесь как написанные слова.

<https://beforeword.xyz/research/written-i/>

English rendering: “I”, “experience”, “participant”, “response”, and “research” enter here as written words.

Называние переживания не предъявляет его вместо написания. Это относится и к нынешним словам «описание», «добавлено», «участница» и «результат».

English rendering: Naming an experience does not present it in place of the writing. This also applies to the present words “description”, “added”, “participant”, and “result”.

Short methodological passages from a previously supplied copy are reproduced, not the participant’s messages. Her experience is not established from these extracts. The complete original file, private correspondence, and administrative details are not included in the selection; the extract does not replace the current web page’s contents.