

# Anna Tichá card 199 validation

*Addendum to the partial decipherment report*

4 October 2026

The unchanged key produces connected Czech on card 199, mapping 522 of 532 handwritten bodies. An independent language review finds a coherent account of jealousy, a ball, and concert plans, with specific unresolved defects. This adds one whole-card test of the original key; it does not measure historical plaintext accuracy.

| Fixed pass            | Mapped bodies | Unknown bodies | Coverage |
|-----------------------|---------------|----------------|----------|
| Primary lookup        | 522 / 532     | 10             | 98.1%    |
| After secondary rules | 522 / 532     | 10             | 98.1%    |

Coverage counts assigned source bodies, not verified correct plaintext. Two one-body ch forms make the 522 mapped bodies emit 524 non-unknown characters. The secondary rules changed nothing because no source position met their eligibility conditions.

## Unchanged first literal

Primary and secondary outputs are identical. The exact saved text follows, including unknowns, imperfect strings, source spaces, line breaks, and region labels.

```
=== SOURCE REGION LEFT_CCW ===  
vrelý dik za drahy listek byl  
jsem zarliv na vasi sanici  
dokud jsem nevedel s kým jsi jela  
vplesu sem nebyl ac vybori prisli  
jeste v posledni chvili vecer v sobotu  
mne premlou vati ples se krasne vydaril  
bylo v ?em mnoho znamy? dam netouzil jsem vsak  
po zabave s nimi bez t?be by mne tam nebylo nic  
bavilo v pondeli pujdu do rudolfina na treti  
koncert curnalistu chtel jsem jiti jiz vcera  
na druhy koncert nebyly vsak jiz listky ??  
koupí na ten koncert se tesim je pry pro?ukce
```

```
=== SOURCE REGION RIGHT_CW ===  
skoly sevcikovy velkoleba  
tisic vasnivy? pus posila vecne tvuj pepous který  
svemu ?rdecku preje aby se dobre bavilo avaak  
prosi aby nezapomnelo ze nalezi vyradne pepous?v?
```

LEFT\_CCW and RIGHT\_CW identify two differently oriented image regions. Their displayed order is an indexing convention; cross-region reading order was UNKNOWN in the frozen source record. The first outputs were frozen at 22:19:51 UTC on 4 October 2026.

All 23 original key entries occur on this card, including G16 → f once at body 267 in rudolfina and two capped G10 → ch forms. The later unbarred-t entry is absent. This therefore exercises the original 23 entries even though the applied lookup contains 24.

# Source selection and test design

## Why card 199 was selected

Card 199 (HCP1518) was chosen before decipherment from three unread cards nearest in catalogue date to development card 198, dated 30 January 1904. The candidates were card 200, 23 January; card 199, 26 January; and card 407, 2 February. A seven-day tie was settled in advance in favor of the earlier date, excluding card 406, 6 February. [1-3]

An image-only screen selected card 199 for estimated length and legibility: a 12-line block and an oppositely oriented four-line block, mostly on pale margins. Card 200 was also long and generally clear; card 407 was shorter, with heavier ink and smudging. The screen noted a possible rare G16 form but established no unequivocal marked G02. Floral overlap and a crowded or corrected ending remained source concerns. Selection was purposive, with no plaintext scoring or random-sample claim.

## What was fixed before the replay

The protocol was frozen at 21:37:06 UTC on 4 October 2026. It reused the existing 24-entry primary lookup and version 2 secondary mark rules. The original photograph was preserved and hashed. Two readers independently transcribed the complete card against neutral graphical references; both counted 532 bodies. Source-only reconciliation and added-mark classification were completed before the first application of the key.

The primary pass accepts exact whole-form matches to the frozen lookup. The secondary pass considers only primary UNKNOWN positions and requires one supported base, mark geometry, and owner, all at high confidence. Ambiguous ownership, unsupported shapes, and unsupported base-mark combinations remain UNKNOWN. Here, the geometry audit found no eligible position, so the unchanged secondary output supplies no new test of its mark transformations.

The 532-body denominator is preserved throughout; 22 auxiliary punctuation records are separate. No source body was discarded as a null, and no fitting, spelling repair, count adjustment, or language-driven joining or splitting changed the first outputs. A source correction or new key proposal made after those outputs must be reported separately and tested on later material.

## Independent reading and evidence limits

The transcriptions and linguistic assessments were generated by AI; these checks used restricted inputs and are not external human expert reviews.

The language reviewer received the first secondary literal and source spacing, without source-image interpretations, catalogue context, expected words, or the key. The review assesses connected Czech and identifies anomalies, including interpretations that would require changing resolved values. It cannot establish a historical character-error rate because no independently known plaintext is available.

Graphical resemblance and date proximity were selection context only. Neither establishes one physical writer. This single, deliberately selected card also cannot establish collection-wide recovery or historical priority. The earlier report and its staged results remain unchanged.

# Reading and later source review

## What the literal supports

The independent review reads a warm thanks for a note, jealousy before learning who accompanied the addressee, and an explanation for missing a ball despite persuasion. The writer plans a Monday concert after finding no tickets for the second concert the day before. The intimate closing sends kisses and asks not to be forgotten. The intended noun in sanici remains uncertain.

The strings rudolfina and skoly sevcikovy admit the linguistic readings Rudolfinum and Ševčík's school after capitalization and diacritics. The literal alone establishes no city, particular school, concert date, or historical event match.

## Unaccepted linguistic repairs

These proposals change already resolved letters or insert a missing letter. They are editorial hypotheses, not corrections to the saved literal.

| First literal | Proposed reading | Required change            |
|---------------|------------------|----------------------------|
| curnalistu    | žurnalistů       | c → z, then diacritics     |
| velkoleba     | velkolepá        | b → p                      |
| avaak         | avšak            | Third letter a → s, then š |
| vyradne       | výhradně         | Insert h                   |

Each ? represents one unknown source body. Completing znamy? or vasnivy? with ch is structurally possible under this key, but neither completion is verified. The noun sanici is also unresolved. Spelling modernization, unknown filling, and changes to resolved values remain distinct operations.

The final words of LEFT\_CCW and opening words of RIGHT\_CW support a linguistic continuation about a school's performance, conditional on completing pro?ukce and repairing velkoleba. This favors LEFT\_CCW → RIGHT\_CW as an interpretation; the source freeze did not establish that order.

## Separate graphical audit after the test

Four groups were selected after the first output for a separate graphical reinspection. The reviewer saw source crops and neutral references, without plaintext or the original group assignments. Because the regions were chosen after the test, this is a bounded source audit, not another held-out validation.

The audit retains the graphical sequences behind curnalistu and avaak. In velkoleba, the eighth body allows h/b alternatives, not the proposed p. In vyradne, it reports an i/y classification discrepancy at the second body and conditional grouping of the first body; it establishes no extra h. None of these findings licenses the proposed lexical repairs. They leave source and orthographic uncertainties whose causes remain unresolved. The first outputs and coverage are unchanged.

# Historical context and sources

## Concert notices found after the test

Two contemporary Národní listy notices provide specific external corroboration for the proposed concert reference. Both source readers recorded the card's separate date as 26/I/1904, a Tuesday. If that dates composition and the future Monday is the next Monday, the literal's yesterday points to 25 January and its planned Monday to 1 February.

The 25 January 1904 notice announces that day's second concert of the Association of Czech Journalists in Prague at Rudolfinum. The 31 January notice announces its third and final concert there on Monday 1 February, with a group from Ševčík's master school performing again. Both specify 7 p.m. These match the proposed dates, concert numbers, venue, organisation, and school. [4-5]

This evidence was found after the fixed-key test. It strengthens the concert interpretation but does not change literal curnalistu or validate its letter repair. Both notices are advance announcements, so they do not prove the performances occurred as advertised, that the writer attended, or who the writer was.

## Chronology of the previously read cards

The six-card date audit found agreement between catalogue dates and picture-side inscriptions. These do not establish dispatch or receipt dates. The new visual checks for cards 198 and 441 had already seen catalogue metadata, so they are not blinded confirmations.

| Card | Calendar date    | Catalogue record        |
|------|------------------|-------------------------|
| 329  | 15 February 1900 | <a href="#">HCP1648</a> |
| 453  | 1 March 1900     | <a href="#">HCP1772</a> |
| 441  | 11 December 1901 | <a href="#">HCP1760</a> |
| 440  | 24 December 1901 | <a href="#">HCP1759</a> |
| 250  | 31 December 1902 | <a href="#">HCP1569</a> |
| 198  | 30 January 1904  | <a href="#">HCP1517</a> |

Cards 329 and 453 are 14 days apart. A source-audited underlined 14 within a days-ago phrase on card 453 makes card 329 a possible earlier note; the link remains unproved. All six records name Anna Tichá as recipient and Unknown as sender. Pepouš-family signoffs are decipherment evidence, not an externally identified sender.

Existing mark annotations support early 1900 as a useful stratum for a future rare-form test, without establishing a temporal trend. Card 200 is reserved after source screening only. Any extension learned after card 199 must be frozen before a future transcription and test on that card.

## Source links

[1] [Card 199 catalogue record](#)

[Card 199 original photograph](#)

[2] [Card 200 catalogue record](#)

[3] [Card 407 catalogue record](#)

[4] [Národní listy 25 January 1904 vol 44 no 25 p 3](#)

[5] [Národní listy 31 January 1904 vol 44 no 31 p 3](#)