CARRY THESE

Six cards, and the next rung

$P(H \mid E) = P(E \mid H)\,P(H)/P(E)$

posterior = likelihood × prior ÷ evidence. Say it aloud before you flip.

$P(E \mid H)$ vs $P(H \mid E)$

likelihood vs posterior. The bar is not symmetric, and confusing them is the classic error.

The bar |

"given". Conditioning, not division. Four jobs in mathematics; this is one of them.

Outermost operator

The top of the tree is the thing you reach last when reading left to right.

$\forall \varepsilon\ \exists \delta$

Nested loops. Swap them and you have written a different theorem.

$\sum$

A fold. The index gives the range; the body is what gets accumulated.

Where this sits



You have done the naming. Next: the glyphs themselves — the decorations, and what a letter's case tells you.

> KEY
>
> **Before Issue 1.** Copy one formula out of a paper you have given up on. Name every symbol; mark the ones you cannot. That list is your next lesson.

Parsing Mathematics · Issue 0 · The Method — version 0.1 · 1 November 2026 · CC BY-SA 4.0
Set in Source Serif and Inter; mathematics by KaTeX. Composed from a single source.

0

WHY THE WALL IS A LANGUAGE WALL

The Method

You can already read code. What you are missing is the grammar — and it is four drills, not four years.

A NOTATION COURSE FOR PEOPLE WHO ALREADY THINK IN CODE

INSIDE

1. the three symptoms
2. the plate
3. the transfer
4. two drills
5. six cards

SAY PARSE SCOPE PRODUCE

WHAT IS ACTUALLY IN THE WAY

You are not bad at mathematics

You can hold a type system in your head and a call graph in your hand. You can read a regular expression at a glance. So the wall you hit on page four of a paper is not made of intelligence, and not of concepts. It is made of three specific, trainable things.

1 · You cannot say it

Mathematics is learned as speech before it is learned as symbol. "Let epsilon be greater than zero." Nobody is taught to pronounce a formula, so the symbols stay an unparsed glyph stream — and an unpronounceable thing cannot survive in working memory, which holds about four chunks of anything.

2 · You read left to right

A formula is a tree, and the outermost operator is usually the thing you reach *last*. In a sum you meet the Σ first and the body second. In a limit you meet the condition first and the expression second. Linear reading produces garbage, and then you blame yourself.

3 · You have no symbol table

Academic notation is locally defined and heavily overloaded. The failure is almost never *"I do not know what σ means"*. It is *"I do not know what σ means here"* — and the paper declared it, once, four pages earlier, in a sentence you skimmed.

> KEY
>
> **The reframe.** Twelve glyphs, three operations, four symbols. Count them. Almost every frightening formula is a small tree wearing a long coat — and the coat is notation nobody taught you to pronounce.

THE EVIDENCE

Three symptoms, one cause. You can name every idea in the paragraph and still lose the sentence — that is a *notation* failure, not a comprehension failure.

ANSWERS · FOLD UNDER BEFORE YOU LOOK

What the drills were testing

Drill A

- $P(H \mid E) = \frac{P(E|H)\,P(H)}{P(E)}$ — "P of H given E, equals P of E given H, times P of H, all over P of E."
- $\lim_{x \to a} \frac{f(x) - f(a)}{x - a}$ — "the limit, as x approaches a, of f of x minus f of a, over x minus a."
- $A\mathbf{v} = \lambda\mathbf{v}$ — "A times v equals lambda times v."

The test in each case: did the words arrive in the right order, and did every symbol get named. *"P E H P H"* is a fail even though it is not wrong.

Drill B — the trees

- $\frac{a+b}{c \cdot d}$ — top is the fraction bar. Two children: a sum, and a product.
- $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{x_i - \bar{x}}{s}$ — top is the sum. Its body is a fraction; the fraction's children are a difference and a single symbol.

Note the third one from Drill A: $A\mathbf{v} = \lambda\mathbf{v}$ has no obvious operator at the top, because the top is the **equals sign**. A relation is a node like any other, and an equation is a tree whose root is a claim.

> KEY
>
> **The habit that transfers.** In every formula you meet from now on, ask the same question first: *what is the top of this tree?* Nothing else is worth doing until you can answer it.

DRILL A · SAY · PARSE

Read it aloud, then find the top

A. For each formula, write the spoken form in the space below it, then say it out loud. Do not paraphrase. Do not skip a symbol. The written form is what proves you parsed it.

$$P(H \mid E) = \frac{P(E \mid H)\,P(H)}{P(E)}$$

$$\lim_{x \to a} \frac{f(x) - f(a)}{x - a}$$

$$A\mathbf{v} = \lambda\mathbf{v}$$

B. Circle the outermost operator in each, then draw the tree for the second one in the box. The outermost operator is the one evaluated *last* — the one you reach last when reading left to right.

$$\frac{a + b}{c \cdot d} \qquad \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{x_i - \bar{x}}{s}$$

THE TELL

A fraction bar spans the whole expression beneath it. That span is the outermost operator, drawn as a line.

THE METHOD · AND THE HONEST EXPECTATION

A wall, not a mountain

If the difficulty is saying, parsing and scoping, then the fix is not another four years of mathematics. It is four drills, run on the mathematics you already have reasons to read.

- **Say it.** Out loud, in words, no skipping, no "and so on".
- **Parse it.** Find the outermost operator. Draw the tree.
- **Scope it.** Build a symbol table before you read a line of the argument.
- **Produce it.** Turn it back into English, into code, and into notation again.

Each issue is one rung, and each rung ends with something you can *do* rather than something you have read. **The honest expectation:** this will not make you fluent in research mathematics. It will make you *legible* on what most technical work actually rests on — rates of change, linear structure, probability, evidence.

> KEY
>
> **It is a reading skill.** The mathematics stays where it is. What changes is your ability to walk up to a page of it, take the notation apart, and come away with the argument.

Who it is for

You write code, or you read it. You have met a paper, a datasheet or a proof where the ideas were plain and the notation was not, and you assumed the fault was yours. It was not.

> **One rule.** No symbol goes unnamed. Every formula gets a symbol table before you attempt to understand it. If a symbol is not in the table, the reading stops until it is.

THE SIGNATURE PAGE · IT RETURNS IN EVERY ISSUE

One formula, taken apart

Everything in this series is taught on a plate: a formula set large, then a numbered key. Read the formula first. Then the key. Then the formula again.

Bayes' theorem

$$P(H \mid E) = \frac{P(E \mid H)\,P(H)}{P(E)}$$

1. $P(H \mid E)$ — the posterior: the chance of the hypothesis once the evidence is in.
2. $P(E \mid H)$ — the likelihood: how well the hypothesis predicted this evidence.
3. $P(H)$ — the prior: what you thought before you looked.
4. $P(E)$ — the evidence: how likely the observation is at all.

Notice what the key did. It did not explain probability. It named four things, gave each a spoken form, and pointed at where each sits in the tree.

> KEY
>
> **The one line to carry out.** The bar inside $P(H \mid E)$ is not decoration and not division — it is *conditioning*, and it means "given". Every conditional statement in every paper is a statement about what changes when you are told something.

TRY IT NOW

Say the plate aloud, in words, before you turn the page.

How to use a plate

1. **Read the formula** before the key. Let it be unreadable for a moment.
2. **Draw the tree.** Find the outermost operator.
3. **Name every symbol**, in order, aloud.
4. **Read the formula again.** It is a different object the second time.

WHY THIS IS EASIER FOR YOU THAN FOR MOST

You already have the compiler

Not a metaphor. The constructions are the same; only the glyphs differ.

NOTATION	WHAT IT ACTUALLY IS
$f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$	a type signature
$x \mapsto x^2$	a lambda
$\{x \in \mathbb{R} : x^2 < 2\}$	a comprehension
$\sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i$	a fold over a range
$\frac{d}{dx}$	a higher-order function: function to function
$\frac{\partial}{\partial x}$	one argument of several held fixed
$A\mathbf{v} = \lambda\mathbf{v}$	a fixed point up to scaling
a_{ij} with i repeated	an implicit fold over an index

The one that convinces people

$$\forall \varepsilon > 0\ \exists \delta > 0\ \forall x\ \left(|x - a| < \delta \Rightarrow |f(x) - f(a)| < \varepsilon\right)$$

Read it as loops: *for every epsilon, there is a delta, such that for all x…* Now move the $\exists\delta$ outside the $\forall x$:

$$\exists \delta > 0\ \forall \varepsilon > 0\ \forall x\ \left(\dots\right)$$

Different theorem. Same glyphs, reordered — exactly as swapping two nested loops changes the program. Nobody who can read code finds that mysterious once it is said out loud.

The one you will actually meet

Set-builder notation is a comprehension, character for character:

$\{x \in \mathbb{R} : x^2 < 2\}$ ⟷ `[x for x in R if x**2 < 2]`

A declaration, a collection, a predicate. Once you have seen that, $\{x : P(x)\}$ stops being notation and becomes a loop you already know how to read.

THE HABIT

When a formula looks impossible, count the operators before you read the symbols. Most have three or four.