

Bridge Universe Consolidated Audit Cleanup

Robert E. Branin

July 29, 2026

Table of Contents

Bridge Universe — Consolidated Audit Cleanup

The First Fracture — Movements I & II (Compiled Canon) vs. Creator’s Bible v1.2

Audit date: July 28–29, 2026 **Consolidation date:** July 29, 2026 **Audited document:** The First Fracture — Movements I & II (Compiled), 76 pages, by Robert E. Branin

(Narrowlight Press, 2026) **Source audits merged:** 1. *Bridge Universe — Revised Continuity Audit — TFF Movements I & II, Canon vs. Bible, v2.0 Revised* (July 28, 2026; 380 lines) 2. *Bridge Universe — Line-by-Line Continuity Audit — TFF Pass 2, pp. 26–76* (July 29, 2026; 286 lines) **Cross-reference:** Bridge Universe — Accepted Rulings Matrix (consolidated dispositions) **Revision:** Consolidated Cleanup v1.0

PART I — CLEANUP

This Part I is a clean, consolidated editorial pass that merges both audits into a single authoritative findings register. The authority hierarchy, closed-corpus discipline, and methodology are preserved exactly as written in the v2.0 revised audit. Duplicate findings have been merged. Stylistic observations are not inflated into continuity findings.

1. Methodology and Authority Hierarchy

(Preserved exactly as written in the v2.0 revised audit.)

Authority Hierarchy Applied

This audit applies the following hierarchy consistently. A paraphrased memory note or unrecovered summary does not outrank two directly examined documents that agree.

Current controlling manuscript prose — The First Fracture — Movements I & II (Compiled), 76 pages. The controlling Level 1 manuscript for Movements I and II.

Recovered source-of-truth records and explicit current author rulings — SNAP003/restored source-of-truth rules as preserved in project instructions. Only directly recovered document text qualifies at this level; paraphrased mappings or memory notes do not.

Current story canon — The First Fracture as story-canon authority for its immediate historical period.

Creator's Bible and Durable Master constitutional material — Creator's Bible v1.2 (Constitutional Clarification and Publishing Identity Edition); Durable Master v1.7 (Terminology Governance and Constitutional Reconciliation Edition). Constitutional Canon (Body A).

Superseded drafts, summaries, memory notes, reconstructed mappings, and earlier material — Including memory notes, paraphrased project instructions, and unrecovered SNAP003 content represented only through preserved paraphrase.

Corrected Audit Method

The prior audit treated the Creator's Bible as a whitelist requiring every narrative fact to have appeared there first. That reverses the hierarchy. The correct method is:

Use the Bible to identify actual constitutional constraints.

Use the manuscript to establish narrative facts.

Flag only direct contradiction, not mere absence.

Do not require story-specific facts to be promoted before they are valid.

Do not turn the Bible into an exhaustive encyclopedia of every future narrative fact.

A controlling novel manuscript may establish new narrative facts — characters, locations, institutions, technologies, transit systems, local terminology, infrastructure, professions, and story-specific social structures. Absence from the Bible does not make

those claims unsupported. The manuscript itself supports them unless they conflict with an actual governing constitutional rule.

Body A / Body B Distinction

The Creator’s Bible v1.2 has a standing exclusion (Open Canon Register O-11; Supersession Register) confirming that “First Fracture” material — characters, scenes, prose — is excluded from Constitutional Canon (Body A) and exists in Body B (Narrative Canon) only. This exclusion means the absence of First Fracture narrative elements from the Bible is by design, not a defect. The Bible’s character-function locks for Oren Tal, Tavian Rook, and Aloysius Meeks are noted as Body B locks that govern depiction but do not constitute Constitutional Canon institutions.

2. Consolidated Findings Register

All retained issues, properly categorized. Stylistic observations are not promoted here. The category labels distinguish between: **continuity conflict**, **editorial inconsistency**, **grammar**, **formatting**, **terminology variation**, and **stylistic observation** (the last is excluded from the findings register by rule; see Section 9).

Continuity Conflict

CF-1 (LBL-1): Lio Age Contradiction (19 vs. 17)

Category: CONTINUITY CONFLICT

Severity: Medium

Source: Pass 2 line-by-line audit (LBL-1)

Location: p. 37 (narrative prose) and p. 61 (dialogue); character profile p. 15

Page 37 (narrative prose): “He was nineteen, broad through the shoulders, and dressed in the careful approximation of adulthood favored by applicants who believed a Response Lead might judge their future by the condition of a collar.”

Page 61 (dialogue — Lio’s mother): “You are seventeen. You are not going out there because the systems have stopped making sense.”

Character profile (p. 15): Lio (19)

Assessment: Internal contradiction within the controlling manuscript. Two of three references state 19; one states 17. The mother’s line reads as straightforward factual argument, not intentional error or deception.

Suggested resolution: Change p. 61 “seventeen” to “nineteen” to match p. 37 and the character profile. Alternatively, if the younger age is intended to convey protective instinct, make this explicit in context.

Status: RETAIN — Medium. This is the only internal continuity contradiction found in the audited pages.

Grammar

CF-2 (LBL-2): “it’s” Used as Possessive (p. 59)

Category: GRAMMAR

Severity: Low

Source: Pass 2 line-by-line audit (LBL-2)

Location: p. 59

Original text: “People scattered from it’s path.”

Issue: “it’s” is a contraction of “it is.” The possessive form is “its.”

Suggested correction: “People scattered from its path.”

Status: RETAIN — Low.

Editorial Inconsistency

CF-3 (LBL-3): “Assistant” Capitalization Inconsistency (p. 56)

Category: EDITORIAL INCONSISTENCY

Severity: Low

Source: Pass 2 line-by-line audit (LBL-3)

Location: p. 56 (and pp. 53–56 generally)

Detail: Tavian’s assistant is referred to as “his assistant” (lowercase) on pp. 53, 54, 55, but capitalized as “his Assistant” on p. 56:

p. 53: “His assistant had once asked whether it was discouraging...”

p. 54: “His assistant laughed uneasily.”

p. 55: “His assistant had already begun wrapping a celebrated navigator’s computational astrolabe...”

p. 56: “his Assistant asked” (capitalized)

Assessment: Same character referenced with inconsistent capitalization. “assistant” should be lowercase throughout — a common noun referring to a role, not a proper name or title.

Suggested correction: Change “his Assistant asked” to “his assistant asked” on p. 56.

Status: RETAIN — Low.

CF-4 (LBL-4): Tavora — Character Named Without Introduction (p. 58)

Category: EDITORIAL INCONSISTENCY

Severity: Low

Source: Pass 2 line-by-line audit (LBL-4)

Location: p. 58

Original text: “No estimate. ‘That useful?’ Tavora asked, watching his face as he processed the data.”

Issue: The name “Tavora” appears in dialogue attribution without prior introduction. A nurse was described earlier on the same page (“A nurse came alongside him. She was breathing hard.”), but the name “Tavora” is not connected to the nurse or any other character. “Tavora” appears only once in the entire 76-page manuscript.

Assessment: Minor narrative issue. The reader must infer that Tavora is the nurse mentioned earlier, but the connection is not made explicit.

Suggested action: If Tavora is the nurse, link the name to the earlier description. If Tavora is a different character, provide a brief introduction.

Status: RETAIN — Low.

Formatting

CF-5 (F-1 / LBL-7): Duplicate Movement II Title Text (p. 44)

Category: FORMATTING

Severity: Low

Source: Both audits — v2.0 (F-1) and Pass 2 (LBL-7, carried forward)

Location: p. 44

Detail: “THE FIRST FRACTURE” appears twice on the Movement II title page — once above and once below “Movement II — The Convergence of Chaos and Consequence.”

Assessment: Layout and formatting review only. If intentional styling, no action needed. If unintentional, recommend correction before further distribution. This is not a canon conflict.

Status: RETAIN — Low. (Merged duplicate: v2.0 F-1 and Pass 2 LBL-7 are the same finding.)

Terminology Variation (Downgraded — Not a Conflict)

CF-6 (LBL-6): Anika Soren Dual Titles

Category: TERMINOLOGY VARIATION

Severity: Low (downgraded from narrative-logic finding)

Source: Pass 2 line-by-line audit (LBL-6)

Location: p. 29 (narrative) vs. p. 4 (character profile)

Character profile (p. 4): “CHIEF BERTHING ENGINEER, INFRASTRUCTURE SPECIALIST, BUILDER. MAINTAINER. PROTECTOR.”

Narrative prose (p. 29): “Logistics Hub Supervisor Anika Soren preferred machinery to reunions.”

Assessment: The titles “Chief Berthing Engineer” and “Logistics Hub Supervisor” can coexist. The profile lists a formal rank (“Chief Berthing Engineer”); the narrative uses a job description (“Logistics Hub Supervisor”) for the same character supervising the logistics hub while holding the rank of chief berthing engineer. These are different facets of the same role, not a contradiction. The Bible does not contain an Anika Soren character-function lock, so there is no constitutional constraint to consult.

Disposition: TERMINOLOGY VARIATION — titles can coexist; not a conflict. No correction required for validity. (Optional clarification in the narrative is permissible but not necessary.)

Status: DOWNGRADED. Retained in the register as a terminology variation for transparency.

**Summary of
Findings
Register**

ID

Original ID

Category

Severity

Status

CF-1

LBL-1

Continuity Conflict

Medium

Retain

CF-2

LBL-2

Grammar

Low

Retain

CF-3

LBL-3

Editorial Inconsistency

Low

Retain

CF-4

LBL-4

Editorial Inconsistency

Low

Retain

CF-5

F-1 / LBL-7

Formatting

Low

Retain (merged)

CF-6

LBL-6

Terminology Variation

Low

Downgraded

Note on numbering: CF-1 through CF-6 preserve the original issue substance and approximate order. CF-5 merges the two duplicate references (F-1 and LBL-7). CF-6 is retained for transparency but is downgraded from a conflict to a terminology variation.

3. Verified Claims

Claims directly supported by the Creator's Bible v1.2, Durable Master v1.7, or recovered source-of-truth rules. Merged from both audits; duplicates removed. Pass 2 R-3 (peer-link Communications Lock compliance) is merged into V-7; Pass 2 R-5 (Tavian role consistency) is merged into V-3.

Character-Function Locks (Body B — Narrative Canon)

V-1. Aloysius Meeks — Surveyor, Navigator, Reference and Mapping Specialist -

Manuscript (character profile, p. 10): "Surveyor, Navigator, Reference and Mapping Specialist" - Bible (Part VII, ~Line 1039): "Aloysius Meeks is the surveyor-navigator governing trustworthy physical reference when official maps and positioning systems disagree." - Bible (Part XLV, ~Line 4041): Restated identically. - **Disposition: VERIFIED.** Canon role description directly corresponds to Bible character-function lock. The narrative (pp. 62–75) depicts Meeks using manual instruments to verify physical references when official systems disagree — consistent with the lock's depiction governance. - *Pass 2 confirmation:* Character name and depiction consistent across pp. 62–63, 69–76 (Pass 2 R-8).

V-2. Oren Tal — Musician, Instrument Repair Technician, Harmonics Technician -

Manuscript (character profile, p. 9): "Musician, Instrument Repair Technician, Harmonics Technician" - Bible (Part XXIX, ~Line 2668): "Oren Tal governs music, resonance, harmonics, acoustic pattern, and continuity through sound." - Bible (Part XLV, ~Line 4034): Restated identically. - **Disposition: VERIFIED in function.** "Musician" and "Harmonics Technician" are directly supported by the Bible's "governs music, resonance, harmonics." "Instrument Repair Technician" is a specific narrative expression of the broader function lock and is compatible with it. - **Terminology note:** A secondary project record (memory note, character_role_mapping.md, July 15) uses "instrument restorer" rather than "instrument repair technician." The Bible itself uses neither phrase — it says "governs music... and continuity through sound." The variation between "restorer" (secondary record) and "repair technician" (manuscript) is a terminology variation within "associated roles." Neither contradicts the Bible's function lock. No conflict. - *Pass 2 confirmation:* Oren Tal consistent across pp. 35–36, 41 (Pass 2 R-8).

V-3. Tavian Rook — Archivist, Conservator, Provenance Specialist (merged with Pass

2 R-5) - Manuscript (character profile, p. 14): "Archivist, Conservator, Provenance Specialist" - Manuscript narrative (pp. 52–53): Tavian depicted as a conservator working in the Harbor Eleven Historical Repository, performing restoration work on books and artifacts, governing preservation and provenance. - Bible (Part XVII, ~Line 1749): "Tavian Rook is the conservator/archivist governing preservation, provenance, material

evidence, and what surviving records actually say.” - Bible (Part XLV, ~Line 4037): Restated identically. - **Disposition: VERIFIED AND RESOLVED.** The controlling manuscript (Level 1) and the Creator’s Bible (Level 4) directly agree: Tavian Rook is the archivist/conservator governing preservation, provenance, and material evidence. A secondary project record (memory note, character_role_mapping.md, July 15) contains a paraphrased mapping that assigns Tavian Rook as “security and engineering lead.” This mapping was not recovered from a direct source document — it exists only as a preserved paraphrase or memory note. Per the authority hierarchy, a paraphrased memory note must not outrank two directly examined documents that agree. The “security and engineering lead” mapping is superseded, corrupted, or misattributed. It does not create an unresolved canon conflict. No author ruling required. - *Pass 2 R-5 merged:* Tavian’s narrative depiction (pp. 52–57) is fully consistent with the Bible character-function lock — conserving/restoring books and artifacts, governing preservation, provenance, material evidence, prioritizing provenance records over “treasure” objects (“Provenance over condition. Documentation over object.”). The “security and engineering lead” mapping does not appear anywhere in the narrative. Verified and resolved.

Institutional and Structural Claims

V-4. Harbor Steward role - Manuscript (p. 19): Harbor stewards walk the quays. - Bible (Part XIX, ~Line 1868): “Harbor Steward — Maintains tidal plains, manifests, berths, convoy traffic, harbor rhythm, cargo legitimacy.” - **Disposition: VERIFIED.**

V-5. Harbor District Eleven - Manuscript: Recurring location throughout both movements. - Bible (Part VII, ~Line 1033): “Harbor District Eleven is recorded as a key visual and narrative territory.” - Durable Master (~Lines 5540, 5582, 6536, 6736): Multiple references. - **Disposition: VERIFIED.**

V-6. Floodgate systems - Manuscript (p. 19): Detailed description of floodgate operation. - Bible and Durable Master: Referenced extensively as core infrastructure. - **Disposition: VERIFIED.**

V-7. Peer-link communications and failure mode (*merged with Pass 2 R-3*) - Manuscript (p. 74): “The peer indicator remained active, showing Lio somewhere within the local mesh, but no viable path connected them.” - Manuscript (p. 75): “The represented path disappearing even though the physical route remains continuous.” - Bible (Part XLV, ~Line 4050–4055): “Peer-link communications remain directionally secure. Messages are not to be depicted as intercepted, altered, corrupted, misrouted, falsely authenticated, or degraded by static/corrupt packets. Preferred language for undeliverable messages: ‘No

viable peer path.” - **Disposition: VERIFIED.** The manuscript’s peer-link depictions comply with the Bible’s Communications Lock. Messages are not depicted as intercepted, altered, or corrupted. The failure mode uses the Bible’s preferred language. The distinction between the physical route remaining and the represented path disappearing is consistent with the lock’s framework. - *Pass 2 R-3 merged:* Compliance confirmed across pp. 64, 68, 74–75 — “no viable peer path” language used consistently; messages never depicted as intercepted, altered, corrupted, misrouted, or falsely authenticated; hardened radio (p. 43) remains a separate channel. No issue.

V-8. The Fracture as historical concept - Manuscript: Depicts the onset of civilizational systems disagreement. - Bible (Part V): Two Fracture periods documented (Era I and Era IV). Bible warns: “Do not collapse the two ‘Fracture’ periods into one.” - **Disposition: VERIFIED as concept.** The manuscript does not specify which Fracture period it corresponds to, which is appropriate given the standing exclusion.

V-9. Publishing identity and provenance - Manuscript: “Published by Narrowlight Press,” “Robert E. Branin,” “Copyright © 2026” - Bible (front matter, NP-S01): Narrowlight Press publishing standard confirmed. - **Disposition: VERIFIED.**

V-10. Authorship and AI provenance statement - Manuscript (pp. 16–17): Statement on Authorship, AI, and Creative Provenance. - Bible (front matter): Similar AI-assistance disclosure and human-authorship assertion. - **Disposition: VERIFIED.**

V-11. Cover tagline: “The record does not belong to power. It belongs to continuity.” - Manuscript (cover). - Bible (Part I): Governing philosophy centers on “The record persists” and continuity as civilizational spine. - **Disposition: VERIFIED as thematically consistent.**

4. Narrative Facts Established by the Controlling Manuscript

(Preserved from the v2.0 revised audit.)

The following elements are established by the controlling manuscript (Level 1) as Body B narrative canon. They do not require prior Bible inclusion to be valid. Absence from the Bible is expected per the standing exclusion (O-11). No constitutional conflict was found with any governing rule in the Bible or Durable Master for any of these items.

	Named Characters
Character	
Age	
Role(s) per Manuscript	
Bible Status	
Rhea Teren	
33	
Former Marine Staff Sergeant; SRS Guards Officer; Assessment & Operations	
Not in Bible; established by narrative canon	
Mira Ellison	
38	
Teacher, Linguist, Educator	
Not in Bible; established by narrative canon	
Marek Senn	
58	

Maintenance Specialist; Keeper of Obsolete Competence; Apprentice Mentor

Not in Bible; established by narrative canon

Niko Harven

19

Apprentice Technician; Observation Specialist

Not in Bible; established by narrative canon. Age 19 is controlling; any prior reference to another age is superseded.

Jonas Calder

41

Medical Officer; Trauma Specialist; Keeper of the Living Measure

Not in Bible; established by narrative canon

Brann

19

R.S.R. Field Operator; Relay Survey & Recovery

Not in Bible; established by narrative canon

Anika Soren

32

Chief Berthing Engineer; Infrastructure Specialist

Not in Bible; established by narrative canon

Russ

15

Continuity Heir; Mathematical Prodigy

Not in Bible; established by narrative canon

Lio

Guards Volunteer; Safeguard Response Service (SRS)

Not in Bible; established by narrative canon

SRS / R.S.R. Distinction

The manuscript uses two separate designations that must not be conflated:

SRS — Safeguard Response Service: Associated with Rhea Teren (officer) and Lio (volunteer). The narrative prose uses “Safeguard” throughout (Safeguard Response Office, Safeguard Operations, Safeguard volunteers, Safeguard personnel). The abbreviation “SRS” appears in the character profile images.

R.S.R. — Relay Survey & Recovery: Associated with Brann (field operator). This designation appears in the character profile image. The narrative prose depicts Brann conducting reconnaissance and recovery operations but does not use the “R.S.R.” abbreviation in prose text.

These are distinct organizations with distinct functions. SRS is a safeguard/response service. R.S.R. is a relay survey and recovery operation.

Locations

Location

Manuscript Usage

Bible Status

Concord

Primary city setting throughout both movements

Not in Bible; established by narrative canon

Concord Central Concourse

Recurring location in Movement II

Not in Bible; established by narrative canon

Ground Anchor Station

Major transit hub; Orbital Terminus anchor

Not in Bible; established by narrative canon

Orbital Terminus

Orbital interchange; Russ's father supervises operations

Not in Bible; established by narrative canon

Orbital Elevator / Descent Corridor

“Concord Prima Orbital Lift”; descent carrier sequence (pp. 22–25)

Not in Bible; established by narrative canon

Eastern Agricultural Dome, Nereth

Movement II opening location (p. 44)

Not in Bible; established by narrative canon

Aurilium / Aurilium III

Setting header (p. 19): “AURILIUM III CONCORD PRIME”

Not in Bible; established by narrative canon

Habitat Ring

Referenced on departure boards in character profiles

Not in Bible; established by narrative canon

Tidal basin

Classroom overlooks tidal basin (p. 19)

Not in Bible as specific term; concept compatible with established harbor infrastructure

Institutions

Institution

Manuscript Usage

Bible Status

Safeguard Response Service (SRS)

Central institution; Rhea is an officer, Lio is a volunteer

Not in Bible; established by narrative canon

R.S.R. (Relay Survey & Recovery)

Brann's organization; character profile

Not in Bible; established by narrative canon

Harbor Eleven Historical Repository

Tavian's workplace; old customs house converted to museum/archive (pp. 52–53)

Not in Bible; established by narrative canon

Technology and Infrastructure

Element

Manuscript Usage

Bible Status

Descent carriers / descent elevator

Children discuss identifying vessels from “the carrier’s perspective during descent” (p. 20); full descent sequence (pp. 22–25)

Not in Bible; established by narrative canon

Drop-lighters

“A drop-lighter could just be made out against the stars” (p. 20)

Not in Bible; established by narrative canon

Maglev

“The distant whisper of the maglev crossing the southern guideway” (p. 62)

Not in Bible; established by narrative canon

Orbital-weather systems

Referenced in prologue (p. 17)

Not in Bible; established by narrative canon

Identity/payment ring

Networked finger ring for identity, confirmation, access, and payment (pp. 24, 50)

Not in Bible; established by narrative canon

Wrist units

Separate wrist-mounted communication devices (pp. 51, elsewhere)

Not in Bible; established by narrative canon

Disposition for all items in this section: Established by controlling narrative canon; no constitutional conflict found.

5. Items Reviewed With No Conflict

Merged from both audits; duplicates removed. Pass 2 R-3 (peer-link) and R-5 (Tavian) have been merged into V-7 and V-3 respectively (see Section 3). Pass 2 R-2 (ring/payment) is folded into the Payment/Identity Ring Review (see Section 7).

NCF-1 (v2.0 R-1): Hardened radio static

Manuscript (p. 43): “The hardened radio burst into static. A voice struggled through interference.”

Bible (Part XLV, ~Line 4050): Communications Lock governs “peer-link communications” specifically.

Disposition: REVIEWED — NO CONFLICT. The Communications Lock governs peer-link communications, not every communication system in the universe. A hardened radio is a separate communication channel. The manuscript’s peer-link depictions (Brann and Lio’s devices) fully comply with the lock — they use “no viable path” language and do not depict message degradation. No direct source states that hardened radio and peer-link are the same system. No author review required.

Pass 2 confirmation: The hardened radio (p. 43) confirmed as a separate channel in Pass 2 R-3.

NCF-2 (v2.0 R-2): Contradictory authenticated orders

Manuscript (pp. 39–42): Rhea receives multiple contradictory orders, each carrying valid authentication. “Every order she had received carried valid authentication.”

Bible (Part XLV): Prohibits depicting messages as “falsely authenticated.”

Disposition: REVIEWED — NO CONFLICT. The manuscript does not depict false authentication. The orders genuinely pass authentication. Authentication establishes origin or credential validity — it does not guarantee coherence, wisdom, institutional unity, consistency, correct judgment, or absence of systemic fracture. The issuing authority itself is generating incompatible instructions. This is a manifestation of the Fracture, not a violation of the peer-link security rule. No author review required.

NCF-3 (Pass 2 R-1): SRS / Safeguard usage consistency (pp. 35–43, 60–61)

The narrative prose consistently uses “Safeguard” throughout — “Safeguard Response Office,” “Safeguard Operations,” “Safeguard volunteers,” “Safeguard personnel,” “Safeguard insignia,” “Safeguard qualification.” The abbreviation “SRS” appears only in the character profile images, not in the narrative prose. No conflation with R.S.R. detected.

Disposition: NO ISSUE. Consistent with the SRS/R.S.R. distinction established in Section 4.

NCF-4 (Pass 2 R-4): Niko’s age consistency (pp. 32, 59)

Character profile (p. 7): “Niko Harven (19)”

p. 59: When Jonas asks “Age?”, Niko answers “Nineteen.”

Disposition: NO ISSUE. Per author ruling, Niko is 19. Any prior reference to another age is superseded (see S-2). (*Note: distinct from Lio’s age contradiction, CF-1, which concerns a different character.*)

NCF-5 (Pass 2 R-6): Section header structure (pp. 26–76)

Section headers follow a consistent pattern: centered all-caps title, followed by character name and location. Two instances of “THIRTY MINUTES” as a header (pp. 63, 66) are intentional — the first begins Brann’s scouting section, the second continues it after Russ’s interlude.

Disposition: NO ISSUE.

NCF-6 (Pass 2 R-7): Timeline consistency (pp. 26–76)

Movement I and Movement II depict the same Fracture event from different perspectives. Movement I: morning through midday; Movement II: the same day continuing. Events are simultaneous or sequential within the same day. No timeline contradictions detected. The thirty-minute countdown (pp. 61–75) is internally consistent: 14 minutes (p. 67), 19 minutes (p. 68), 24 minutes (p. 68), 26 minutes (p. 70), 28 minutes (p. 72), 29 minutes (p. 73), expiry (p. 75).

Disposition: NO ISSUE.

NCF-7 (Pass 2 R-8): Character name consistency (pp. 26–76)

All character names used consistently throughout: Ilyan Vos (p. 26), Anika Soren (p. 29), Marek Senn (pp. 31–35, 59–60), Niko Harven (pp. 32–35, 59–60), Rhea Teren (pp. 35–43, 60–61), Lio Marran (pp. 37–43, 61–68), Oren Tal (pp. 35–36, 41), Tavian Rook (pp. 52–57), Jonas Calder (pp. 57–60), Brann (pp. 61–76), Aloysius Meeks (pp. 62–63, 69–76), Russ (pp. 49–52, 65–66), Marc (Lio’s father, p. 61).

Disposition: NO ISSUE.

NCF-8 (Pass 2 R-9): Back cover — six movement descriptions (p. 76)

The back cover lists six movements with taglines:

Movement I: “When the first note was wrong, no one knew what song had changed.”

Movement II: “Chance and choice collide. The cost is paid in real time.”

Movement III: “Some things are erased. Some are rewritten. Some remember.”

Movement IV: “What was built to endure may be the key to what broke.”

Movement V: “Loyalties are tested. Burdens are chosen. Paths divide.”

Movement VI: “The fracture is not mended. It is carried forward.”

These are consistent with the novel’s themes and the Bible’s Fracture periods. No constitutional conflict.

Disposition: NO ISSUE.

6. Superseded or Corrupted Prior Claims

(Preserved from the v2.0 revised audit.)

S-1. Tavian Rook “security and engineering lead” mapping

Source: Memory note (character_role_mapping.md, July 15, 2026) and BU 2 project instructions Section 5. These are secondary project records, not directly examined source documents.

Claim: “Tavian Rook = security and engineering lead, and associated roles.”

Status: SUPERSEDED OR CORRUPTED. The controlling manuscript (Level 1) assigns Tavian Rook as “Archivist, Conservator, Provenance Specialist.” The Creator’s Bible v1.2 (Level 4) assigns him as “conservator/archivist governing preservation, provenance, material evidence.” These two directly examined documents agree. The “security and engineering lead” mapping was not recovered from a direct source document — it exists only as a preserved paraphrase. Per the authority hierarchy, a paraphrased memory note must not override direct manuscript and Bible agreement.

Resolution: Tavian Rook is canonically the Archivist / Conservator / Provenance Specialist. The “security and engineering lead” mapping is superseded, corrupted, or misattributed. No author ruling required.

S-2. Niko Harven age — any prior reference to 17, 15, 13, or another age

Source: Controlling manuscript character profile establishes Niko Harven as 19.

Status: SUPERSEDED. Any prior reference to Niko as 17, 15, 13, or another age is superseded by the controlling manuscript. Use 19 consistently.

Note: This concerns Niko Harven specifically. It is distinct from CF-1 (LBL-1), the Lio age contradiction, which is an unresolved internal manuscript contradiction about a different character.

S-3. Prior audit’s treatment of narrative facts as “unsupported”

Status: SUPERSEDED. The prior audit classified 20 narrative elements as “unsupported” because they were absent from the Bible. This methodologically reversed the authority hierarchy. Absence from the Bible does not make a manuscript claim unsupported. These items are reclassified in Section 4 as established by controlling narrative canon.

7. Payment/Identity Ring Visibility and Continuity Review

(Preserved from the v2.0 revised audit; incorporates Pass 2 R-2 full-text confirmation.)

Ring Establishment

The manuscript establishes a networked finger ring through routine use in the descent sequence:

Page 24 (descent corridor): “A connection request crossed his display. He turned the ring once against his finger, confirming it without interrupting the conversation.”

This establishes the ring as a device connected to the wearer's accounts and personal systems, functioning as an ordinary identity, confirmation, access, and payment interface. The technology is established through habitual action, not exposition.

Ring Usage in the Bakery Scene

The bakery scene (pp. 49–50) correctly uses the ring rather than a separate “payment chip”:

Page 50: “the payment terminal rejected the man’s ring. He tried again.”

Page 50: “Russ tried his ring. Nothing. He tried again. The terminal displayed a processing symbol, then nothing.”

Page 50: “My account shows funds,” she said, voice level but beginning to fracture. “I have credits. Plenty of them.” / “The terminal disagrees.”

This depicts the exact scenario where merchant terminals reject the ring while the wearer’s device still reports valid funds or credentials — consistent with the Fracture’s systemic disagreement.

“Chip” References

Zero instances of the word “chip” appear anywhere in the 76-page manuscript. No corrections are needed. There are no references to “chip” that should be “ring.”

(Confirmed by full-text search in both v2.0 audit and Pass 2 R-2.)

**Ring and Device
References in the
Manuscript**

Device

Context

Text

24

Finger ring

Descent corridor — connection confirmation

“He turned the ring once against his finger, confirming it without interrupting the conversation.”

50

Finger ring

Bakery — payment terminal rejection

“the payment terminal rejected the man’s ring. He tried again.”

50

Finger ring

Bakery — Russ’s payment attempt

“Russ tried his ring. Nothing. He tried again.”

50

Personal display

Bakery — account shows valid funds while terminal rejects

“My account shows funds,” she said. “I have credits. Plenty of them.”

51

Wrist unit

Concourse — people trying to contact others

“their wrists held in front of them like supplicants offering prayers to systems that were no longer listening”

51

Wrist unit

Concourse — man at transit gates

“held his wrist up repeatedly, asking the same question to a system that kept giving him answers”

Elsewhere

Wrist unit

Tavian’s notification

“his wrist unit vibrated”

Ring Continuity Assessment

Ring is established through habitual action in the descent sequence (p. 24). No unnecessary exposition.

Ring is used consistently for payment in the bakery scene (p. 50).

Ring rejection while the wearer’s account still reports valid funds is depicted as a Fracture symptom (p. 50).

No instances of the word “chip” were found anywhere in the manuscript; no corrective ring insertions are recommended based on the reviewed device/payment scenes.

The ring (finger) and wrist unit (wrist) appear to be distinct devices serving related but separate functions. The ring handles identity confirmation and payment; the wrist unit handles communication and contact. No conflation was found between them.

Disposition: CONSISTENT. No corrections needed. The ring technology is established through routine use and applied consistently. (*Merges Pass 2 R-2 ring/payment references.*)

8. Corrected Source List

(Preserved from the v2.0 revised audit.)

Sources are separated by examination tier. Only Bridge Universe documents were used. No external or AI-derived sources were consulted. (*Closed-corpus discipline preserved.*)

A. Directly Examined Controlling Sources	
ID	
Document	
Edition/Version	
Body/Level	
Role in Audit	
S1	
The First Fracture — Movements I & II (Compiled)	
Canon declaration, July 28, 2026	
Body B / Level 1 (manuscript prose)	
Audited document (controlling)	
S2	
The Bridge Universe Creator's Bible	
v1.2, Constitutional Clarification and Publishing Identity Edition	
Body A / Level 4	
Primary comparison source	
S3	

The Bridge Universe Durable Master

v1.7, Terminology Governance and Constitutional Reconciliation Edition

Body A / Level 4

Secondary comparison source

Note on SNAP003: A directly recovered SNAP003 document was not located during this audit. The SNAP003/restored source-of-truth rules are referenced in the BU 2 project instructions but the original document text was not directly examined. No claims in this audit depend on unrecovered SNAP003 content.

B. Secondary Project Records

ID

Document

Date

Role in Audit

S4

BU 2 Project Instructions (Sections 1–9)

Current

Audit methodology and authority hierarchy reference

S5

Memory note: character_role_mapping.md

July 15, 2026

Character-role mapping (secondary; superseded where it conflicts with S1/S2)

S6

Memory note: chronology_discipline.md

July 15, 2026

Chronology category definitions

S7

Memory note: publishing_structure.md

July 26, 2026

Publishing identity confirmation

C. Unrecovered or Inferential Material

ID

Item

Status

S8

SNAP003 original document text

NOT DIRECTLY RECOVERED. Referenced through project instructions and memory notes only. No audit claims depend on its content.

S9

“Security and engineering lead” role mapping for Tavian Rook

UNRECOVERED. Exists only as paraphrase in secondary records (S5). Superseded by direct manuscript (S1) and Bible (S2) agreement.

Documents NOT used (excluded per closed-corpus discipline): - No external web sources - No AI-derived reference material - No non-Bridge-Universe documents

9. Removed/Downgraded Items

This section documents what was removed or downgraded from the source audits and why, for full transparency.

Removed

LBL-5: “the boys” without clear antecedent (p. 62) — REMOVED

Original text: “He continued watching until the last of the boys disappeared into the afternoon crowds. Only then did he return to his desk.”

Original Pass 2 assessment: The definite article “the” in “the last of the boys” suggests specific boys that Meeks was watching, but no boys were introduced in Meeks’s section. Marked as a low-severity narrative-logic issue.

Removal rationale: This is not a genuine continuity contradiction. The phrase is a stylistic observation about referential specificity, not a factual conflict between sources or an internal contradiction of established fact. Per the consolidation rules, stylistic observations are not inflated into continuity findings. The text is internally coherent; the referent (concourse pedestrians, including youths) is inferable from the surrounding concourse scene. No canon fact is contradicted.

Status: REMOVED from the findings register. Documented here for transparency.

Downgraded

LBL-6: Anika Soren dual titles — DOWNGRADED to Terminology Variation

Original Pass 2 assessment: Character profile lists “Chief Berthing Engineer”; narrative prose uses “Logistics Hub Supervisor.” Originally flagged as a low-severity narrative-logic (terminology variation) issue.

Downgrade rationale: The titles “Chief Berthing Engineer” and “Logistics Hub Supervisor” can coexist — a formal rank and a job description for the same role are not mutually exclusive. This is not a conflict. It is reclassified as a **Terminology Variation** (CF-6 in the findings register). The Bible contains no Anika Soren character-function lock, so there is no constitutional constraint to consult.

Status: DOWNGRADED. Retained in the findings register as CF-6 for transparency, but classified as a terminology variation rather than a continuity conflict. No correction required for validity.

Stylistic Observations (Not Promoted)

The following observations from the source audits are noted as stylistic only and are deliberately **not** promoted to continuity findings, per the consolidation rules:

The “the boys” referential specificity (LBL-5) — see above.

General prose-style observations implicit in the Pass 2 “no issue” items (e.g., concourse description pacing, header repetition intent) — these are stylistic and do not bear on canon or continuity.

10. Consolidated Numerical Summary

Findings Register	
Category	
Count	
Items	
Continuity conflict	
1	
CF-1 (LBL-1: Lio age, 19 vs 17)	

Grammar

1

CF-2 (LBL-2: it's/its, p. 59)

Editorial inconsistency

2

CF-3 (LBL-3: Assistant capitalization, p. 56); CF-4 (LBL-4: Tavora introduction, p. 58)

Formatting

1

CF-5 (F-1/LBL-7: duplicate title text, p. 44)

Terminology variation (downgraded)

1

CF-6 (LBL-6: Anika dual titles)

Total retained findings

6

Removed (not genuine issues)

1

LBL-5 (“the boys”) — stylistic only

Verified Claims

11 items (V-1 through V-11): 3 character-function locks, 5 institutional/structural claims, 1 communications-lock compliance verification, 2 provenance/front-matter claims.
(Merged: Pass 2 R-3 folded into V-7; Pass 2 R-5 folded into V-3.)

Narrative Facts Established by Controlling Manuscript

9 named characters not in Bible (established by narrative canon, no conflict)

9 locations not in Bible (established by narrative canon, no conflict)

3 institutions not in Bible (established by narrative canon, no conflict)

6 technology/infrastructure elements not in Bible (established by narrative canon, no conflict)

Actual Conflicts

0 items. No conflicts found between the controlling manuscript and any directly examined source document. (CF-1 is an *internal* manuscript contradiction, not a conflict between sources.)

Reviewed Items With No Conflict

8 items (NCF-1 through NCF-8): hardened radio static; contradictory authenticated orders; SRS/Safeguard usage; Niko age consistency; section header structure; timeline consistency; character name consistency; back cover movement descriptions. (*Merged: Pass 2 R-3 folded into V-7; Pass 2 R-5 folded into V-3; Pass 2 R-2 folded into Section 7 ring review.*)

Superseded or Corrupted Prior Claims

3 items: Tavian Rook “security and engineering lead” mapping (S-1, superseded); Niko Harven prior age references (S-2, superseded); prior audit’s “unsupported” classification methodology (S-3, superseded).

Payment/Identity Ring Review

0 corrections needed. Ring established through habitual action; used consistently; zero “chip” references found in manuscript. (*Merges Pass 2 R-2.*)

Communications Lock Items

0 items requiring author review. Both communications-related items (NCF-1, NCF-2) reviewed with no conflict.

Optional Constitutional Promotion Candidates

5 items listed in the v2.0 audit (SRS, Concord, Ground Anchor Station, R.S.R., Orbital Terminus/Elevator). Promotion optional and purpose-dependent, not required for validity. (*Preserved from v2.0; not a findings category.*)

Corrected Canon Dispositions Summary

Item

Disposition

Tavian Rook role

VERIFIED AND RESOLVED — Archivist / Conservator / Provenance Specialist

Niko Harven age

ESTABLISHED — 19; any prior age superseded

SRS and R.S.R.

DISTINCT — SRS (Safeguard Response Service) associated with Rhea/Lio; R.S.R. (Relay Survey & Recovery) associated with Brann

Hardened radio static

REVIEWED — NO CONFLICT

Contradictory authenticated orders

REVIEWED — NO CONFLICT

Compiled 76-page manuscript

CONTROLLING — Level 1 manuscript for Movements I and II

Named characters, locations, institutions, technologies

ESTABLISHED by controlling narrative canon; no constitutional conflict found

Duplicate Movement II title text

FORMATTING — layout review only

Constitutional promotion

OPTIONAL and purpose-dependent, not required for validity

Payment/identity ring

CONSISTENT — established through habitual action; zero “chip” references

Lio age (19 vs 17)

CONTINUITY CONFLICT — internal contradiction; resolve to 19

“it’s” → “its” (p. 59)

GRAMMAR — correct to “its”

“Assistant” capitalization (p. 56)

EDITORIAL INCONSISTENCY — lowercase throughout

Tavora introduction (p. 58)

EDITORIAL INCONSISTENCY — provide introduction

Anika Soren dual titles

TERMINOLOGY VARIATION — titles can coexist; not a conflict

“the boys” (p. 62)

REMOVED — stylistic observation, not a continuity contradiction

PART II — AUDIT QUALITY REVIEW

This Part II reviews both source audit documents (the v2.0 revised audit and the Pass 2 line-by-line audit) for duplicated methodology, unnecessary repetition, circular reasoning, simplification opportunities, and inconsistencies between the two audits. Findings are presented as a concise list with recommendations for future audits.

AQ-1. Duplicated methodology and authority hierarchy

Finding: Both audits restate the authority hierarchy and methodology. The v2.0 audit states it in full (Section 1); the Pass 2 audit states it in abbreviated form in its header (“Methodology: Authority hierarchy per v2.0 revised audit... Closed-corpus discipline maintained.”). This is defensible — Pass 2 correctly references v2.0 rather than restating — but the consolidation now carries a single authoritative copy (Part I, Section 1), eliminating the need for any future audit to restate it.

Recommendation: Future audits should reference the consolidated methodology section by citation rather than restating the hierarchy. A single canonical methodology document should be maintained and versioned; each audit cites the version it applied.

AQ-2. Unnecessary repetition — ring/payment review

Finding: The Payment/Identity Ring Review appears in the v2.0 audit (Section 9) and is independently re-verified in Pass 2 (R-2). Both reach the identical conclusion (zero “chip” references; ring used consistently; ring and wrist unit distinct). The Pass 2 version adds the explicit full-text-search confirmation across pp. 26–76, which is the only genuinely new content.

Recommendation: The consolidated document merges these into a single ring review (Part I, Section 7). Future audits should not re-run a full review of an already-reviewed subsystem unless new manuscript pages in scope actually touch that subsystem. A “previously reviewed” flag should prevent duplicate re-verification.

AQ-3. Unnecessary repetition — Tavian Rook verification

Finding: Tavian Rook's role consistency is verified in v2.0 (V-3) and re-verified in Pass 2 (R-5). Both reach the identical conclusion: manuscript and Bible agree on Archivist/Conservator/Provenance Specialist; the "security and engineering lead" mapping is superseded/corrupted and appears nowhere in the narrative. No new information is added by the second pass.

Recommendation: Character-function-lock verifications should be performed once against the full manuscript. A line-by-line pass that re-checks the same lock over a new page range adds no value unless the new pages depict the character in a way that *could* contradict the lock. Future audits should track which locks have been verified against which page ranges to avoid redundant re-verification.

AQ-4. Unnecessary repetition — peer-link Communications Lock compliance

Finding: Peer-link compliance is verified in v2.0 (V-7, citing pp. 74–75) and re-verified in Pass 2 (R-3, citing pp. 64, 68, 74–75). The page ranges overlap on pp. 74–75. Both reach the identical conclusion: compliance confirmed; "no viable peer path" language used; no interception/alteration/corruption depicted; hardened radio is a separate channel.

Recommendation: Same as AQ-3. A coverage matrix (lock × page range verified) would prevent overlapping re-verification. The consolidated document merges V-7 and R-3 into a single entry (Part I, Section 3, V-7).

AQ-5. Inconsistent issue numbering and category labels

Finding: The two audits use different numbering schemes and category labels: - v2.0 uses V-n (verified), R-n (reviewed, no conflict), S-n (superseded), F-n (formatting). - Pass 2 uses LBL-n (line-by-line issues) and R-n (reviewed, no issue) — the R- prefix collides with v2.0's R- prefix but refers to a different list (Pass 2 R-1 = SRS/Safeguard, whereas v2.0 R-1 = hardened radio). - Pass 2 labels LBL-1 as "Narrative logic (internal contradiction)" while the accepted rulings matrix and this consolidation classify it as a "Continuity Conflict." The category vocabulary is not standardized across audits. - Pass 2 labels LBL-3 as "Spelling/grammar (capitalization)" while this consolidation classifies it as "Editorial Inconsistency." Capitalization inconsistency is editorial, not strictly grammar. - Pass 2 labels LBL-6 as "Narrative logic (terminology variation)," a hybrid label; this consolidation cleanly separates "Terminology Variation" as its own category.

Recommendation: Adopt a single standardized category taxonomy before future audits: **Continuity Conflict, Editorial Inconsistency, Grammar, Formatting, Terminology Variation, Stylistic Observation.** Use a single global numbering scheme (e.g., CF-n for

consolidated findings) and avoid reusing prefix letters (R-) across separate lists in the same project. The consolidated document (Part I, Section 2) applies this standardized taxonomy.

AQ-6. Inconsistent severity vocabulary

Finding: Both audits use “Medium” and “Low” severity, which is consistent. However, Pass 2’s numerical summary subdivides Low into “(spelling/grammar)” and “(narrative logic)” and “(formatting)” sub-buckets, mixing severity with category. v2.0 does not subdivide. This makes cross-audit counting error-prone.

Recommendation: Separate severity (a scalar: High/Medium/Low) from category (a label) in all summaries. Do not combine them in a single count column. The consolidated summary (Part I, Section 10) keeps these orthogonal.

AQ-7. Potential circular reasoning in the Tavian disposition

Finding: The v2.0 audit’s V-3 and S-1 both rely on the same argument structure: the manuscript and Bible agree (so the mapping is verified), and the contradictory memory note is superseded *because* the manuscript and Bible agree. This is not circular in a fallacious sense — the two directly examined sources genuinely agree, and the memory note is lower in the hierarchy — but the presentation reuses the same evidence for both “verified” and “superseded” dispositions without clearly separating the two logical steps.

Recommendation: Future audits should structure such dispositions as two distinct steps: (1) verification step — what do the directly examined sources say, and do they agree? (2) supersession step — does any lower-tier record contradict the verified result, and is it therefore superseded? Keeping these steps visibly separate prevents the appearance of circularity even when the reasoning is sound.

AQ-8. Simplification opportunity — merge “no conflict” and “no issue” lists

Finding: v2.0 uses “Reviewed Items With No Conflict” (R-1, R-2); Pass 2 uses “Items Reviewed With No Issue Found” (R-1 through R-9). These are functionally the same category with different labels. The consolidation merges them into a single “Items Reviewed With No Conflict” section (Part I, Section 5).

Recommendation: Standardize on one label (“Reviewed — No Conflict”) for all items that were checked and found clean. Eliminate the “no issue” vs “no conflict” distinction, which conveys no meaningful difference.

AQ-9. Simplification opportunity — eliminate redundant “priority recommendations” section

Finding: Pass 2 includes a “Priority Recommendations” section (Section 5) that re-lists all seven LBL issues with their suggested actions. This duplicates the per-issue assessments already given in Section 2 of Pass 2. The consolidation does not carry a separate recommendations section; each finding carries its own suggested resolution inline.

Recommendation: Do not maintain a separate summary-recommendations section that merely repeats inline assessments. Either inline the recommendation with each finding (as the consolidation does) or, if a priority list is needed, limit it to action items requiring author decision (i.e., exclude items already resolved or downgraded).

AQ-10. Inconsistency in scope labeling

Finding: Pass 2’s header says “Pages 26-76: Previously Unexamined Pages” but its scope statement clarifies the actual ranges are pp. 26–43, 54–76 (the Movement II title page p. 44 and pp. 44–53 were covered in v2.0). The header is imprecise and could be read to claim pp. 44–53 were unexamined, when they were examined in v2.0.

Recommendation: State page ranges precisely in headers and scope statements. Avoid shorthand ranges that include previously examined pages. A coverage map (which audit examined which pages) should accompany every audit.

AQ-11. No circular reasoning detected in substantive findings

Finding: Aside from the presentational concern in AQ-7, no genuine circular reasoning was detected in either audit. The authority hierarchy is applied consistently: directly examined sources outrank paraphrased memory notes; absence from the Bible is not treated as unsupported once the Body A/B distinction is applied; the “unsupported” reclassification (S-3) corrects a prior methodological error rather than compounding it.

Recommendation: Maintain this discipline. The single most important safeguard is the rule that a paraphrased memory note must not outrank two directly examined documents that agree — apply it explicitly wherever a secondary record conflicts with direct sources.

AQ-12. Opportunity to consolidate the “optional constitutional promotion” section

Finding: The v2.0 audit includes an “Optional Constitutional Promotion Candidates” section (Section 8) listing five Body B elements that *could* be promoted to Body A. This is forward-looking guidance, not an audit finding. It does not appear in Pass 2. The

consolidation preserves it (noted in Part I, Section 10) but does not elevate it to a findings category.

Recommendation: Separate audit findings (retrospective: what is the state of the text?) from governance recommendations (prospective: what should be promoted/frozen?). Keep promotion candidates in a governance tracker, not in the audit findings register. This prevents the audit from drifting into editorial planning.

Summary of Part II Recommendations

Maintain a single versioned methodology document; cite it, do not restate it. (AQ-1)

Track a coverage matrix (subsystem × page range) to prevent redundant re-verification of ring, Tavian, and peer-link items. (AQ-2, AQ-3, AQ-4)

Adopt a single standardized category taxonomy and a single global numbering scheme before future audits. (AQ-5)

Keep severity (scalar) and category (label) orthogonal in all summaries. (AQ-6)

Structure verified-and-superseded dispositions as two visibly distinct logical steps. (AQ-7)

Standardize on one “no conflict” label; eliminate the “no issue” vs “no conflict” distinction. (AQ-8)

Do not maintain a separate recommendations section that duplicates inline assessments. (AQ-9)

State page ranges precisely; accompany every audit with a coverage map. (AQ-10)

Preserve the direct-source-over-paraphrase safeguard explicitly. (AQ-11)

Separate audit findings from governance recommendations; keep promotion candidates in a tracker. (AQ-12)

End of consolidated document.