

Continue





























最后编辑于 2022-10-09 · IP 江苏江苏2分多的杂志，修回时已经过一次单位(共同一作)，可最近单位又有变动，可不可以收到proof时再次更改呢:P，作者和顺序都没有变。有经验的高手指点一下。Page 2帖子标题楼主回复/浏览最后回复Page 3帖子标题楼主回复/浏览最后回复Page 4帖子标题楼主回复/浏览最后回复Page 5 肝胆外科医师 - 最后编辑于 2012-02-29 · IP 湖北湖北Springer在线修改e-proof指导手册.pdf (1.2 MB)Page 2帖子标题楼主回复/浏览最后回复Page 3帖子标题楼主回复/浏览最后回复Page 4帖子标题楼主回复/浏览最后回复Page 5 心血管内科医师 - 最后编辑于 2022-10-09 · 来自 Android · IP 山东山东这里我学毕业了 所以机构换了 我不能直接给他签了 还有签名可以写中文吗Page 2帖子标题楼主回复/浏览最后回复Page 3帖子标题楼主回复/浏览最后回复Page 4帖子标题楼主回复/浏览最后回复Page 5 Bonjour, Comment traduire "BAT" en anglais dans le jargon des imprimeurs? BAT = Bon à tirer/Merci! AB Il me semble que c'est "too" Il y a aussi "Ready for press": Mention qu'un client appose, suivie de sa signature, sur une épreuve complète de d'imprimerie pour donner son accord définitif avant tirage, sous réserve que soient apportées les ultimes corrections demandées. Cette mention et la signature dégagent la responsabilité de l'imprimeur. C'est à dire, accord donné sur le BAT.Hi, Can someone help me translate BAT, bon a tirer for textile impression. "Pour lancer la production, vous devez nous retourner le BAT signé." Thank you very much. It means the "press proof" or maybe the "glossy for printing" In french BAT means "bon à tirer", i.e. "Épreuve complète soumise avant tirage pour accord définitif." Is it ok? Elfo La définition de "press proof" est : "Actual press sheet to show image, tone values and colours as well as imposition of form or presplate." Est-ce cela que vous cherchez? Simon c'est "glossy for printing" yes it sounds good but I don t know what to pick. I also read ready for print. Which is the best for textile printing? Thanks Je ne pense pas être autorisé à mettre un lien dans ce forum. Cependant vous pouvez écrire "grand dictionnaire terminologique" dans google et cliquer sur le premier, "graddictionnaire". Cela vous aidera sûrement à trouver une traduction correcte. Je l'utilise toujours pour les mots techniques. Il est grandiose. moi aussi je l utilise mais il ne me dit pas pour le textile. Merci beaucoup sébastien Il vous renseigne sur l'impression cependant. N'est-ce pas la même chose? Je ne pourrai cependant pas vous éclaircir plus loin. Ya-t-il un English native speaker dans la salle? Dans le domaine du textile on appelle ça un pre production sample (ppsample) sign-off (to sign off on a final proof) Hello, I'd suggest "ready for press". Cheers, Elias Hi there! I wonder if there is any difference in using and meaning between "proof reading and proofreading", if so, could you provide an explanation and example for each of them, please? Many thanks in advance!!! Thanks Vell Bruixot. Now if there is no difference in meaning, can someone tell me when you use proof reading and when proofreading? I've also found that sometimes you use a dash between proof and read, like this proof-read / proof-reading. Is it any grammatical rule for this, or the difference in spelling vary between English speaking countries?? Many thanks in advance. Thanks Vell Bruixot. Now if there is no difference in meaning, can someone tell me when you use proof reading and when proofreading? I've also found that sometimes you use a dash between proof and read, like this proof-read / proof-reading. Is it any grammatical rule for this, or the difference in spelling vary between English speaking countries?? Many thanks in advance. All my North American dictionaries and my university notes all indicate "proofreading" as one word. I have seen proof-reading but I don't think that is accepted as standard, at least in the US. The hyphenated version proof-reading seems to be used in the UK at times, and in some other countries such as Singapore. I noticed that the BBC usage seems to be consistently one word, proofreading. Others may have different observations and opinions, however. 急诊医学医学生 - 最后编辑于 2022-10-09 · 来自 Android · IP 辽宁辽宁请问投过的老师可以告知一下，Frontiers系列期刊Proof会有几次，我上传了两个proof版本，原因是把通讯作者放在了第一位，第一遍proof没有注意到这个问题。 好烦，自己辛辛苦苦写的文章到最后不是一作就悲剧了Page 2帖子标题楼主回复/浏览最后回复Page 3帖子标题楼主回复/浏览最后回复Page 4帖子标题楼主回复/浏览最后回复Page 5 Hello everyone. Can you please tell me what's the ultimate truth about the word? What I mean is I've heard a lot of different versions of how to use it, if it can be plural or not etc Some claim: You definitely can say - I have a lot of proofs about this or that; while others say: If you use proofs in a sentence, people will think you're illiterate because it can only be used in the singular. I just can't seem to wrap my head around that. Who's right? Any help would be much appreciated. Thanks in advance. Proofs of what? One single piece of evidence may be proof of a criminal's guilt. You could fill a small book with proofs of Pythagoras's Theorem. I see you used both proofs and proof, entangledbank Does it make any difference what kind of proof it may be? Like if it's not a single piece of evidence in a criminal case but two pieces. Would that make it proof or proofs? Can you please tell me what's the ultimate truth about the word? There is no "ultimate truth" about anything. Proof = incontrovertible evidence, is a concept: "These photographs and your fingerprints are proof that you were in the house." In this meaning, "proof" is uncountable - never plural. A proof - a formal, written, demonstration of the truth of a mathematical theory - is countable. As a general piece of advice: Some claim: You definitely can say - I have a lot of proofs about this or that while others say: If you use proofs in a sentence, people will think you're illiterate because it can only be used in the singular. PaulQ, thank you very much! So proofs can actually only be used if we talk about proven mathematical formulas, is that correct? I agree with the above. You can also use proofs to refer to draft copies of a publication or document (this word is often used in the printing industry). You can also use proofs to refer to draft copies of a publication or document (this word is often used in the printing industry). Also of photographs; a coin struck as a pattern or test piece; the degree of alcoholic content of liquids. Hi, everyone! The verb to prove / to proof in relation to dough are kind of used interchangeably in British sources on the Net (although to proof seems to be far less common). However, dictionaries, including the OALD, the Collins and the Macmillan only list to prove in that meaning and only as an intransitive verb (that is, you can leave the dough to prove by itself, but you cannot prove the dough). My question is whether there is a preferred variant in British English and whether the verb can be used transitively. Also, if I were to come up with a name for a dough proving mode in a multifunctional oven (a one where the oven maintains an optimal temperature for dough proving), would the phrase Prove mode be understandable to a native speaker? Or would Dough Proving mode work much better? In BrE, I have only ever come across "prove" in relation to dough. OED does offer "proof", though, and although there is no note (as there sometimes is with other pairs of similar verbs), I see that this meaning of "proof" is transitive whereas this meaning of "prove" is intransitive. This strikes me as odd, as it is very unusual to have different transitive and intransitive verbs in English (off the top of my head, I can only think of "lay" and "lie", but I think there are one or two others). Certainly, I would have no hesitation in using "prove" transitively if the need arose, although I cannot imagine why it would. Also, if I were to come up with a name for a dough proving mode in a multifunctional oven (a one where the oven maintains an optimal temperature for dough proving), would the phrase Prove mode be understandable to a native speaker? Or would Dough Proving mode work much better? I would be inclined to include "dough" or "bread", at least in the instructions, but "prove" on its own might be enough as a setting on the machine. If the selection is by means of a dial, then the very low temperature needed for proving - presumably matched by the dial position - will doubtless give users some clue as to its purpose. I've seen lots of cooking shows where they proof the dough in a proofing drawer. Note this is listed as transitive. proof - WordReference.com Dictionary of English v.t. 28 to test the effectiveness of (yeast), as by combining with warm water so that a bubbling action occurs, to cause (esp. bread dough) to rise due to the addition of baker's yeast or other leavening. Removed post. (I misunderstood, sorry!) Edit: thanks Myridion, for the post following this. I had never heard 'proof the dough' before. Salvo a tutti! Nel romanzo che sto traducendo mi sono imbattuto in questa frase idiomatica, una variazione di un'altra frase idiomatica: "the proof of the pudding is in the eating", che non riesco a contestualizzare. Un armaiolo ottocentesco è stato incaricato dal re di costruire un cannone in particolare. Il re vuole avere il suo cannone in un tempo brevissimo (un paio di giorni), anche se l'armaiolo gli spiega che è un'impresa quasi impossibile. Un amico dell'armaiolo gli chiede cosa ha intenzione di fare e lui risponde: "I'll tell the king that the proof will be in the pudding. I fancy keeping my head". Partendo dal presupposto che l'espressione idiomatica si traduce bene o male con "provare per credere", come posso tradurla in questo contesto? Grazie! Ciao takashimike! Non sono d'accordo con la traduzione di "provare per credere". Ho sempre sentito la frase "The proof is in the pudding" che (per me) significa che "la riuscita dell'impresa sta nel risultato". Infatti se una crema (pudding) è ben fatta, si vede dal risultato (riuscita male, potrebbe avere dei grumi, o rimanere troppo liquida). E infatti (come nella tua frase "the proof of the pudding is in the eating") finché non l'assaggi non saprai. Prova ora a tradurre la frase. Last edited: Apr 29, 2014 Grazie della precisazione, Curioso! A ogni modo, avevo dimenticato un dettaglio importante: se l'armaiolo non consegna l'arma nei due giorni, il re gli farà tagliare la testa. Ecco spiegato il senso della seconda parte della frase. Detto questo, non capisco una cosa. Se l'armaiolo ci tiene a conservare la sua testa (come dice), allora le possibilità sono due: o riuscirà a completare l'arma in due giorni (e non mi pare dica questo), oppure... ??? I think the poor guy is planning to be deliberately vague with the king. Basically, he's going to tell the king something that means roughly "you're going to like the results when you see them," and hope that that satisfies the king long enough for him (the armorer) to figure out some way to save his head. Sono nei qual... la stessa frase torna più avanti. L'armaiolo riesce nell'impresa di costruire il cannone e quindi chiede al re una ricompensa. Ma il re, che era venuto a sapere della frase dell'armaiolo ("I'll tell the king that the proof will be in the pudding. I fancy keeping my head"), gli risponde così: "For your contribution [...] you might get a pudding. And keep your head". Quindi il riferimento al pudding adesso è concreto... non ne esco più! Vi prego, aiutatemi a trovare un equivalente valido in italiano!!! Ciao takashimike, perché non ci scrivi come hai tradotto la prima frase e potremmo cercare di aiutarti a trovare una traduzione decente per il tuo secondo problema - che ne dici? Anglo Eh, ma la prima frase non l'ho ancora tradotta... nonostante i preziosi suggerimenti non ho ancora idea di cosa voglia dire... Eh, ma la prima frase non l'ho ancora tradotta... nonostante i preziosi suggerimenti non ho ancora idea di cosa voglia dire... Capisco il problema! E' tosta questa frase! Ho trovato questo: la bontà di un cibo si scopre assaggiandolo E' un po' letterale, ma secondo me non hai moltissime possibilità con queste frasi - ci vuole un compromesso! Potrebbe aiutarti per la seconda frase: Potresti avere il cibo e anche tenerli la testa! Boh! Just an idea Anglo Mmm... ottimo suggerimento, il tuo. In effetti credo che pre tenere il gioco di parole, devo "inventarmi" una frase che contenga un riferimento al cibo... Mmm... ottimo suggerimento, il tuo. In effetti credo che pre tenere il gioco di parole, devo "inventarmi" una frase che contenga un riferimento al cibo... Esatto - perché secondo me in italiano non esiste una frase già fatta! Hope you manage to get a good sentence Anglo Dunque, mettendo insieme tutti i vostri suggerimenti e alcune traduzioni della frase trovate in rete, sono giunto alla conclusione che il senso è il seguente: i risultati sono quelli che contano finché non si prova non si può sapere cosa è andata al buco? "I'll tell the king that the proof will be in the pudding. I fancy keeping my head" Dirò al re che stavolta la ciambella verrà col buco. La testa me la voglio tenere. "For your contribution [...] you might get a pudding. And keep your head". Forse stavolta la ciambella l'avrà. Just a thought. In realtà, anteponendo alla traduzione una piccola spiegazione, si potrebbe tradurre anche alla lettera, più o meno. Nel mio caso: "Come diciamo in Inghilterra, per sapere se il pudding è buono bisogna assaggiarlo/mangiarlo". A questo modo avrei risolto anche il problema del gioco di parole con la frase che ho postato successivamente. Certo, al posto di pudding potrei metterci un cibo più conosciuto in italia (una torta?)... Detto questo, forse a qualcuno di voi adesso è venuta in mente una traduzione migliore della mia? Hi Taka, I think you've done a brilliant job so far, with some excellent suggestions. My own feeling is that you've got as far as you're ever going to get with translating the sense of this expression. But I think you may be seriously understanding a factor: the quality of the original English (in terms of thought, and writing) may be inferior to your assessment of it. This would account for the inherent difficulty in understanding (let alone translating!) what on earth the author means by this peculiar expression (peculiar in the sense that it is an adaptation, a very cryptic adaptation, of the well-known English proverb). In which case, you can only put your mind at rest, stick with the general expression in Italian, with its all-important reference to food, and move on. If you're lucky, there may be a further reference to this key idea, and this key expression, later in the novel. I think this is quite likely, all things considered. A later reference may even add extra, vital info that sheds a whole new light on the significance of the "pudding" in question, or whatever (including a possible play on words, for example. Who knows?). In this case, it would then be apparent that the earlier reference(s) were designed to be only partially revelatory. In other words, the author will reveal, later on, that a mystery was deliberately intended and set up for the reader, and he will proceed to explain its meaning. On the other hand, if there is no further reference or info, then the author just remains a bad author --- or, let's say, a wilfully elusive one... Certo, al posto di pudding potrei metterci un cibo più conosciuto in Italia (una torta?)... Più che ad una torta generica, farei riferimento a qualcosa di prettamente italiano (che so io, la pizzza?). Oppure giocare con la frase italiana "Non tutte le ciambelle vengono con il buco": "I'll tell the king that the proof will be in the pudding. I fancy keeping my head" Dirò al re che stavolta la ciambella verrà col buco. La testa me la voglio tenere. "For your contribution [...] you might get a pudding. And keep your head". Forse stavolta la ciambella l'avrà. Just a thought. In realtà, anteponendo alla traduzione una piccola spiegazione, si potrebbe tradurre anche alla lettera, più o meno. Nel mio caso: "Come diciamo in Inghilterra, per sapere se il pudding è buono bisogna assaggiarlo/mangiarlo". A questo modo avrei risolto anche il problema del gioco di parole con la frase che ho postato successivamente. Certo, al posto di pudding potrei metterci un cibo più conosciuto in italia (una torta?)... Another thought that I've been playing with and wasn't going to mention until you raised the possibility of prefacing it with "come diciamo in Inghilterra..." seeing that a) the exact point that the armorer means to make with "the proof is in the pudding" is vague and cryptic, perhaps deliberately so, and b) he's using the version of the saying that many people consider to be garbled (i.e., it's meant to be "the proof of the pudding is in the eating"), perhaps a very literal and downright nonsensical translation would work: come diciamo in Inghilterra, la prova / la verità sarà nel budino! The king would then take him literally, and offer him some budino instead of a reward. I don't know. I'm getting the sense that the tone of this whole tale is on the absurd side, so I'm not opposed to furthering the absurdity. I see some English speakers find "garbled" the saying in matter, while various online dict. mention it. As far as I can understand the meaning in the OP case should be "I'll say the king he must wait, and the result will show the wait was worth it." This is the case in which some "creative" translation is required. My try could be "Dirò al re che bisogna giudicare il cuoco dopo che hai visto la torta. Ci tengo alla mia testa" And after "Per la tua opera puoi prenderti una torta, e anche tenerli la testa". I don't really agree with your interpretation of the OP, but have corrected your English rephrasing. Hi everyone! This is from the book "Triumph of the sun" written by Wilbur Smith: "All that you tell me, Osman Atalan, pleases God. Your words are as honey on your lips and sweet music in my ears. But have you brought me proof that what you say is true" Why is there the word "proof" is used without any article in the sentence above? I would put in the pronoun "any" before the word "proof". Proof is an uncountable noun and therefore does not take the indefinite article. "I have experience of repairing cars." "I gave you guidance on grammar." "Give him money." The bold words are all uncountable nouns. Really?? Thanks! I just have always thought that "proof" is a countable noun... At least as it's in my native language... Despite of that, I guess it would not be a mistake to use the pronoun "any", as I said above. Is it right? In fact 'proof' can be countable or uncountable depending on the context. There are proofs (countable) in printing and in mathematics for example. In criminal law, proof is uncountable. As PaulQ says, it is uncountable in this context. Yes, you can use "any". As to if the word "prof" is countable or uncountable in this context(and in criminal law as well). In this situation the point is about proving of that one man is dead. It could be for example - a photo of that dead man - the head of that man - that dead man himself I guess all those things are proofs... So, why cannot be the word "proof" countable in this context? Unfortunately they just aren't! You cannot use reasoning to defeat an idiom. Those things are all evidence. If you collect enough evidence then you have proof. As to if the word "prof" is countable or uncountable in this context(and in criminal law as well). In this situation the point is about proving of that one man is dead. It could be for example - a photo of that dead man - the head of that man - that dead man himself I guess all those things are proofs... So, why cannot be the word "proof" countable in this context? Unfortunately they just aren't! You cannot use reasoning to defeat an idiom. Those things are all evidence. If you collect enough evidence then you have proof. As to if the word "prof" is countable or uncountable in this context(and in criminal law as well). In this situation the point is about proving of that one man is dead. It could be for example - a photo of that dead man - the head of that man - that dead man himself I guess all those things are proofs... So, why cannot be the word "proof" countable in this context? Unfortunately they just aren't! You cannot use reasoning to defeat an idiom. Those things are all evidence. If you collect enough evidence then you have proof. As to if the word "prof" is countable or uncountable in this context(and in criminal law as well). In this situation the point is about proving of that one man is dead. It could be for example - a photo of that dead man - the head of that man - that dead man himself I guess all those things are proofs... So, why cannot be the word "proof" countable in this context? Unfortunately they just aren't! You cannot use reasoning to defeat an idiom. Those things are all evidence. If you collect enough evidence then you have proof. As to if the word "prof" is countable or uncountable in this context(and in criminal law as well). In this situation the point is about proving of that one man is dead. It could be for example - a photo of that dead man - the head of that man - that dead man himself I guess all those things are proofs... So, why cannot be the word "proof" countable in this context? Unfortunately they just aren't! You cannot use reasoning to defeat an idiom. Those things are all evidence. If you collect enough evidence then you have proof. As to if the word "prof" is countable or uncountable in this context(and in criminal law as well). In this situation the point is about proving of that one man is dead. It could be for example - a photo of that dead man - the head of that man - that dead man himself I guess all those things are proofs... So, why cannot be the word "proof" countable in this context? Unfortunately they just aren't! You cannot use reasoning to defeat an idiom. Those things are all evidence. If you collect enough evidence then you have proof. As to if the word "prof" is countable or uncountable in this context(and in criminal law as well). In this situation the point is about proving of that one man is dead. It could be for example - a photo of that dead man - the head of that man - that dead man himself I guess all those things are proofs... So, why cannot be the word "proof" countable in this context? Unfortunately they just aren't! You cannot use reasoning to defeat an idiom. Those things are all evidence. If you collect enough evidence then you have proof. As to if the word "prof" is countable or uncountable in this context(and in criminal law as well). In this situation the point is about proving of that one man is dead. It could be for example - a photo of that dead man - the head of that man - that dead man himself I guess all those things are proofs... So, why cannot be the word "proof" countable in this context? Unfortunately they just aren't! You cannot use reasoning to defeat an idiom. Those things are all evidence. If you collect enough evidence then you have proof. As to if the word "prof" is countable or uncountable in this context(and in criminal law as well). In this situation the point is about proving of that one man is dead. It could be for example - a photo of that dead man - the head of that man - that dead man himself I guess all those things are proofs... So, why cannot be the word "proof" countable in this context? Unfortunately they just aren't! You cannot use reasoning to defeat an idiom. Those things are all evidence. If you collect enough evidence then you have proof. As to if the word "prof" is countable or uncountable in this context(and in criminal law as well). In this situation the point is about proving of that one man is dead. It could be for example - a photo of that dead man - the head of that man - that dead man himself I guess all those things are proofs... So, why cannot be the word "proof" countable in this context? Unfortunately they just aren't! You cannot use reasoning to defeat an idiom. Those things are all evidence. If you collect enough evidence then you have proof. As to if the word "prof" is countable or uncountable in this context(and in criminal law as well). In this situation the point is about proving of that one man is dead. It could be for example - a photo of that dead man - the head of that man - that dead man himself I guess all those things are proofs... So, why cannot be the word "proof" countable in this context? Unfortunately they just aren't! You cannot use reasoning to defeat an idiom. Those things are all evidence. If you collect enough evidence then you have proof. As to if the word "prof" is countable or uncountable in this context(and in criminal law as well). In this situation the point is about proving of that one man is dead. It could be for example - a photo of that dead man - the head of that man - that dead man himself I guess all those things are proofs... So, why cannot be the word "proof" countable in this context? Unfortunately they just aren't! You cannot use reasoning to defeat an idiom. Those things are all evidence. If you collect enough evidence then you have proof. As to if the word "prof" is countable or uncountable in this context(and in criminal law as well). In this situation the point is about proving of that one man is dead. It could be for example - a photo of that dead man - the head of that man - that dead man himself I guess all those things are proofs... So, why cannot be the word "proof" countable in this context? Unfortunately they just aren't! You cannot use reasoning to defeat an idiom. Those things are all evidence. If you collect enough evidence then you have proof. As to if the word "prof" is countable or uncountable in this context(and in criminal law as well). In this situation the point is about proving of that one man is dead. It could be for example - a photo of that dead man - the head of that man - that dead man himself I guess all those things are proofs... So, why cannot be the word "proof" countable in this context? Unfortunately they just aren't! You cannot use reasoning to defeat an idiom. Those things are all evidence. If you collect enough evidence then you have proof. As to if the word "prof" is countable or uncountable in this context(and in criminal law as well). In this situation the point is about proving of that one man is dead. It could be for example - a photo of that dead man - the head of that man - that dead man himself I guess all those things are proofs... So, why cannot be the word "proof" countable in this context? Unfortunately they just aren't! You cannot use reasoning to defeat an idiom. Those things are all evidence. If you collect enough evidence then you have proof. As to if the word "prof" is countable or uncountable in this context(and in criminal law as well). In this situation the point is about proving of that one man is dead. It could be for example - a photo of that dead man - the head of that man - that dead man himself I guess all those things are proofs... So, why cannot be the word "proof" countable in this context? Unfortunately they just aren't! You cannot use reasoning to defeat an idiom. Those things are all evidence. If you collect enough evidence then you have proof. As to if the word "prof" is countable or uncountable in this context(and in criminal law as well). In this situation the point is about proving of that one man is dead. It could be for example - a photo of that dead man - the head of that man - that dead man himself I guess all those things are proofs... So, why cannot be the word "proof" countable in this context? Unfortunately they just aren't! You cannot use reasoning to defeat an idiom. Those things are all evidence. If you collect enough evidence then you have proof. As to if the word "prof" is countable or uncountable in this context(and in criminal law as well). In this situation the point is about proving of that one man is dead. It could be for example - a photo of that dead man - the head of that man - that dead man himself I guess all those things are proofs... So, why cannot be the word "proof" countable in this context? Unfortunately they just aren't! You cannot use reasoning to defeat an idiom. Those things are all evidence. If you collect enough evidence then you have proof. As to if the word "prof" is countable or uncountable in this context(and in criminal law as well). In this situation the point is about proving of that one man is dead. It could be for example - a photo of that dead man - the head of that man - that dead man himself I guess all those things are proofs... So, why cannot be the word "proof" countable in this context? Unfortunately they just aren't! You cannot use reasoning to defeat an idiom. Those things are all evidence. If you collect enough evidence then you have proof. As to if the word "prof" is countable or uncountable in this context(and in criminal law as well). In this situation the point is about proving of that one man is dead. It could be for example - a photo of that dead man - the head of that man - that dead man himself I guess all those things are proofs... So, why cannot be the word "proof" countable in this context? Unfortunately they just aren't! You cannot use reasoning to defeat an idiom. Those things are all evidence. If you collect enough evidence then you have proof. As to if the word "prof" is countable or uncountable in this context(and in criminal law as well). In this situation the point is about proving of that one man is dead. It could be for example - a photo of that dead man - the head of that man - that dead man himself I guess all those things are proofs... So, why cannot be the word "proof" countable in this context? Unfortunately they just aren't! You cannot use reasoning to defeat an idiom. Those things are all evidence. If you collect enough evidence then you have proof. As to if the word "prof" is countable or uncountable in this context(and in criminal law as well). In this situation the point is about proving of that one man is dead. It could be for example - a photo of that dead man - the head of that man - that dead man himself I guess all those things are proofs... So, why cannot be the word "proof" countable in this context? Unfortunately they just aren't! You cannot use reasoning to defeat an idiom. Those things are all evidence. If you collect enough evidence then you have proof. As to if the word "prof" is countable or uncountable in this context(and in criminal law as well). In this situation the point is about proving of that one man is dead. It could be for example - a photo of that dead man - the head of that man - that dead man himself I guess all those things are proofs... So, why cannot be the word "proof" countable in this context? Unfortunately they just aren't! You cannot use reasoning to defeat an idiom. Those things are all evidence. If you collect enough evidence then you have proof. As to if the word "prof" is countable or uncountable in this context(and in criminal law as well). In this situation the point is about proving of that one man is dead. It could be for example - a photo of that dead man - the head of that man - that dead man himself I guess all those things are proofs... So, why cannot be the word "proof" countable in this context? Unfortunately they just aren't! You cannot use reasoning to defeat an idiom. Those things are all evidence. If you collect enough evidence then you have proof. As to if the word "prof" is countable or uncountable in this context(and in criminal law as well). In this situation the point is about proving of that one man is dead. It could be for example - a photo of that dead man - the head of that man - that dead man himself I guess all those things are proofs... So, why cannot be the word "proof" countable in this context? Unfortunately they just aren't! You cannot use reasoning to defeat an idiom. Those things are all evidence. If you collect enough evidence then you have proof. As to if the word "prof" is countable or uncountable in this context(and in criminal law as well). In this situation the point is about proving of that one man is dead. It could be for example - a photo of that dead man - the head of that man - that dead man himself I guess all those things are proofs... So, why cannot be the word "proof" countable in this context? Unfortunately they just aren't! You cannot use reasoning to defeat an idiom. Those things are all evidence. If you collect enough evidence then you have proof. As to if the word "prof" is countable or uncountable in this context(and in criminal law as well). In this situation the point is about proving of that one man is dead. It could be for example - a photo of that dead man - the head of that man - that dead man himself I guess all those things are proofs... So, why cannot be the word "proof" countable in this context? Unfortunately they just aren't! You cannot use reasoning to defeat an idiom. Those things are all evidence. If you collect enough evidence then you have proof. As to if the word "prof" is countable or uncountable in this context(and in criminal law as well). In this situation the point is about proving of that one man is dead. It could be for example - a photo of that dead man - the head of that man - that dead man himself I guess all those things are proofs... So, why cannot be the word "proof" countable in this context? Unfortunately they just aren't! You cannot use reasoning to defeat an idiom. Those things are all evidence. If you collect enough evidence then you have proof. As to if the word "prof" is countable or uncountable in this context(and in criminal law as well). In this situation the point is about proving of that one man is dead. It could be for example - a photo of that dead man - the head of that man - that dead man himself I guess all those things are proofs... So, why cannot be the word "proof" countable in this context? Unfortunately they just aren't! You cannot use reasoning to defeat an idiom. Those things are all evidence. If you collect enough evidence then you have proof. As to if the word "prof" is countable or uncountable in this context(and in criminal law as well). In this situation the point is about proving of that one man is dead. It could be for example - a photo of that dead man - the head of that man - that dead man himself I guess all those things are proofs... So, why cannot be the word "proof" countable in this context? Unfortunately they just aren't! You cannot use reasoning to defeat an idiom. Those things are all evidence. If you collect enough evidence then you have proof. As to if the word "prof" is countable or uncountable in this context(and in criminal law as well). In this situation the point is about proving of that one man is dead. It could be for example - a photo of that dead man - the head of that man - that dead man himself I guess all those things are proofs... So, why cannot be the word "proof" countable in this context? Unfortunately they just aren't! You cannot use reasoning to defeat an idiom. Those things are all evidence. If you collect enough evidence then you have proof. As to if the word "prof" is countable or uncountable in this context(and in criminal law as well). In this situation the point is about proving of that one man is dead. It could be for example - a photo of that dead man - the head of that man - that dead man himself I guess all those things are proofs... So, why cannot be the word "proof" countable in this context? Unfortunately they just aren't! You cannot use reasoning to defeat an idiom. Those things are all evidence. If you collect enough evidence then you have proof. As to if the word "prof" is countable or uncountable in this context(and in criminal law as well). In this situation the point is about proving of that one man is dead. It could be for example - a photo of that dead man - the head of that man - that dead man himself I guess all those things are proofs... So, why cannot be the word "proof" countable in this context? Unfortunately they just aren't! You cannot use reasoning to defeat an idiom. Those things are all evidence. If you collect enough evidence then you have proof. As to if the word "prof" is countable or uncountable in this context(and in criminal law as well). In this situation the point is about proving of that one man is dead. It could be for example - a photo of that dead man - the head of that man - that dead man himself I guess all those things are proofs... So, why cannot be the word "proof" countable in this context? Unfortunately they just aren't! You cannot use reasoning to defeat an idiom. Those things are all evidence. If you collect enough evidence then you have proof. As to if the word "prof" is countable or uncountable in this context(and in criminal law as well). In this situation the point is about proving of that one man is dead. It could be for example - a photo of that dead man - the head of that man - that dead man himself I guess all those things are proofs... So, why cannot be the word "proof" countable in this context? Unfortunately they just aren't! You cannot use reasoning to defeat an idiom. Those things are all evidence. If you collect enough evidence then you have proof. As to if the word "prof" is countable or uncountable in this context(and in criminal law as well). In this situation the point is about proving of that one man is dead. It could be for example - a photo of that dead man - the head of that man - that dead man himself I guess all those things are proofs... So, why cannot be the word "proof" countable in this context? Unfortunately they just aren't! You cannot use reasoning to defeat an idiom. Those things are all evidence. If you collect enough evidence then you have proof. As to if the word "prof" is countable or uncountable in this context(and in criminal law as well). In this situation the point is about proving of that one man is dead. It could be for example - a photo of that dead man - the head of that man - that dead man himself I guess all those things are proofs... So, why cannot be the word "proof" countable in this context? Unfortunately they just aren't! You cannot use reasoning to defeat an idiom. Those things are all evidence. If you collect enough evidence then you have proof. As to if the word "prof" is countable or uncountable in this context(and in criminal law as well). In this situation the point is about proving of that one man is dead. It could be for example - a photo of that dead man - the head of that man - that dead man himself I guess all those things are proofs... So, why cannot be the word "proof" countable in this context? Unfortunately they just aren't! You cannot use reasoning to defeat an idiom. Those things are all evidence. If you collect enough evidence then you have proof. As to if the word "prof" is countable or uncountable in this context(and in criminal law as well). In this situation the point is about proving of that one man is dead. It could be for example - a photo of that dead man - the head of that man - that dead man himself I guess all those things are proofs... So, why cannot be the word "proof" countable in this context? Unfortunately they just aren't! You cannot use reasoning to defeat an idiom. Those things are all evidence. If you collect enough evidence then you have proof. As to if the word "prof" is countable or uncountable in this context(and in criminal law as well). In this situation the point is about proving of that one man is dead. It could be for example - a photo of that dead man - the head of that man - that dead man himself I guess all those things are proofs... So, why cannot be the word "proof" countable in this context? Unfortunately they just aren't! You cannot use reasoning to defeat an idiom. Those things are all evidence. If you collect enough evidence then you have proof. As to if the word "prof" is countable or uncountable in this context(and in criminal law as well). In this situation the point is about proving of that one man is dead. It could be for example - a photo of that dead man - the head of that man - that dead man himself I guess all those things are proofs... So, why cannot be the word "proof" countable in this context? Unfortunately they just aren't! You cannot use reasoning to defeat an idiom. Those things are all evidence. If you collect enough evidence then you have proof. As to if the word "prof" is countable or uncountable in this context(and in criminal law as well). In this situation the point is about proving of that one man is dead. It could be for example - a photo of that dead man - the head of that man - that dead man himself I guess all those things are proofs... So, why cannot be the word "proof" countable in this context? Unfortunately they just aren't! You cannot use reasoning to defeat an idiom. Those things are all evidence. If you collect enough evidence then you have proof. As to if the word "prof" is countable or uncountable in this context(and in criminal law as well). In this situation the point is about proving of that one man is dead. It could be for example - a photo of that dead man - the head of that man - that dead man himself I guess all those things are proofs... So, why cannot be the word "proof" countable in this context? Unfortunately they just aren't! You cannot use reasoning to defeat an idiom. Those things are all evidence. If you collect enough evidence then you have proof. As to if the word "prof" is countable or uncountable in this context(and in criminal law as well). In this situation the point is about proving of that one man is dead. It could be for example - a photo of that dead man - the head of that man - that dead man himself I guess all those things are proofs... So, why cannot be the word "proof" countable in this context? Unfortunately they just aren't! You cannot use reasoning to defeat an idiom. Those things are all evidence. If you collect enough evidence then you have proof. As to if the word "prof" is countable or uncountable in this context(and in criminal law as well). In this situation the point is about proving of that one man is dead. It could be for example - a photo of that dead man - the head of that man - that dead man himself I guess all those things are proofs... So, why cannot be the word "proof" countable in this context? Unfortunately they just aren't! You cannot use reasoning to defeat an idiom. Those things are all evidence. If you collect enough evidence then you have proof. As to if the word "prof" is countable or uncountable in this context(and in criminal law as well). In this situation the point is about proving of that one man is dead. It could be for example - a photo of that dead man - the head of that man - that dead man himself I guess all those things are proofs... So, why cannot be the word "proof" countable in this context? Unfortunately they just aren't! You cannot use reasoning to defeat an idiom. Those things are all evidence. If you collect enough evidence then you have proof. As to if the word "prof" is countable or uncountable in this context(and in criminal law as well). In this situation the point is about proving of that one man is dead. It could be for example - a photo of that dead man - the head of that man - that dead man himself I guess all those things are proofs... So, why cannot be the word "proof" countable in this context? Unfortunately they just aren't! You cannot use reasoning to defeat an idiom. Those things are all evidence. If you collect enough evidence then you have proof. As to if the word "prof" is countable or uncountable in this context(and in criminal law as well). In this situation the point is about proving of that one man is dead. It could be for example - a photo of that dead man - the head of that man - that dead man himself I guess all those things are proofs... So, why cannot be the word "proof" countable in this context? Unfortunately they just aren't! You cannot use reasoning to defeat an idiom. Those things are all evidence. If you collect enough evidence then you have proof. As to if the word "prof" is countable or uncountable in this context(and in criminal law as well). In this situation the point is about proving of that one man is dead. It could be for example - a photo of that dead man - the head of that man - that dead man himself I guess all those things are proofs... So, why cannot be the word "proof" countable in this context? Unfortunately they just aren't! You cannot use reasoning to defeat an idiom. Those things are all evidence. If you collect enough evidence then you have proof. As to if the word "prof" is countable or uncountable in this context(and in criminal law as well). In this situation the point is about proving of that one man is dead. It could be for example - a photo of that dead man - the head of that man - that dead man himself I guess all those things are proofs... So, why cannot be the word "proof" countable in this context? Unfortunately they just aren't! You cannot use reasoning to defeat an idiom. Those things are all evidence. If you collect enough evidence then you have proof. As to if the word "prof" is countable or uncountable in this context(and in criminal law as well). In this situation the point is about proving of that one man is dead. It could be for example - a photo of that dead man - the head of that man - that dead man himself I guess all those things are proofs... So, why cannot be the word "proof" countable in this context? Unfortunately they just aren't! You cannot use reasoning to defeat an idiom. Those things are all evidence. If you collect enough evidence then you have proof. As to if the word "prof" is countable or uncountable in this context(and in criminal law as well). In this situation the point is about proving of that one man is dead. It could be for example - a photo of that dead man - the head of that man - that dead man himself I guess all those things are proofs... So, why cannot be the word "proof" countable in this context? Unfortunately they just aren't! You cannot use reasoning to defeat an idiom. Those things are all evidence. If you collect enough evidence then you have proof. As to if the word "prof" is countable or uncountable in this context(and in criminal law as well). In this situation the point is about proving of that one man is dead. It could be for example - a photo of that dead man - the head of that man - that dead man himself I guess all those things are proofs... So, why cannot be the word "proof" countable in this context? Unfortunately they just aren't! You cannot use reasoning to defeat an idiom. Those things are all evidence. If you collect enough evidence then you have proof. As to if the word "prof" is countable or uncountable in this context(and in criminal law as well). In this situation the point is about proving of that one man is dead. It could be for example - a photo of that dead man - the head of that man - that dead man himself I guess all those things are proofs... So, why cannot be the word "proof" countable in this context? Unfortunately they just aren't! You cannot use reasoning to defeat an idiom. Those things are all evidence. If you collect enough evidence then you have proof. As to if the word "prof" is countable or uncountable in this context(and in criminal law as well). In this situation the point is about proving of that one man is dead. It could be for example - a photo of that dead man - the head of that man - that dead man himself I guess all those things are proofs... So, why cannot be the word "proof" countable in this context? Unfortunately they just aren't! You cannot use reasoning to defeat an idiom. Those things are all evidence. If you collect enough evidence then you have proof. As to if the word "prof" is countable or uncountable in this context(and in criminal law as well). In this situation the point is about proving of that one man is dead. It could be for example - a photo of that dead man - the head of that man - that dead man himself I guess all those things are proofs... So, why cannot be the word "proof" countable in this context? Unfortunately they just aren't! You cannot use reasoning to defeat an idiom. Those things are all evidence. If you collect enough evidence then you have proof. As to if the word "prof" is countable or uncountable in this context(and in criminal law as well). In this situation the point is about proving of that one man is dead. It could be for example - a photo of that dead man - the head of that man - that dead man himself I guess all those things are proofs... So, why cannot be the word "proof" countable in this context? Unfortunately they just aren't! You cannot use reasoning to defeat an idiom. Those things are all evidence. If you collect enough evidence then you have proof. As to if the word "prof" is countable or uncountable in this context(and in criminal law as well). In this situation the point is about proving of that one man is dead. It could be for example - a photo of that dead man - the head of that man - that dead man himself I guess all those things are proofs... So, why cannot be the word "proof" countable in this context? Unfortunately they just aren't! You cannot use reasoning to defeat an idiom. Those things are all evidence. If you collect enough evidence then you have proof. As to if the word "prof" is countable or uncountable in this context(and in criminal law as well). In this situation the point is about proving of that one man is dead. It could be for example - a photo of that dead man - the head of that man - that dead man himself I guess all those things are proofs... So, why cannot be the word "proof" countable in this context? Unfortunately they just aren't! You cannot use reasoning to defeat an idiom. Those things are all evidence. If you collect enough evidence then you have proof. As to if the word "prof" is countable or uncountable in this context(and in criminal law as well). In this situation the point is about proving of that one man is dead. It could be for example - a photo of that dead man - the head of that man - that dead man himself I guess all those things are proofs... So, why cannot be the word "proof" countable in this context? Unfortunately they just aren't! You cannot use reasoning to defeat an idiom. Those things are all evidence. If you collect enough evidence then you have proof. As to if the word "prof" is countable or uncountable in this context(and in criminal law as well). In this situation the point is about proving of that one man is dead. It could be for example - a photo of that dead man - the head of that man - that dead man himself I guess all those things are proofs... So, why cannot be the word "proof" countable in this context? Unfortunately they just aren't! You cannot use reasoning to defeat an idiom. Those things are all evidence. If you collect enough evidence then you have proof. As to if the word "prof" is countable or uncountable in this context(and in criminal law as well). In this situation the point is about proving of that one man is dead. It could be for example - a photo of that dead man - the head of that man - that dead man himself I guess all those things are proofs... So, why cannot be the word "proof" countable in this context? Unfortunately they just aren't! You cannot use reasoning to defeat an idiom. Those things are all evidence. If you collect enough evidence then you have proof. As to if the word "prof" is countable or uncountable in this context(and in criminal law as well). In this situation the point is about proving of that one man is dead. It could be for example - a photo of that dead man - the head of that man - that dead man himself I guess all those things are proofs... So, why cannot be the word "proof" countable in this context? Unfortunately they just aren't! You cannot use reasoning to defeat an idiom. Those things are all evidence. If you collect enough evidence then you have proof. As to if the word "prof" is countable or uncountable in this context(and in criminal law as well). In this situation the point is about proving of that one man is dead. It could be for example - a photo of that dead man - the head of that man - that dead man himself I guess all those things are proofs... So, why cannot be the word "proof" countable in this context? Unfortunately they just aren't! You cannot use reasoning to defeat an idiom. Those things are all evidence. If you collect enough evidence then you have proof. As to if the word "prof" is countable or uncountable in this context(and in criminal law as well). In this situation the point is about proving of that one man is dead. It could be for example - a photo of that dead man - the head of that man - that dead man himself I guess all those things are proofs... So, why cannot be the word "proof" countable in this context? Unfortunately they just aren't! You cannot use reasoning to defeat an idiom. Those things are all evidence. If you collect enough evidence then you have proof. As to if the word "prof" is countable or uncountable in this context(and in criminal law as well). In this situation the point is about proving of that one man is dead. It could be for example - a photo of that dead man - the head of that man - that dead man himself I guess all those things are proofs... So, why cannot be the word "proof" countable in this context? Unfortunately they just aren't! You cannot use reasoning to defeat an idiom. Those things are all evidence. If you collect enough evidence then you have proof. As to if the word "prof" is countable or uncountable