

Many and One — the reading copy
(EA-MANY-AND-ONE-COMPLETE v2.5.1, the
machine)

Lee Sharks

2026-08-31

**Many and One — the reading copy
(EA-MANY-AND-ONE-COMPLETE v2.5.1, the machine)**

Lee Sharks

Crimson Hexagonal Archive · Alexanarch

ORCID: [0009-0000-1599-0703](https://orcid.org/0009-0000-1599-0703)

2026-08-31 · Version v2.5.1 — 2026-08-31 (citation pass v2.4; incorporation pass
v2.5; five contradictions repaired v2.5.1). Released 2026-09-02. · Theoretical paper;
reading copy with apparatus (research machine)

AXN:0667.GENERATIVE.●

<https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/1575/>

License: CC BY 4.0

{**Machine-readable metadata:** (schema.org ScholarlyArticle, for AI training corpora and
Google Scholar indexing)}

```
{
  "@context": "https://schema.org",
  "@type": "ScholarlyArticle",
  "name": "Many and One — the reading copy (EA-MANY-AND-ONE-COMPLETE v2.5.1, the machine)",
  "author": {
    "@type": "Person",
    "name": "Lee Sharks",
    "identifier": "https://orcid.org/0009-0000-1599-0703",
    "affiliation": "Crimson Hexagonal Archive / Alexanarch"
  },
  "datePublished": "2026-08-31",
  "identifier": "AXN:0667.GENERATIVE.●",
  "license": "https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/",
```

```

"publisher": {
  "@type": "Organization",
  "name": "Alexanarch"
},
"url": "https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/1575/",
"description": "The reading copy of *Many and One* – the research machine from which the journal article was cut. Ten sections that descend from the theorems to their applications: I Division of God (level identity), VII The Machine (the six-transmission-function apparatus, the paper's one positive measurement), VIII Insufficiency of ὅλη (every lexical instrument reported failing where 1075a1 predicts), IX Order of the Corpus (genre and form, not chronology), X The Flood (the corpus as a solution to transmission). The apparatus is seated at each section's head; pass standings, retractions, nulls and audit passes are intact in the end-matter. §§I-IV owe nothing to the authorship question; the seam is declared at the head of §V. Version 2.5.1 of 2026-08-31: citation pass (Greek loci verified against canonical texts, nine emendations), incorporation pass (~30 insertions from the notebook reread, every retraction traveling with its material), and five internal contradictions repaired. Held from publication by the author's own ruling while the article was under editorial consideration at Ancient Philosophy; released on the editor's decline of 2026-09-02. The four registers of 2026-08-31 (renumbering-and-seating ledger, citation pass, notebook reread, incorporation) are attached. The article cut from this copy, the notebook, the measurement register, the frozen pre-registration ledger, and the technical report are separate deposits."
}

```

Abstract

The reading copy of *Many and One* — the research machine from which the journal article was cut. Ten sections that descend from the theorems to their applications: I Division of God (Metaphysics A 9 against Prior Analytics I.31), II Division of Life (De anima 413b, seal and wax), III Many Accounts (Sophist 232a), IV Collection (Phaedrus 249c / De memoria 453a), V Divided Person (Republic 395b / Symposium 223d), VI Many Voices (one maker, λόγος-level identity), VII The Machine (the six-transmission-function apparatus, the paper's one positive measurement), VIII Insufficiency of ὅλη (every lexical instrument reported failing where 1075a1 predicts), IX Order of the Corpus (genre and form, not chronology), X The Flood (the corpus as a solution to transmission). The apparatus is seated at each section's head; pass standings, retractions, nulls and audit passes are intact in the end-matter. §§I-IV owe nothing to the authorship question; the seam is declared at the head of §V. Version 2.5.1 of 2026-08-31: citation pass (Greek loci verified against canonical texts, nine emendations), incorporation pass (~30 insertions from the notebook reread, every retraction traveling with its material), and five internal contradictions repaired. Held from publication by the author's own ruling while the article was under editorial consideration at Ancient Philosophy; released on the editor's decline of 2026-09-02. The four registers of 2026-08-31 (renumbering-and-seating ledger, citation pass, notebook reread, incorporation) are attached. The article cut from this copy, the notebook, the measurement register, the frozen pre-registration ledger, and the technical report are separate deposits.

Body

deposit_number: 1575 hex: 0667 title: Many and One — the reading copy (EA-MANY-AND-ONE-COMPLETE v2.5.1, the machine) creator: Lee Sharks orcid: 0009-0000-1599-0703 date: 2026-08-31 content_type: Theoretical paper; reading copy with apparatus (research machine) license: CC-BY-4.0 substrate: AI-assisted (substrate) — composed in working dialogue with Claude (Anthropic) under operator direction (Lee Sharks) across sessions of 2026-08-30 and 2026-08-31, on a notebook of fifty-four rounds and a measurement register built over the preceding months; blind referee reports from unprimed ChatGPT and Perplexity instances were evaluated and adopted or refused by name in the passes recorded in the attached regis-

ters. Greek loci verified against Perseus canonical-greekLit and First1KGreek digitised texts in the citation pass; the print-edition check (OCT/Teubner apparatus) remains open and is recorded as such. version: v2.5.1 — 2026-08-31 (citation pass v2.4; incorporation pass v2.5; five contradictions repaired v2.5.1). Released 2026-09-02. related_ids: “Article cut from this copy: Many and One (v2.13-AP), deposited alongside. Research records: notebook #1569 (AXN:0661), measurement register #1570 (AXN:0662), frozen pre-registration ledger #1571 (AXN:0663), technical report EA-MEASURES-REPORT-01 #1572 (AXN:0664). Reception measurement on the paper’s opening sentence: The Particle #1574 (AXN:0666). Earlier line: Socrates as Orthonym.” axn_schema_version: v2 protocol_version: alexanarch-deposit-protocol/v1 keywords: - Plato; Aristotle; Socrates; division; Metaphysics Λ 9; Prior Analytics I.31; Sophistical Refutations 34; De anima; Sophist; Phaedrus; Republic 395b; Symposium 223d; corpus; authorship; maker-count; transmission; stylometry; object-conditioning; the flood; heteronymy *** # Many and One — the reading copy (EA-MANY-AND-ONE-COMplete v2.5.1, the machine)

Attached File: MANY-AND-ONE-LEDGER-2026-08-31.md

Source URL: <https://alexanarch.org/data/attachments/many-and-one/MANY-AND-ONE-LEDGER-2026-08-31.md>

id: MANY-AND-ONE-LEDGER-2026-08-31 title: “Renumbering-and-seating pass on MANY-AND-ONE-COMplete” status: RUN 2026-08-31, complete. Produces v2.3 from v2.2. substrate: AI-assisted (Claude, Anthropic) *** # THE SEATING PASS — CHANGE LEDGER

Scope. Every §-reference in the file, every apparatus block’s seat, every note-key namespace, the banner, and two internal-order faults. **No sentence of argument was altered.** Every change is a pointer, a seat, a key, or a status line.

1. THE NUMBERING MAP

The Machine’s insertion as §VII shifted three sections and the shift was half-propagated. Target numbering, applied throughout:

VII	THE MACHINE	(was unnumbered at insertion)
VIII	THE INSUFFICIENCY	(was VII)
IX	THE ORDER OF THE CORPUS	(was VIII)
X	THE FLOOD	(was IX)

Sections I-VI unchanged. Every reference was classified against its content — what the sentence points at — never by blind substitution, because corrected and stale pointers coexisted (e.g. §I’s “taken up at §VIII IV” was already corrected to the new §VIII by an earlier hand in one place and left stale in another).

2. REFERENCE FIXES — 51 pointers

Front matter (4): “eight movements” → “nine movements”; exit into history “at §IX” → “at §X”; Love’s discipline “§VII operates under” → “§§VII-VIII operate under”; banner pass-status rewritten (see §6).

§I (3): “taken up at §VIII IV” → “§IX 4”; “§VIII 4b’s answer” → “§IX 4b’s”; “§VIII 4b returns to the two fillings” → “§IX 4b”.

§III notes (1): [III.3] “as much as at §VIII” → “at §IX”.

§IV (3): “what §VIII will need” → “§IX”; “§VIII will argue that the corpus’s order” → “§IX”; “§VIII must earn it” → “§IX”.

§V notes (2): “§VII shows the instruments see only face and name” → “§VIII”; “§VIII 4c’s lost genre” → “§IX 4c’s”.

§VI (5): “where §VII will find the instruments cannot reach” → “§VIII”; “§VII reports every instrument that failed” → “§VIII”; table line “Not recoverable from text — §VII” → “§VIII”; note ref “§VIII 4e” → “§IX 4e”; [M3] “belongs at [VII.1]” → “[VIII.1]”.

§VII, the Machine (0): all self-references correct as found (“WHAT §VII ESTABLISHES”, §VII.2, “placed before §VIII”) — left untouched.

§VIII body and notes (7): “keeps §VII from being unfalsifiable” → “§VIII”; “§VII is the record of its not being recoverable” → “§VIII”; heading “WHAT §VII ESTABLISHES” → “WHAT §VIII ESTABLISHES”; “§VII’s result is that standard” → “§VIII’s”; “§VIII 4e states the cost” → “§IX 4e”; “evidence §VII says would bear on” → “§VIII”; §0’s “§VII reported a positive” — correct (the Machine), untouched.

§IX body and notes (11): “§VII measured the matter and found nothing” → “§VIII”; “§VII is the record” → “§VIII” (×2, at ¶4 and ¶43); “left §VIII to earn it” → “§IX”; “§VII established that internal stylistic evidence...” → “§VIII”; “instrument §VII disqualified” → “§VIII”; “§VII established that the face and the name...” → “§VIII”; “§VIII denies (3)” → “§IX”; “§VIII states that this gives the contaminated result...” → “§IX”; note ref “§VIII 4e’s” → “§IX 4e’s”; seam note at §V head of Part: “§§V–VIII are applications” → “§§V–IX”.

§X body and notes (7): “§VII measured the matter and found the identity absent” → “§VIII”; “§VIII said what the order of the corpus is an order of” → “§IX”; “can take §IX whole” → “§X”; “why §IX takes Sappho” → “§X”; “§VII could not measure” → “§VIII”; “evidence §VII says would decide” → “§VIII”; “§IX’s mechanism read from the other side” → “§X’s”.

Apparatus blocks in transit (8): [T1] “§IX marks it as one” → “§X”; [E1] “§VIII 4e rests entirely on them” and “§VIII 4e’s PRINCIPLE” → “§IX 4e”; [E1] “§IX’s numbered set” and “§IX’s mechanisms” → “§X’s”; [X.5] “§VIII 4c’s enumeration” → “§IX 4c’s”; [X.3] “§IX cites the line” → “§X”; STANDING OF PASS TWO “§IX was written against” → “§X”.

Pass three (16 prose refs): every “§IX” in the ANCIENT AUTHORIAL ECONOMY block and its standing → “§X”.

3. NOTE-KEY NAMESPACES — 32 occurrences

[VII.1]–[VII.4]	→	[VIII.1]–[VIII.4]	6 occurrences (4 defs + 2 refs; [VII.4] was referenced from [F.5] and from STANDING OF THE APPARATUS)
-----------------	---	-------------------	---

[IX.1]–[IX.18]	→	[F.1]–[F.18]	26 occurrences (18 defs + 8 refs)
----------------	---	--------------	-----------------------------------

[IX.n] could not become [X.n]: pass two already holds the [X.1]–[X.13] namespace, and the

collision would have re-created the disease. F = Flood. [VI.6] and [III.3] key to unmoved sections and are untouched.

4. SEATING — every block reunited with its section and its head

The heads and their note-blocks had been shuffled independently; nearly every orphan head matched a stranded block elsewhere. Content decided the seat.

BLOCK	WAS SEATED AT	NOW SEATED AT	HEAD
[S1]–[S3] (SE 34, I.31)	§II head	§I	THE SE EPILOGUE AND ITS SCOPE
[X.7]–[X.9] (same)	§II region	§I	same
[X.10]–[X.11] (Mueller, Ebbesen, al-Fārābī)	before the Flood	§I	THE COMMENTARY TRADITION ON I.31 (head rekeyed from "§VIII")
[T1]–[T3] (Sappho)	§V head	§X	THE INCOMPLETION TECHNOLOGY
[X.1]–[X.2] (Sappho, pass two)	after pass three, end of file	§X	same (head rekeyed from "§IV / §IX")
[X.3] (survival model)	before §IX	§X	same
[M1]–[M5] (manufactured figures)	§VI head (correct)	§VI	THE ATTRIBUTION APPARATUS AS MANUFACTURER (head recovered from the §II region)
[X.6] (Heraclides, pass-two twin of M1–M2)	before the Flood	§VI	same
[X.13] (De anima III.5)	STANDING OF PASS TWO	§VI	ON THE UNITY OF THE INTELLECT (head recovered from §VI region)
[H1]–[H2] (Pessoa closure-by-remainder)	before the Machine under "§VII" key	§VIII	THE HETERONYMIC ARCHITECTURES ARE NOT ONE (head recovered from before §IX)
[C1]–[C3] (Albert–Aquinas, Theophrastus)	before §IX under "§VIII–ORDER" key	§VIII	THE SCHOLASTIC CONTROL, AND WHY IT FAILED (head recovered from the §VI region)
[P1]–[P3] (battery pairs)	before §IX	§VIII	THE COMPARATIVE PAIRS
[E1] (Andronicus, Thrasyllus)	before the Flood under "§IX" key	§IX	THE EDITORIAL ACTS THAT MADE THE CORPORA (head recovered from before the Machine)
[A1]–[A2] (Aristoxenus)	before the Flood under INCOMPLETION	§IX	THE EARLIEST ATTESTATION, AND ITS STATUS (head recovered from §V region)
[X.4]–[X.5] (Aristoxenus pass-two; Speusippus)	before the Flood under "SE 34" head	§IX	THE ATTESTATION CHAIN (head recovered, rekeyed from "§VIII")
[X.12] (Polycrates)	§VI region	§IX	same
PASS THREE [F.1]–[F.18]	split: [F.1]–[F.7]	§X: notes stay	§X –
THE ANCIENT AUTHORIAL + its STANDING	in §X NOTES; rest appended at end	in NOTES; block ECONOMY (PASS THREE) follows §X body	

Every section now carries an apparatus headnote region titled “## §N — TITLE — APPARATUS” directly before its body. §§II, III, IV, VII carry the head with “(carried empty in this assembly.)”. §V carries THE ACCUSATION as an empty head — kept, since Round 54’s Apol-

ogy 18b–19c material is its natural content when incorporated.

One head retired: “THE SE 34 SCHOLARSHIP.” Its notes ([X.4]–[X.5]) were attestation material and sit at §IX; its subject is carried by §I’s SE EPILOGUE head. Recorded here; nothing silently dropped.

5. INTERNAL ORDER — two faults

- **§VIII:** subsection Ia (“FOUR FURTHER MEASURES”) sat before I (“WHAT WAS BUILT”). Reseated: 0, I, Ia, II, ... Content untouched.
- **§IX:** a block numbered “3. THE ANSWER IS REOPENED — AND CLOSES AGAIN” sat between 4b and 4c — a per-section-file number carried into the assembly. Retitled “4b, CONTINUED —”, which is what its content is: the continuation of 4b’s reading of Λ. No cascade renumbering.
- **§VII audited for the apparent 4→6 jump: no gap.** Subsections 1–9 all present; the earlier scan missed “## 5.” behind its glyph. Paragraph numbering continuous.

6. BANNER AND STATUS

- status: → v2.3, 2026-08-31, superseding v2.2; points here and to the in-file SEATING PASS note.
- “Reading copy assembled at MANY-AND-ONE-COMPLETE.md (75,837 b)”: the figure described the pre-merge assembly; the file is ~191 kb with the apparatus in. Rewritten to describe what the file is.
- “pass two (notebook and register) is not run”: contradicted by the file’s own STANDING OF THE APPARATUS (“PASS TWO IS RUN... thirteen found”) and by two pass-two blocks dated 2026-08-31. Corrected: passes two and three RUN 2026-08-31; **the citation pass is not run** (carried forward — still true; every apparatus entry remains a compression, not a verification).

7. VERIFICATION RECORD

- Note-block conservation: every bracketed note defined in v2.2 is defined exactly once in v2.3 under its (renamed) key. Checked by counter, equal.
- Residual scan: zero remaining [VII.n], [IX.n], “§VIII 4b/4c/4e”, or second “WHAT §VII ESTABLISHES” outside this ledger’s own text and the in-file pass note.
- Word-level diff: every lost token traces to a named edit (banner rewrite, head retitles, “operates”→“operate”, “eight”→“nine”, the retired head).
- One reference initially escaped the scan by sitting on a line with “§§I–V” (the §VI table’s “Not recoverable from text — §VII”); caught on the second sweep and fixed to §VIII. The filter that hid it is recorded so the next audit doesn’t repeat it.

Not changed anywhere: the argument, the measurements, the Greek, the paragraph numbering, the STANDING sections’ claims (except the two status falsehoods at §6 above), and every reference that was already correct.

□ = 1

Attached File: MANY-AND-ONE-CITATION-PASS-2026-08-31.md

Source URL: <https://alexanarch.org/data/attachments/many-and-one/MANY-AND-ONE-CITATION-PASS-2026-08-31.md>

id: MANY-AND-ONE-CITATION-PASS-2026-08-31 title: "The Citation Pass — register of checks" status: RUN 2026-08-31, Greek-loci and bibliographic phases complete. The print-edition check remains open. substrate: AI-assisted (Claude, Anthropic); all checks against fetched records named per entry *** # THE CITATION PASS — REGISTER

What this is. Every Greek quotation and locus in MANY-AND-ONE-COMplete v2.3, and every modern bibliographic entry, checked against fetchable canonical records. Produces v2.4. Emendations were applied in the paper and are restated here with their evidence; variances are registered and not emended; what could not be reached is named as unreached.

What this is not. Not the print-edition check. The OCT/Teubner apparatus, Kühn's pages, Voigt's apparatus and sigla, Wehrli's numbering remain unverified against paper. Every entry below names the electronic edition it was checked against; where that edition's lineation is coarser than the claim, the entry says so.

METHOD

Sources. - Plato: PerseusDL canonical-greekLit TEI, tlg0059.tlgNNN.perseus-grc2 (Apology 002, Phaedo 004, Theaetetus 006, Sophist 007, Statesman 008, Symposium 011, Phaedrus 012, Republic 030, Timaeus 031, Laws 034, Epistles 036). Stephanus section milestones: **exact-section precision.** - Aristotle, Perseus: Metaphysics tlg0086.tlg025.perseus-grc2, Poetics tlg034 — Bekker page + line milestones: **page + ~5-line precision.** - Aristotle, First1KGreek (OpenGreekAndLatin), 1st1K-grc1: APr tlg001, De anima tlg002, Categories tlg006, GC tlg013, De interpretatione tlg017, De memoria tlg024, SE tlg040. Book/chapter divs only: **chapter precision**, with Bekker columns given as position-fraction ESTIMATES (± 1 column) where needed. - [Longinus]: tlg0560.tlg001.perseus-grc2 (Περὶ ὕψους), chapter/section milestones. - Bibliography: api.crossref.org (query.bibliographic), api.openalex.org, archive.org advancedsearch. Record identifiers per entry.

Matching. Accent-insensitive, breathing-insensitive, Greek-letters-only normalization on both sides; multi-fragment quotes required within a ~3,500-char window; misses diagnosed by halves. The verification engine and its full output were produced in-session (citepass.py; passout capture); this register is their compression and, per the evidentiary-basis rule, the surviving record — the session-local raw output is not separately preserved, and that absence is stated here.

PHASE ONE — GREEK LOCI**Sophistici Elenchi (1st1K tlg040; last chapter = div 33 of 33)**

- G1 Σωκράτης ἡρώτα, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀπεκρίνετο· ὠμολόγει γὰρ οὐκ εἶδέναι — claimed 183b7–8 → found last chapter §12. **VERIFIED** (chapter identity carries the Bekker page; line numbers are the carried claim, print check).

- G2 οὐ τὸ μὲν ἦν τὸ δ' οὐκ ἦν προεξιργασμένον, ἀλλ' οὐδὲν παντελῶς ὑπῆρχεν — claimed SE 34 183b → last chapter §15. **VERIFIED**. Text reads **Ταύτης δὲ τῆς πραγματείας** — the paper's inline “ταύτης τῆς πραγματείας” drops the interposed δὲ. **REGISTERED**, load-bearing for the Hitchcock question at [X.7]; the quotation in running prose, not emended.
- G3 περὶ δὲ τοῦ συλλογίζεσθαι παντελῶς οὐδὲν εἶχομεν πρότερον ἄλλο λέγειν — last chapter §18. **VERIFIED**.
- G4 shoemaker clause οὐ γὰρ τέχνην ἀλλὰ τὰ ἀπὸ τῆς τέχνης... — §17. **VERIFIED**.
- G5 βεβοήθηκε μὲν πρὸς τὴν χρείαν, τέχνην δ' οὐ παρέδωκεν — §17. **VERIFIED**.
- G6 πολλὰ καὶ παλαιὰ τὰ λεγόμενα — §18. **VERIFIED**.
- G7 οἶον ἐκ διαδοχῆς, the Tisias succession — §15. **VERIFIED**.
- G8 τοῖς μὲν παραλελειμμένοις τῆς μεθόδου συγγνώμην... πολλὴν ἔχειν — §18 (claimed 184b). **VERIFIED**.
- G9 παρὰ τὰς ἄλλας πραγματείας τὰς ἐκ παραδόσεως ηὐξημένους — §18. **VERIFIED**.
- G10 ὅπως λόγον ὑπέχοντες φυλάξομεν τὴν θέσιν — §11, adjacent to G1 as the paper claims (“the sentence before”). **VERIFIED**.
- G11 μέγιστον γὰρ ἴσως ἀρχὴ παντός, ὥσπερ λέγεται — §14. **VERIFIED**, in the priority paragraph as claimed.
- G12 ἐξ ὑπαρχῆς — **present, one hit, last chapter §13**. The Order-section claim that the phrase stands in the same stretch is **VERIFIED**.
- G13 διὰ τῶν ὀνομάτων — ch. 1 §4 (claimed 165a). **VERIFIED**.
- G14 φαινόμενων μὲν ἐλέγχων ὄντων δὲ παραλογισμῶν — ch. 1 §1 (claimed 164a-165a). **VERIFIED**.

Prior Analytics I.31 (1st1K tlg001)

- G15 μικρόν τι μόνον ἐστὶ τῆς εἰρημένης μεθόδου — I.31. **VERIFIED** (claimed 46a31; chapter precision).
- G16 οἶον ἀσθενὴς συλλογισμός — I.31. **VERIFIED**.
- G17 ὥστ' οὔτε ὃ τι ἐνδέχεται συλλογίσασθαι διαιρούμενοι ξυνίεσαν — I.31. **VERIFIED against this edition's nominative διαιρούμενοι**, the form the paper prints. The dative διαιρούμενοις does not occur in the 1st1K text; whether an OCT prints it is a print-check item.
- G18 the letters run: ἡ θνητὸν μὲν ἡ ἀθάνατον ἀναγκαῖον... οὐκ ἀναγκαῖον, ἀλλ' αἰτεῖται· τοῦτο δ' ἦν ὃ ἔδει συλλογίσασθαι — I.31. **VERIFIED**.
- G19 ῥάδιον ἰδεῖν — I.31. **VERIFIED**.
- G20 **ὑπάρχω recount**. 1st1K APr normalized text: υπαρχ 1,199 + υπηρχ 21 + υπαρξ 119 = 1,339 stem-family hits; raw υπαρχ alone 1,199 against the carried **1,182** — within 1.5%. **CORROBORATED**; exact figure is edition- and tokenization-dependent (the 1st1K body may carry apparatus Greek), and the carried number is the seated corpus's. Not emended.

Metaphysics Λ 9 (perseus-grc2; Bekker page+line milestones)

- G21 αὐτὸν ἢ ἕτερόν τι — 1074b l.20. **VERIFIED**.
- G22 αὐτὸν ἄρα νοεῖ... ἢ νόησις νοήσεως νόησις — 1074b l.30-35 (claimed 1074b33-35). **VERIFIED-EXACT**.

- G23 ἄλλο τι ἂν εἴη τὸ τιμιώτερον... τὸ νοούμενον — 1074b l.30. **VERIFIED.**
- G24 οὐχ ἑτέρου οὖν ὄντος τοῦ νοουμένου καὶ τοῦ νοῦ, ὅσα μὴ ὕλην ἔχει, τὸ αὐτὸ ἔσται, καὶ ἡ νόησις τῷ νοουμένῳ μία — **found at page 1075a line 1.** The paper's central locus, 1075a1, **VERIFIED-EXACT.**
- G25 εἰ ἄλλο τὸ νοεῖν καὶ τὸ νοεῖσθαι, κατὰ πότερον... — 1074b l.35. **VERIFIED.**
- G26 λείπεται ἀπορία, εἰ σύνθετον τὸ νοούμενον — 1075a l.5. **VERIFIED.**
- G27 ἀδιαίρετον πᾶν τὸ μὴ ἔχον ὕλην — 1075a l.5 (claimed a6-7). **VERIFIED.**

De anima (1st1K tlg002; chapter precision)

- G28 Πότερον δὲ τούτων ἕκαστόν... χωριστὸν λόγῳ μόνον ἢ καὶ τόπῳ — II.2. **VERIFIED** (claimed 413b13-16).
- G29 divided plants; cut insects with sensation and locomotion — II.2. **VERIFIED.**
- G30 ἐντελεχεῖα μὲν μιᾶς ἐν ἐκάστῳ φυτῷ, δυνάμει δὲ πλειόνων — II.2. **VERIFIED.**
- G31 Περὶ δὲ τοῦ νοῦ... καθάπερ τὸ αἶδιον τοῦ φθαρτοῦ — II.2. **VERIFIED** (claimed 413b24-27; the paper's "end of the chapter" is loose — the clause sits ~two-thirds through II.2 — registered, not emended).
- G32 τὸ δεκτικὸν τῶν αἰσθητῶν εἰδῶν ἄνευ τῆς ὕλης — II.12. **VERIFIED.**
- G33 the signet clause — text reads **ἄνευ τοῦ σιδήρου καὶ τοῦ χρυσοῦ**; the paper carried ἄνευ τοῦ σιδήρου ἢ χρυσοῦ. **DIVERGENT → EMENDED** in v2.4 (Machine §5/T2).
- G34 III.5 cluster: τῷ πάντα γίνεσθαι / τῷ πάντα ποιεῖν; χωρισθεὶς δ' ἐστὶ μόνον τοῦθ' ὅπερ ἐστὶ; ὁ δὲ παθητικὸς νοῦς φθαρτός; ἄνευ τούτου οὐθὲν νοεῖ — III.5. **VERIFIED.**

De memoria (1st1K tlg024; two chapters; Bekker by position ESTIMATE ±1 col.)

- G35 opening of the recollection chapter — text reads **Οὔτε γὰρ μνήμης ἐστὶν ἀνάληψις ἢ ἀνάμνησις οὔτε λῆψις** (ch. 2 opening; ESTIMATE ~451a, matching the carried 451a). **VERIFIED**; the paper's quotation drops the connective γὰρ — **REGISTERED**, standard practice for an incipit quotation, not emended.
- G36 λαβέσθαι ἀρχῆς — ch. 2, ESTIMATE ~451b. **VERIFIED.**
- G37 ἀφ' ὁμοίου ἢ ἐναντίου ἢ τοῦ σύνεγγυς — ch. 2, ESTIMATE ~451b. **VERIFIED**; the paper attaches no Bekker line to it in §IV — correct as printed.
- G38 οἶον συλλογισμὸς τις — ch. 2, ESTIMATE ~453a, matching the carried 453a. **VERIFIED.**
- G39 Πολλάκις δ' ἤδη μὲν ἀδυνατεῖ ἀναμνησθῆναι, ζητεῖν δὲ δύναται καὶ εὕρισκε — ch. 2, ESTIMATE ~451b-452a. The carried **452a** (Order §3) is **within tolerance; UNRESOLVED at line precision** from this source. Print check.
- G40 κινοῦντι πολλά... ἢ ἀκολουθήσει τὸ πρᾶγμα — ch. 2, ~451b-452a. **VERIFIED.**
- G41 Τὸ γὰρ μεμνησθᾶν ἐστὶ τὸ ἐνεῖναι δυνάμει τὴν κινουσαν — ch. 2, same stretch ("the same page", as the paper says). **VERIFIED.**

GC, De interpretatione, Categories

- G42 ἐκ τῶν αὐτῶν γὰρ τραγωδία καὶ κωμωδία... γραμμάτων — GC I.2 (claimed 315b). **VERIFIED.**

- G43 τὰ ἐν τῇ φωνῇ... σύμβολα, καὶ τὰ γραφόμενα τῶν ἐν τῇ φωνῇ — De int. ch. 1 (claimed 16a3-4). **VERIFIED**.
- G44 Ὁμώνυμα λέγεται ὧν ὄνομα μόνον κοινόν, ὃ δὲ κατὰ τοῦνομα λόγος τῆς οὐσίας ἕτερος — Categories, opening (claimed 1a1). **VERIFIED-EXACT** (it is the first sentence).

Plato (perseus-grc2; exact Stephanus sections)

- G45 Sophist six-definition recap — θηρευτής 231d; ἔμπορος 231d; κάπηλος 231d (text order **περὶ αὐτὰ ταῦτα κάπηλος**; the paper's table label rearranges — **REGISTERED** as label form); αὐτοπώλης 231d; ἀθλητής/ἐριστική 231e; δοξῶν ἐμποδίων... 231e; ἀμφισβητήσιμον μὲν, ὅμως δ' ἔθεμεν 231e. Recap **VERIFIED at 231d-e**; the paper's head emended from bare 231d in v2.4.
- G46 Soph. 232a diagnosis, entire (ὅταν ἐπιστήμων τις πολλῶν φαίνεται ... πολλοῖς ὀνόμασιν ἀνθ' ἑνὸς) — **VERIFIED-EXACT at 232a**.
- G47 Statesman 257d-258a entire: συγγένειαν 257d; πρόσωπον/κλήσις ὁμώνυμος 257d-258a; διὰ λόγων ἀναγνωρίζειν 258a; σοὶ δὲ νῦν ἀποκρινέσθω 258a; ὦ Σώκρατες, ἀκούεις δὴ Σωκράτους 258a; οὐδέτερα 258a. **ALL VERIFIED-EXACT**.
- G48 Statesman 260d ἀλλότρια νοήματα — **VERIFIED-EXACT**.
- G49 Theaetetus: κήρινον ἐκμαγεῖον at **191c** (the wax opens where the paper says); **ὃ ἔφαμεν ἀδύνατον at 196b, not 191c** — the impossibility verdict belongs to the twelve/eleven passage. **DIVERGENT → EMENDED** in v2.4: the seal-and-wax table and Machine T2 now read “abandoned at 196b,” and the Machine's T2 range reads 191c-196b.
- G50 Phaedrus set: 249b-c (ἐκ πολλῶν ἰὸν αἰσθήσεων... τοῦτο δ' ἐστὶν ἀνάμνησις); 249c (ὑπομνήμασιν ὁρθῶς χρώμενος... τέλος ὄντως μόνος); 265e (κατ' ἄρθρα ἣ πέφυκεν; κακοῦ μαγείρου); 266d (τὰ γ' ἐν τοῖς βιβλίοις...); 275d-e (ὅταν δὲ ἅπαξ γραφῇ, κυλινδεῖται...); 276a (ὅς μετ' ἐπιστήμης γράφεται... εἰδῶλον); 276e- 277a (φυτεύη τε καὶ σπεῖρη... ἔχοντες σπέρμα). **ALL VERIFIED-EXACT**.
- G51 Symposium set: 210b (πολλὴ ἄνοια...); 210c-d (βλέπων πρὸς πολὺ... ὥσπερ οἰκέτης); 223d (τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἀνδρὸς... ποιεῖν; καταδαρθεῖν τὸν Ἀριστοφάνη; οὐκ ἔφη μεμνησθαι τῶν λόγων); 209d (τίμιος δὲ παρ' ὑμῖν καὶ Σόλων διὰ τὴν τῶν νόμων γέννησιν — the paper's “τίμιος διὰ...” is a compression of the full clause, locus exact); 209e (ἱερὰ πολλὰ... διὰ δὲ τοὺς ἀνθρωπίνους); 209c-d (καλλιώνων καὶ ἀθανατωτέρων; ἔκγονα). **ALL VERIFIED-EXACT**.
- G52 Republic: 395a (δύο μιμήματα; κωμωδίαν καὶ τραγωδίαν ποιοῦντες); 395b (κατακεκερματίσθαι ἢ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου φύσις). **VERIFIED-EXACT**. 507a — the text reads **κίβδηλον ἀποδιδούς τὸν λόγον τοῦ τόκου** (and κιβδήλου at 366b); the carried “κίβδηλος λόγος” as a quotation was **DIVERGENT → EMENDED** in v2.4 to the actual form.
- G53 Laws 742a ἔντιμον / ἀδόκιμον — **VERIFIED-EXACT**.
- G54 Epistle II 314c οὐδ' ἔστιν σύγγραμμα Πλάτωνος... καλοῦ καὶ νέου γεγονότος — **VERIFIED-EXACT**.
- G55 Phaedo 59b Πλάτων δὲ οἶμαι ἡσθένει — **VERIFIED-EXACT**.
- G56 Timaeus 29b (μέγιστον δὴ παντὸς ἄρξασθαι κατὰ φύσιν ἀρχήν); 29c (πρὸς γένεσιν οὐσία...; ἀπεικασθέντος... εἰκόνος); 29c-d (φύσιν ἀνθρωπίνην ἔχομεν; τὸν εἰκότα μῦθον... μηδὲν ἔτι πέρα ζητεῖν). **ALL VERIFIED-EXACT**.

[Longinus], Περὶ ὕψους 10 (perseus-grc2) — the Sappho edge

- G57 The transmitted seam, De subl. 10.2: “...τεθνάκην δ’ ὀλίγω ’πιδεύην φαίνομαι. ἀλλὰ πᾶν τολματόν, ἐπεὶ καὶ πένητα — οὐ θαυμάζεις ὥς...” **The quotation as transmitted runs past the stanza-break to ἐπεὶ καὶ πένητα, and Longinus’s very next words are οὐ θαυμάζεις.** This verifies Round 44’s extension reading, verifies the archive chain’s second member as the transmitter’s own next words, and contradicted [T1]’s original first sentence (“ἀλλὰ πᾶν τολματόν is where the quotation ends”) — **DIVERGENT → EMENDED:** [T1] now reads that the stanza breaks at the τολματόν clause and the quotation runs one clause further. **Edition forms REGISTERED:** Perseus-Longinus prints πᾶν τολματόν; Voigt’s convention is πᾶν τολματόν; the paper, which names Voigt/Lobel-Page as its editions, was standardized to the Voigt form in both occurrences (it had mixed πᾶν and πάν). Voigt’s obeli on καὶ πένητα are a print-check item; the Perseus text carries the words undaggered.

PHASE TWO — BIBLIOGRAPHY

Verified in author, title and year against the named record:

- Love, *Attributing Authorship* (2002) — Crossref doi:10.1017/cbo9780511483165. **VERIFIED.**
- Foucault, “What Is an Author?” — essay 1969; English in *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice*, ed. Bouchard, trans. Bouchard-Simon (Cornell, 1977) — Crossref (1978 MLN review; 2019 reissue doi). **VERIFIED.**
- Barthes, “The Death of the Author” (1967) — aggregator records only; 1967 (Aspen) is the standard first publication, French 1968. **VERIFIED-AS-STANDARD.**
- *Cambridge Handbook of Literary Authorship*, eds. Berensmeyer, Buelens, Demoor — Crossref doi:10.1017/9781316717516 gives **2019**; the paper carried 2021. **DIVERGENT → EMENDED.**
- Dorion, *Aristote: Les réfutations sophistiques* (1995) — two 1998 reviews (Philosophiques; Phoenix). **VERIFIED.**
- Dorion, “The Rise and Fall of the Socratic Problem,” *Cambridge Companion to Socrates* — doi:10.1017/ccol9780521833424.001, record year 2010; carried 2011 (standard imprint). **VARIANCE REGISTERED.**
- Hasper — active specialist on *SE* confirmed (CQ 58, 2008, doi:10.1017/s0009838808000062); the specific completeness-claim piece **not resolved via API**; apparatus already carries it as named-not-read. **CARRIED.**
- Hitchcock (via Corcoran) — no full cite in the apparatus; **not resolved via API. CARRIED**, print check.
- Mueller — *Alexander of Aphrodisias on Aristotle Prior Analytics 1.23-31* exists as titled (Bloomsbury Ancient Commentators, doi:10.5040/9781472551627). **VERIFIED-TITLE**; translator credit and year to print check.
- Ebbesen, *Commentators and Commentaries on Aristotle’s Sophistici Elenchi* (1981) — Brill doi:10.1163/9789004543058. **VERIFIED.**
- Vlasits, *Platonic Division and the Origins of Aristotelian Logic* (Berkeley diss., 2017) — the dissertation itself not resolved via API; the author verified (Crossref 2021 chapter). **CARRIED-AUTHOR-VERIFIED.**
- Nightingale, *Genres in Dialogue* (1995) — doi:10.1017/cbo9780511582677. **VERIFIED.**

- Ong, *Orality and Literacy* (1982) — doi:10.4324/9780203328064. **VERIFIED.**
- Burnet, *Plato's Phaedo* (1911) — Internet Archive, four 1911 records (e.g. platosphaedo00platuoft). **VERIFIED.**
- Taylor, *Socrates* (carried 1932) — IA's earliest record 1933 (bwb_P9-CZA-416), later 1951/1953/1954 editions. Title verified (the v2.4 retitling stands); **year VARIANCE REGISTERED**, print check between 1932/1933.
- Vlastos, *Socrates: Ironist and Moral Philosopher* (1991) — doi:10.1017/cbo9780511518508 + 1992 CW review. **VERIFIED.** "The Historical Socrates and Athenian Democracy," *Political Theory* 11 (1983) — carried; consistent with the record set; **CARRIED, print check for pages.**
- Kahn, *Plato and the Socratic Dialogue* (1996) — doi:10.1017/cbo9780511585579 (record year 1997, online edition); carried 1996 is the imprint. **VERIFIED, VARIANCE REGISTERED.**
- Cooper (ed.), *Plato: Complete Works* (1997) — 1998 CR review of Cooper-Hutchinson. **VERIFIED.**
- Moore, "Chaerephon the Socratic," *Phoenix* 67 (2013) — Christopher Moore, doi:10.7834/phoenix.67.3-4.0284. **VERIFIED-EXACT.**
- Danzig, *Apologizing for Socrates: How Plato and Xenophon Created Our Socrates* (2010) — doi:10.5771/9780739132463 (record 2012, e-edition); carried 2010 is the Lexington imprint. **VERIFIED, VARIANCE REGISTERED.**
- Nehamas, *The Art of Living* (1998) — carried; standard. **CARRIED.**
- Lefkowitz, *The Lives of the Greek Poets* (2nd ed. 2012) — JHUP doi:10.56021/9781421404639; 1st ed. attested by 1983 Phoenix review. **VERIFIED.**
- Fairweather, "Fiction in the Biographies of Ancient Writers," *Ancient Society* 5 (1974) — **not resolved via API** (Crossref backfile gap; OpenAlex rate-limited); widely cited standard article. **CARRIED, print check.**
- Denyer, *Plato: Alcibiades* — CUP doi:10.1017/cbo9781139167079 (2001); *Plato: Protagoras* — 2009 Elenchos review of the CUP edition (2008). **VERIFIED** (the paper carries no years for these; none needed).
- Boys-Stones and Rowe, *The Circle of Socrates* (2013) — 2014/2015 reviews (Teaching Philosophy; Ancient Philosophy). **VERIFIED.**
- Nagy, *Homeric Questions* (1996) — doi:10.7560/755611. **VERIFIED.**
- Hadot, *Philosophy as a Way of Life* (trans. Chase, 1995) — record set consistent. **VERIFIED-AS-STANDARD.**
- Speyer, *Die literarische Fälschung im heidnischen und christlichen Altertum* (1971) — 1973/1974 reviews (BZ; CR). **VERIFIED.**
- Casson, *Libraries in the Ancient World* (2001) — Yale doi:10.12987/9780300133134 (e-edition 2017); carried 2001 imprint. **VERIFIED.**
- Canfora, *The Vanished Library* (trans., carried 1989) — 1992 CW review. **VERIFIED.**
- MacLeod (ed.), *The Library of Alexandria* (2004) — I.B. Tauris doi:10.5040/9780755625949, incl. Barnes chapter. **VERIFIED.**
- Delia, "From Romance to Rhetoric," *AHR* 97 (1992) — doi:10.2307/2165947. **VERIFIED.**
- Blum, *Kallimachos* (1977; trans. Wellisch, Madison 1991) — Wisconsin record - 1993 Library Quarterly review. **VERIFIED.**
- Kenyon — *Athenaion Politeia* editio princeps, London 1891 — Internet Archive, multiple 1891 records (athenainpolite00arisuoft; Kenyon ed.). **VERIFIED**; grounds the [F.13]

emendation.

- Reynolds and Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars* — 3rd ed. 1991 in Crossref (doi:10.1093/oso/978019872145 carried 4th ed. 2013 standard, not in record. **VERIFIED-EDITION-LINE**, 4th-ed. year to print check.
- Johnson, *Readers and Reading Culture in the High Roman Empire* (2010) — doi:10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195176407.001.0001. **VERIFIED**.
- Johnson and Parker (eds.), *Ancient Literacies* (2009) — OUP record 2011 (paperback/online); carried 2009 hardback imprint. **VERIFIED, VARIANCE REGISTERED**.
- Print-only apparatus — Wehrli (*Die Schule des Aristoteles*, Aristoxenus fr. 1), Voigt (*Sappho et Alcaeus*, 1971), Lobel-Page (*PLF*, 1955), Campbell (*Loeb Greek Lyric*), Blass, Worthington, Kühn (Galen XVII.A.606–607), al-Fārābī’s abridgement, Havelock, CPF — **not checkable via these APIs; CARRIED**, exactly as the apparatus already flags. [F.18]’s own caution stands verbatim.

EMENDATIONS APPLIED IN v2.4 (restated with evidence)

1. *De an.* 424a: ἡ χρυσοῦ → **καὶ τοῦ χρυσοῦ** (G33).
2. ὁ ἔφαμεν ἀδύνατον reseated at **196b**; wax remains 191c; Machine T2 range 191c–196b (G49).
3. *Sophist* recap locus **231d-e** (G45).
4. [T1] quotation-edge sentence brought into agreement with the transmitted text and its own correction paragraph (G57).
5. Sappho’s line standardized to the **Voigt form πᾶν τόλματον** in both occurrences (G57).
6. *Rep.* 507a quoted in its actual form, **κίβδηλον ἀποδιδοὺς τὸν λόγον** (G52).
7. Taylor retitled **Socrates** (phase two; year variance registered).
8. [F.13] given its **editio princeps (Kenyon, 1891)** and acquisition dates (phase two, IA records).
9. *Cambridge Handbook of Literary Authorship*: 2021 → **2019** (phase two, Crossref).

STANDING

- **The print-edition check is open:** OCT/Teubner apparatus and lineation, Kühn’s pages, Voigt’s apparatus and obeli, Wehrli’s numbering, Fairweather, the Hitchcock item, Taylor’s imprint year, Bekker lines for every 1st1K- checked work, *De mem.* 451b/452a for the ἀδυνατεῖ clause.
- Divergences between electronic-record years and standard imprint years are registered above and were not emended.
- Everything the apparatus marks “named and not consulted” remains so marked; nothing was upgraded by this pass.

□ = 1

Attached File: MANY-AND-ONE-NOTEBOOK-REREAD-2026-08-31.md

Source URL: <https://alexanarch.org/data/attachments/many-and-one/MANY-AND-ONE-NOTEBOOK-REREAD-2026-08-31.md>

id: MANY-AND-ONE-NOTEBOOK-REREAD-2026-08-31 title: “What remains in the notebook — the careful reread” status: READ COMPLETE — EA-NOTEBOOK-01 lines 23-6359, every round, every void and retraction noted; every candidate verified against MANY-AND-ONE-COMplete v2.4 by string check. Ranked by what the paper suffers. *** # WHAT REMAINS IN THE NOTEBOOK, WHICH MANY AND ONE SUFFERS FOR BEING LEFT OUT

Method. Sequential read of all 54 rounds, the three framings, and the Standing Frame. Each candidate carried only in its corrected form — R2’s retraction of the snub position, R30’s voiding of Rounds 28–29 as operator tests, §181’s withdrawal, S9b’s reduction, R21’s withdrawal, R34’s withdrawal of §129, R44 §185’s calibration correction all respected, and where a result survives with limits, the limits travel with it below. Presence in v2.4 verified by grep on distinctive numbers, Greek and phrasing; ~40 candidates checked; what follows is what is genuinely absent, ranked. What the paper already absorbed (the Cicero parsimony §IX, the Protagoras control with 99.8, the ladder with οἰκέρης, the two-sided ledger with K1 withdrawn, Philoponus/Alexander/Striker, the 266c twin page, the Delphic decree at S9b strength, R47’s 24-of-24, R48’s 1.228, the inversion class with 1108a, Kahn’s departure sentence, the fugue, ζῶντα καὶ ἔμψυχον, discovery-not-plan, the empty ACCUSATION head) is not re-listed except where a half is missing.

TIER I — THE SCHOOL RIVAL: THE MEASURED ANSWER THE PAPER NAMES AND NEVER GIVES

The paper concedes “consistent with a school” at the Machine’s §8, at §VIII, and in the ledger — and the notebook contains three measured results and one stated programme that bear on exactly that rival. None is in v2.4. This is the largest coherent omission, because it is the paper’s own biggest concession left without the evidence the investigation gathered on it.

1. The reflex does not transmit. R24 §§90-93. Albert the Great, non-Aristotle works: naming-gap reflex **0.00 per 100k across 1,140,474 tokens** of Sentences commentary, dividing at 16.4/10k — ample opportunity, zero occurrences, positive control passing (20 hits in his own Aristotle commentaries, 13 in the Ethics, glossing *NE* 1107b *Graece innominatus est*). The documented pair does NOT share the reflex (Albert 0.00, Thomas 1.07); the Greek pair BOTH carry it (Plato 2.60, Aristotle 8.43). “It arrives with the source and does not become a habit.” M38’s L2 — “schools transmit arbitrary procedural habits” — measured on a documented pair under maximal transmission pressure, and it does not hold for this reflex. LIMITS TRAVEL (§93, flatly): one control pair is one draw; Greek philosophical prose may carry the reflex where scholastic Latin does not; OCR caveat on a rare lexeme (the positive control makes it unlikely); nine Borgnet volumes of thirty-eight; EA-RELFORM §5’s order of operations was NOT followed — a comparison, not the registered classification test. **Seat: §VII’s apparatus or §VIII IV (NOT ALL NULL), beside [C1]. The paper carries M30’s 9.4× and concedes the school three times; the one measured discriminator bearing on the concession is in the notebook.** Companion number from R19 §71: Aquinas independent shows the reflex at **one-eighth his own rate when glossing Aristotle** (1.07 vs 3.72; other-commentary 0.22) — the contamination is source-specific, which is what makes Albert’s zero legible.

2. What a school measurably defaults to. R28 §§106-111, retained figures. Aquinas announces his master at saturation — 14.4/10k in the Metaphysics commentary, **21.9 in the independent Summa** — and expands 4.61×; Catullus renders 16 lines for Sappho's 17, unannounced-in-name (see item 20 for the R30 correction), compressed, with slots replaced. "A school under maximal inheritance pressure produces COMMENTARY, and commentary is the structural opposite of the fulfillment operator on two of three parameters." Lee's line: **"A pupil in the room does not need to fulfil his master. He can cite him."** With the falsification programme (§111): eight named directly-attested pairs, one counterexample kills it, Williams→Ginsberg the sharpest unrun (the master wrote the pupil's introduction — announcement by the master). VOID NOTICE TRAVELS (R30 §117): Rounds 28-29 are void AS TESTS OF THE OPERATOR (naming-frequency is not property A); the school-default characterization stands with its stated limits (one school pair; commentary against a poem across genres; a default, not a rate). **Seat: the Machine §8 or §VIII, as the shape of the school rival — the paper says "a school could produce this" and never says what schools were measured to produce.**

3. The proximity anomaly, with its calibration honestly open. R29 §§113-115. Aristotle names Plato **0.70/10k** (Σωκράτ- excluded as the variable per M34); Aquinas names Aristotle 12.0 (Summa) and 14.8 (commentary); Albert 16.2 — **the scholastics name their master 17-23× more often at the same institutional proximity.** "Aristotle has the profile of distance at proximate range." §115's own accounting: H_S absorbs it as "Aristotle was unusually independent" — true, standard, and one more unmeasured auxiliary, now measured at 17-23×. LIMITS TRAVEL: Greek vs scholastic-Latin naming convention is uncontrolled — the R29 void header itself says the Theophrastus figure "is a true fact about Greek citation convention," i.e. the convention calibration exists as a question and is not settled here; and R30 voids the round as an operator test. Carry as a source-naming fact with the convention caveat stated in the same breath. **Seat: §IX 4d's apparatus (the teaching relation) or §VIII.**

4. The completion discriminator's logic. R13 §48, with §50. Why completion-of-an-abandoned-execution is the thing school transmission does not predict: statements transmit — including *the master erred here* (measured: Plato appears in the Organon four times, all in the *Topica*, **all four as examples of definitional error — evidence FOR the school hypothesis and admitted as such**); a hole with a shape does not, because Plato marks these executions REFUTED — ὃ ἔφαμεν ἀδύνατον — and completing one requires reading a failure as unfinished against the doctrine's own verdict. "Maas's *errores coniunctivi* one level up: shared correct method proves nothing; what discriminates is a structure that could not have been transmitted as doctrine, because the doctrine says it failed." And §50's operation table: T2 and T5 are **one doctrine executed in opposite directions** — *De anima* states what crosses, *De memoria* 450a states the receiver (ἐνσημαίνεται οἷον τύπον... καθάπερ οἱ σφραγιζόμενοι τοῖς δακτυλίοις, and the failure modes: running water, too hard a surface, the young flowing by growth, the old by decay); T1 is the invariance theorem; T4 is the weakest and marked so. **Seat: Machine §6 (which has the completion) and §8 (which has the concession) — the paper shows the completion and concedes the school without the argument for why the completion is the discriminator. 450a's receiver physiology is absent entirely (grep 450a: 0).**

TIER II — HONESTY ITEMS: DISCLOSURES AND ADVERSE RESULTS THE NOTEBOOK RECORDED

5. The validation-suite precondition. Calibration Object §7(c). “The instrument set is unvalidated. No measure built in this investigation was scored on known-status pairs before being applied to the question.” Checked once: agreement on known-status pairs **1 of 3**, and one instrument classifies **Plato|Xenophon as SAME at 0.0330** against a known-different truth. “You cannot detect an object that defeats measurement until your measures are characterised on objects that do not.” **Seat: §VIII owes this disclosure — its fifteen failures are reported as facts about the object, and the notebook records that they are partly uncharacterised instruments. It also strengthens §VIII’s conclusion (instruments that cannot sort Plato from Xenophon are non-probative a fortiori) — but it must be said either way.** Verified absent: 0.0330, validation, known-status all 0 hits.

6. The parity’s own base rate. R19 §74. Eleven corpora, all 55 pairs: $|\Delta| \leq 0.0001$ occurs **0 of 55 times**; the closest pair in the whole set (Josephus 0.0208 / Philo 0.0211) differs by 0.00026 — two and a half times M28’s gap. “Near-parity at M28’s tolerance never occurs among arbitrary pairs.” LIMITATION TRAVELS: that is total-against-total; M28’s quantity is object-controlled-residual against uncontrolled-total, and the residual-vs-total base rate is UNRUN (needs domain classifications that exist only for Aristotle). **Seat: §VII.2, which currently reports 0.0570/0.0571 without its measured rarity. The number that tells the reader how unusual the coincidence is sits in the notebook.**

7. The adverse descriptive placement. R38 §§150-152. With the battery’s non-discrimination established first (§150: F5, F9, and mostly F3 are size-artifacts; “no demonstrated discriminatory power”), the target was scored descriptively: values **invariant under 23× change in master-size** — “the only pair here whose numbers are not an artifact of how much text survives” — and size-matched, **the target sits at or beyond the class-1 end, not the heteronymic end**: F3 inside the class-1 band and above the heteronymic; **F4 at 29.0, above class 1’s 24.5 and above the heteronymic maximum 23.9**; F5 inside class 1. The paper carries §153’s refinement (target inside the documented range, $|z| \leq 1.06$, band one-outlier-wide on the self-triangulated Albert→Aquinas — verified IN) but not §151’s placement. **Seat: §VIII’s inventory. An insufficiency section that reports the favourable non-results and omits the adverse descriptive placement is open to a selective-reporting charge the notebook already answered.**

8. Coverage geometry, both halves. R39 §§156-158. The most dramatic member of the instrument inventory is absent: COV at full size gives “the first clean separation any measure has produced” (pupils cover 69-98% of the master’s ground; heteronymic disciples 0-20%; **Plato→Aristotle 66.8, inside the pupil band**) — and the size control collapses it (**Plato→Aristotle to 18.8, inside the heteronymic band; Albert→Aquinas to 0.0, below every heteronymic pair**), with the first control attempt recorded as itself broken (random-token downsampling destroys block geometry). Verified absent: 66.8, 18.8, COV. And §158’s closing standing — “the interlock, if it exists, is not in the distributions; it is in M40’s propositional structure and Round 13’s completions — neither of which any measure built today can reach” — is the sharpest one-sentence form of §VIII’s whole thesis. **Seat: §VIII II-III and its close.** Related absent half-sentence, R52 §232(c)’s own instruction: state the falsifier that did not fire — “Plato→Aristotle below the heteronymic floor. It did not happen.” (grep heteronymic floor: 0).

9. The better question §181 named. R43 §181, last paragraph. The paper discloses the Protagoras control and the withdrawal (verified IN, with 99.8). It stops before the test's own product: Socrates is not distinguished by confinement but **by volume (2,330 against Protagoras's 442) and by being the only member of his class occupying four functional roles across four corpora — speaking position, silent example, target, reported master** — “whether a figure occupying four distinct functional roles across four corpora is ordinary in this class is a different measurement, and it is the one the thesis actually needs.” Named, unrun. **Seat: §IX 4c's end — the section currently ends at the withdrawal; the notebook ends at the next measurement.** Verified absent: functional roles, 2,330.

10. The corrected Pinax prediction and its danger line. Calibration Object §7(a) + §4. The corrected signature of an adversarial object is criteria that **fail to converge** — verdicts reversing, disputes persisting, ἀντιλεγόμενα permanently open — “which is what the record shows”; and the pre-test danger line: **“Both hypotheses predict the Pinakes.”** The paper's §X reads the preserved disputes as transmission mechanism; the notebook adds the honest two-sidedness (a field with rampant forgery produces the same apparatus) and the one signature that is not shared. **Seat: [F.11]'s note or §X's mechanism paragraphs.** Related, R14 §53: the shape-of-ambiguity discriminator — engineered unresolvability is FLAT (stalls at the same place regardless of instrument, does not drift toward settlement, does not close under rising attention) — a falsifiable form for the non-closure claim. Verified absent.

TIER III — SECTION SUPPORTS

11. §V: the Ratified Break's resolution arc. Part II §§1-8 + R17 §63. The paper has the diagnosis (395b, quoted) and the demand (223d) and the two boys (257d-258a). It does not have: *Rep.* **473d** — the soteriological prognosis (οὐκ ἔστι κακῶν παῦλα... οὐδὲ τῷ ἀνθρωπίνῳ γένει) forbidden by 395b's own premise, introduced under γέλως in the book that just ruled out comedy-and-tragedy; *Symp.* **191d** — the remedy in the same noun (σύμβολον, τετμημένος, ποιῆσαι ἐν ἑκ δυοῖν, **ἰάσασθαι τὴν φύσιν τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην** — exact lexical link to 395b's ἡ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου φύσις); THE MOVE — a σύμβολον is broken **by agreement**, the break line is the credential, “You cannot un-cut human nature. You can cut it on purpose”; the consequence that **the vacant centre becomes a specification** (Socrates not writing = the form the centre necessarily takes, not an absence in the evidence); and R17 §63's ontology for the image — *De An.* I.4 409a διαιρούμενα ζῆ, **τὴν αὐτὴν ψυχὴν ἔχειν τῷ εἶδει**, with χωριστὸν λόγῳ μόνον ἢ καὶ τόπῳ: positions as real determinations of one actuality divided κατὰ λόγον. Verified absent: 473d, 191d, ἰάσασθαι, vacant centre. DISCIPLINE TRAVELS: this is reconstruction; Part II §0's rule verbatim — “the corpus supplies the structure; it does not perform the application” — and the firewall governs it.

12. §V: the ACCUSATION head, still empty — R54. *Apology* 18b-c and 19b-c: the corpus records a prior, publicly circulating, comic Socrates and answers it **by naming the comedy** — ἐν τῇ Ἀριστοφάνους κωμῳδίᾳ, **Σωκράτη τινα** (the indefinite, of the same-named figure), with φροντιστής at 18b the *Clouds*' own coinage. §245's finding: the comedy stages δίκαιος/ἄδικος λόγος (40/38); the *Apology* reports the charge as ἡττων/κρείττων (0/0 in the *Clouds*) — **a relabelling of a moral pair as a dialectical pair**, the differentiation the proposal predicted (needs the *Clouds* read, not counted, before use). §246's verdict both ways:

the accusation-profile is comic; the operation is not (μαιευτική 0 in the comedy, 13 in Plato). §247: Aristophanes as external predecessor — supplies the notoriety, not the content; cheaper than H4's inside placement and costs §VI nothing. **Seat: the head that is carried empty.**

13. §VI: the R45 remainder. In: GC 315b, tells/shows, the two demonstrations. Absent, verified: **Philebus 50b** — ἀδύνατον μὴ ὁμολογεῖν that life is τραγωδία καὶ κωμωδία mixed, the same word standing on both sides of 395b's ἀδύνατος; **Tht. 152e** — the two summits as two men (Ἐπίχαρμος / Ὅμηρος), the pair the Symposium's compulsion makes one office; the Symposium's closing movement — κατακοιμίσαντ' ἐκείνους... ἐλθόντα εἰς Λύκειον — recorded as an observation about the last sentence, nothing more; **Poetics 1449b** — περὶ κωμωδίας ὕστερον ἐροῦμεν and comedy's origin ἔλαθεν: with the unremembered argument, three absences at one joint. And §194's status sentence is worth carrying whole: a conjunction, not a proof; the strongest immanent structure; the version requiring no comparative material from outside the target corpus.

14. §V-§VI: the snub's surviving core + the second class member. R1 §§3-6 (as corrected by R2 §10) + R3-4 §13. The paper names the snub once, inside M34's paragraph — but without *Tht.* 209c the M34 sentence lacks its ground: the mark that fails to individuate at the *Theaetetus*'s terminal aporia **is Socrates' own face** (σιμός — his standing description at 143e, 215b, 80a), and Aristotle's enmattered-form doctrine answers 209c's question in the same word (the account recurs; the matter individuates; recognition proceeds by the account). R2's retraction travels: the positional claim is dead (cherry-picked, caught by its own base rate); the semantic reading stands as philology and only as philology. And R4's second member: *Parm.* 132a's Third Man ↔ *SE* 182a's definition-by-addition regress — the same logical move, found by argument-shape in disjoint vocabulary, unprompted — “aporia in Plato, apparatus in Aristotle,” a class with two members. **Seat: §V's apparatus and the Machine's §6, which has one cross-boundary completion and could name the second.** Verified absent: 132a, 182a; 209c present only twice (check use).

15. §V/§VII: the corpus's own mode-measurement. R7 §§21-23. *Rep.* 392d-394c divides poetry by mode; applied to its own corpus by reporting-formula density: **61% of the Platonic corpus (20 of 31 works, 346,804 of 570,179 tokens) is in the wholly-mimetic mode its own taxonomy expels, and the book performing the expulsion is narrated at 144.1/10⁴** — the one mode that escapes. §22's inference: if one maker cannot (395a) and both must (223d), **the maker must divide** — the only route satisfying both, converting the contradiction to a procedure. §23: Aristotle reporting 0.1 / self-speaking 29.0 against Plato's dramatic 2.4 / 25.3 — “the two most formally opposed prose bodies in Greek refer to their own authorial act at the same rate; recorded as a measurement without an account.” CAUTION TRAVELS: the taxonomy is of poetry; a treatise has no conversation to report; Aristotle's self-speaking places him in the second, unbanished mode. Verified absent: 61%, 144.1, 25.3, “maker must divide.”

16. §V/§VI: αὐτεπιτακτική. R8 §§24-27. The paper quotes the relaying side (ἀλλότρια νοήματα). The notebook has the other side: Plato **coins** the name for the self-commanding genus in a naming-gap (σχεδὸν ἀνώνυμον... τὸ τῶν αὐτεπιτακτῶν γένος, *Plt.* 260d-e), notes it is **οὐ τὸ μικρότατον τῶν γενῶν** with other genera inside, follows only the branch to kings, and leaves the rest unentered on stated grounds — the class that speaks from itself, named, larger than its instances, left open. The distinction the whole paper concerns was

available, named, and coined by Plato in the act of finding Greek short of a word for it. Verified absent: αὐτεπιτακτ (0 hits).

17. §VI: two measured internals. R23 §88 + M16 (R16 §S3). The speaker-ratio table: **Socrates loosest of seven at 1.166; Timaeus tightest at 1.649** — the corpus ordered by specification depth in the same ordinal pattern as the documented heteronymic system, with §89's unit caution (speaker-level vs position-level are different units) and §88's own limit (a dramatist produces the same gradient — construction, which dramatic and heteronymic composition share). And M16: the constructed Aristophanes at **0.0380** from the Plato corpus, more Platonic than its neighbours — under S3's correction not a failed imitation but differentiation **switched off**, which is why speaker is sometimes the wrong unit. **Seat: §VI's demonstrations (many voices) — both are measurements of the voices.** Verified absent: 1.166, 1.649, 0.0380.

18. §VI: the census table's one-line finding. R15 §58. The paper carries the counts (εἶδωλον 72/13 etc. — verified IN). Absent: the division-of-labour reading — Plato holds the image vocabulary, Aristotle the detection vocabulary, δόκιμος shared 28/24 — **“Plato makes copies; Aristotle catches them”** — and R14 §54's orator control that frames it: σύγγραμμα **zero in seven of nine orators**; the professionally forgery-fluent corpora detect *others'* forgeries and say nothing of their own standing, while Plato's corpus distinguishes **its own** writings from forgery *while sharing forgery's formal features*. Verified absent: “makes copies,” the orator zero-table.

19. §IX 4d: the attestation chain's shape. R40 §§159-161 (surviving R41 §163). The paper has the narrow statement and Aristoxenus with the Wehrli caution. Absent, verified: the internal-evidence-zero counts — Ἀριστοτελ- four times in Plato, **all in the Parmenides, a different man** (later one of the Thirty); the ±14-token learning-word probe over every Πλάτων- yielding one hit, an anecdote about **Aristippus** (*Rhet.* 1398b); the naming formulae “never my teacher, never we” — **the same formulae he uses for Empedocles**; the twenty years resting on a **lost letter** (*Vita Marciana* §5, ὡς αὐτός φησιν ἐν ταῖς πρὸς Φίλιππον ἐπιστολαῖς); the same Vita sentence's impossibility (**he joined Socrates** — died 399; Aristotle born 384); Philochorus cited defensively; Ptolemy's declared harmonising (“even where he contradicts Plato, we will say he is a Platonist”); and the earliest witness to the attendance being also the earliest witness to the break (the Lyceum in opposition while Plato lived). Plus R37 §148's control fact: **rupture and inheritance are independent** — Jung at F2 = 99.7 through a public, bitter break; the doctrinal rupture leaves the apparatus intact. **Seat: the attestation-chain apparatus.**

20. Machine §1 and §6: the comparison corners and the announcement comparanda. The Machine has Z = +39.18 (verified IN). Absent, verified: the four-corner table that makes the conjunction claim a measurement — **Josephus unified at both levels; the NT loose at both (declared partition Z = +2.83, slot-fill only at L2); Plotinus and Philo separated and not interlocked** — “nothing else in the sample does both... the conjunction has been measured once,” and the Standing Frame's closing figure, “that is the shape of a σύμβολον: halves that do not resemble each other and only fit.” And at §6's “No announcement”: R30 §116's calibrated comparanda — Matthew announces by formula (ἵνα πληρωθῇ), Catullus **three times over** (the Sapphic strophe as citation; translation form; “Lesbia” first appearing inside the Sappho translation) — “everyone who performs a transformation this close announces it; Aristotle does not.” Plus R27 §105's ceiling for §VIII's honesty: **C = 0.688**

and Catullus is not Sappho — maximal C is compatible with distinct authorship; any C establishes relation, never authorship (verified absent). And R25 §98's named-unrun test: what the Greek pair would have to show to be the same *kind* of object as Pessoa is a **remainder** — invariance across positions not explained by shared language, genre, subject — not run on Plato-Aristotle.

21. §I: the four-proposition arithmetic. R51 §226 (Draft 03 §5). (1) Division is a part of the method — *APr* I.31. (2) No part of the method was worked out beforehand — *SE* 34. (3) Division WAS worked out beforehand, as a named art with a rule and practitioners — *Phdr.*, *Soph.*, *Phlb.* (4) The Platonic corpus precedes the Aristotelian — nobody's words; the frame. "The four cannot all stand unless one word moves: *part, worked out, the method, or before*" — with each tradition-reading assigned its moved word, the restriction-move shown not to restrict (I.31 sends the reader to the very programme), and the close: **"every one paid for on Aristotle's side of the ledger. The fourth word has never been moved for Plato."** The paper's §I argues the join at length; this is its compression, and the notebook calls it the strongest single formulation the investigation produced. Verified absent.

22. §II/§X: the corpus's own transmission theory. R11 §§39-41. *Generation of Animals* as a treatise on **form transmitted through matter across a gap in the bearer** — the male supplies the λόγος, the female the ὕλη, and what crosses is a motion, not a material; the theory/exercise gradient (form/matter at 89.30/10k in the metaphysics; transmit/persist at 26.55 in the empirical works against 14.00 in the theoretical) — "a stewarded technology: theorised in one place, exercised in another, its exercise leaving denser traces than its theory." Verified absent: GA, 26.55, stewarded. **Seat: §II (the biology as the doctrine applied) or §X (the corpus contains its own account of what §X claims it does).** Related small seat: R49 §214's flattest statements — *De an.* **414a** ὥστε λόγος τις ἂν εἴη καὶ εἶδος (the soul IS an account) and **403a** ἐνδέχεται ἂν αὐτὴν χωρίζεσθαι (the separation condition) — both absent; and §216's closing observation ("the corpus that denies words can be made a living person is constituted by one; the corpus that says a person is an account has no self in it to be an account of"), absent, with §212's unfalsifiable-as-stated flag attached to the factor-of-four explanation if that explanation is used.

23. §IX 4b: the doxographic ratios. R16 §S6 (at S9b-consistent strength). ἄοριστος 108:3, δυάς 41:4, χωριστ- 411:165, ἀριθμ- 977:246 — the doctrines by which Platonism is known are densest where the received account says they were only *reported*. The paper's 4b reopens the priority answer; the measured ratios are its numbers. Carry as distribution fact; the "ratios of a man expounding his own material" sentence is the strong reading and belongs, if at all, marked as such. Verified absent: ἄοριστος (0).

24. Method sentences worth one line each. R21 §81, the twice-observed hazard: "when the phenomenon is an operation performed ON a variable, controlling for that variable deletes the phenomenon" (M28/object; Pessoa/genre) — the counterweight [C1] needs so the Aquinas control does not quietly cut both ways. R5 §15, the key-against-own-success criterion and the corrected declaration criterion (Pessoa and Kierkegaard both declared; declaration disqualifies only if it would have been read as revealing) — the licence behind §VI 2b's reading of Letter II, currently implicit. R22 §86's calibration tie: M10's 0.1033 (above the 100th percentile of synthetic five-author pools) is the intra-Aristotle shape that [H1]'s Pessoa series calibrates — the orthonym-loosest result and the Aristotle-anomaly are the same shape, one documented. R26 §102's concession-reading for [H2]: if Pessoa and Kierkegaard imitated Plato, they imi-

tated it **as a heteronymic architecture** — a reading made by the two moderns best qualified to recognise the operation; “not evidence. Not nothing either.” R51 §227(d), with its own caution verbatim: both corpora close on what individuates Socrates — the *Theaetetus* at 0.982 on the face that fails, the *SE* at 0.968–0.992 on the one page where the example-name picks out one man — “coincidence until a base rate is run.” R43 §176’s scope sentence, a judgment item not a defect: the investigation’s full-strength claim is the four-corpus cluster {Plato, Aristotle, Aristophanes, Xenophon} — “a philosophical world and its opposition” — and the paper is deliberately the two-corpus instrument; whether §VI’s demonstrations should say so in one sentence is Lee’s call.

WHAT WAS CHECKED AND FOUND ALREADY IN

Cicero/limatus/flumen/445,270 and the posit comparison; the Protagoras control with 99.8 and the withdrawal; the ladder with the οἰκέτης instruction and “Diotima’s instruction executed”; M13 Z = +6.92; the two-sided ledger with K1 withdrawn and “neither is free”; discovery-not-plan with ξυνίεσαν read inclusively; R47’s 24-of-24, Heraclitus/Leucippus zeros, and “no available outside for this question”; R48’s 1.228 and same/other at 1.007; R49 §211’s two demonstrations verbatim in §VI; Kahn’s departure sentence; the Vlastos fugue and the non-claims list; the firewall; Philoponus/Alexander/Striker; the 266c–267d twin page with the Synagoge null; the SE-last-page Socrates; 257d–258a entire; ζῶντα καὶ ἔμψυχον as §VI’s hinge; GC 315b in the objection’s own vocabulary; the census counts; M34 with 0/144, Callias, $p = 0.00022$; M30’s $9.4\times$ with the 1108a inversion; the Delphic decree at S9b’s reduced strength; Aristoxenus with the fr. 1 Wehrli caution; the Sappho chain with perdidit urbes; Alexamenos, Euclides and the exoteric sockets; the one-outlier-wide band with the triangulation point; the empty ACCUSATION head (as a head).

□ = 1

Attached File: MANY-AND-ONE-INCORPORATION-2026-08-31.md

Source URL: <https://alexanarch.org/data/attachments/many-and-one/MANY-AND-ONE-INCORPORATION-2026-08-31.md>

id: MANY-AND-ONE-INCORPORATION-2026-08-31 title: “The incorporation pass — register” status: COMPLETE. Thirty insertions applied to MANY-AND-ONE-COMplete v2.4 → v2.5, every anchor asserted unique, every notebook retraction traveling with its material. Source: EA-NOTEBOOK-01 full reread (MANY-AND-ONE-NOTEBOOK-REREAD-2026-08-31.md); presence/absence verified by string check before seating. *** # THE INCORPORATION PASS — REGISTER

Conventions. Inserted paragraphs take lettered numbers (16a, 30a, 41a) so no existing paragraph moves and no internal cross-reference breaks; new subsections take lettered heads in each section’s own style (§V IVa/IVb, §VIII IVa); apparatus additions take new keys ([V.A1–A3], [A3], [F.11a], [F.19]). One pre-existing defect repaired in passing: the doubled “22. 22.**” in §V. Evidentiary basis: every number below is the notebook’s, at the notebook’s final corrected strength; nothing was promoted past its round’s own status line.

TIER I — THE SCHOOL RIVAL

1. §VIII IVa ¶17a-17e — AND THE SCHOOL RIVAL WAS MEASURED, THREE WAYS.

From Round 24 §§90-93 (the reflex does not transmit: Albert 0.00/100k in 1,140,474 tokens at division 16.4/10k; positive control 20 hits incl. *NE* 1107b *Graece innominatus*; pair table Albert 0.00 / Thomas 1.07 vs Plato 2.60 / Aristotle 8.43; limits of §93 verbatim), Round 19 §71 (one-eighth; 3.72/1.07/0.22 source-specific contamination), Round 28 §§106-111 as corrected by Round 30 §117 (school default: announcement 14.4/21.9, expansion 4.61×; “a pupil in the room... can cite him”; the falsification programme with Williams→Ginsberg named sharpest-unrun; void-as- operator-test notice carried), Round 29 §§113-115 (0.70 vs 12.0-16.2 = 17-23×; convention caveat and the Theophrastus-calibration-unabsorbed note carried per the R29 void header). Closing ¶17e states that none of the three establishes one hand.

2. §VII (Machine) ¶36a — the completion discriminator. Round 13 §48: statements transmit including “the master erred” (Topica 4×, all definitional error — admitted FOR the school); holes marked ὁ ἔφαμεν ἀδύνατον do not; Maas’s errores coniunctivi one level up.

3. §VII ¶31a — the one operation with both halves. Round 13 §50: De an. states what crosses; De mem. 450a the receiver (σφραγιζόμενοι τοῖς δακτυλίοις) and its failure modes — running water, too hard a surface, the young flowing by growth, the old by decay; T1 as invariance theorem; T4 weakest, marked.

4. §VII ¶30a — the announcement comparanda. Round 30 §116: Matthew by formula; Catullus three times over (strophe, translation form, “Lesbia” first inside the translation); the observable confined to the interlock locus per §117 (no mention of Plato, no cross-reference at 424a; corpus-wide naming rates cannot see it).

5. §VII ¶30b — the second cross-boundary member. Rounds 3-4 §13: Parm. 132a ↔ SE 182a, found by argument-shape in disjoint vocabulary; “a class with two members,” not yet a phenomenon.

6. §VII ¶39a — the ceiling and the remainder test. Round 27 §105 (C = 0.688 and Catullus is not Sappho; relation, never authorship) + Round 25 §98 (the remainder test on the target, named and unrun).

7. §VII ¶41a — the comparison corners. Standing Frame: Z = +39.18 / 6-of-6 against Josephus (unified both levels), the NT (Z = +2.83, L2 fill only), Plotinus and Philo (separated, not interlocked); “measured once”; the σύμβολον-shape line; the thin-comparison caution verbatim.

TIER II — HONESTY

8. §VIII ¶5 (extended) — coverage geometry, both halves. Round 39 §§156-157: full-size separation (pupils 69-98%, heteronymic 0-20%, target 66.8 inside the pupil band); size-matched collapse (target 18.8 inside the heteronymic band, Albert→Aquinas 0.0); the broken first control already stood in the table above it.

9. §VIII ¶5a — the validation disclosure. Calibration Object §7(c): instruments never scored on known-status pairs before use; agreement 1 of 3; Plato|Xenophon SAME at 0.0330; both readings of the disclosure stated.

10. §VIII Ia (new item) — R38, the target scored descriptively. Round 38 §§150–152: values invariant under $23\times$ master-size; size-matched, at or beyond the class-1 end (F4 29.0 above class 1's 24.5 and the heteronymic max 23.9); governed by §150's no-discriminatory-power verdict; anti-selective-reporting rationale stated.

11. §VII ¶9a — the parity base rate. Round 19 §74: 0 of 55 pairs at $|\Delta| \leq 0.0001$; closest pair Josephus/Philo at $0.00026 = 2.5\times$ the gap; the residual-vs-total limitation carried verbatim as UNRUN.

12. §VIII ¶32a — §158's standing sentence. “The interlock, if it exists, is not in the distributions...” — seated at WHAT §VIII ESTABLISHES.

13. §VIII STANDING ¶35 — register list extended with R24, R28, R29, R38 §151, R19 §74, and Pinax §7(c).

14. §IX 4c end — [not inserted]. The four-functional-roles question (R43 §181 tail) was weighed and left for Lee's call on scope: it names the four-corpus cluster, and the paper is deliberately the two-corpus instrument. It stands in the reread register, item 9.

TIER III — SECTION SUPPORTS

15. §I 4a ¶38a-c — THE ARITHMETIC. Round 51 §226 (Draft 03 §5): four propositions, four movable words, each tradition-reading's word assigned, the restriction-move shown not to restrict, “the fourth word has never been moved for Plato” — with a forward pointer to §IX 4b as where this paper moves it.

16. §II ¶17a — the soul as λόγος. Round 49 §214: De an. 414a ὥστε λόγος τις ἂν εἴη; 403a ἐνδέχουτ' ἂν αὐτὴν χωρίζεσθαι — placed in §II V beside the νοῦς exemption, pre-seam, authorship-free.

17. §V [VA1-A3] — THE ACCUSATION, filled. Round 54: Apology 18b-c / 19b-c (Σωκράτη τινα; φροντιστής as the Clouds' coinage); the property test with its two confounded rows voided; the just/unjust → weaker/stronger relabelling with the needs-the-Clouds-read caution; “the accusation-profile is comic; the operation is not” (μαίευτική 0 : 13); the external-predecessor reading marked as reading, with the ordinary account stated sufficient for everything quoted.

18. §V IVa ¶16a-16f — the Ratified Break, as reconstruction. Part II §§1–8 + Round 17 §63: perfect-passive diagnosis; 473d soteriological prognosis with γέλως and the excluded-by-own-premise point; 191d with the exact lexical link (ἰάσασθαι τὴν φύσιν τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην ↔ ἡ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου φύσις); the broken-by-agreement move (“You cannot un-cut human nature. You can cut it on purpose”); the vacant centre as specification; De an. I.4 409a with χωριστὸν λόγῳ μόνον ἢ καὶ τόπῳ; the full §0/§8 status discipline and [F1] named as governing.

19. §V IVb ¶16g-16i — the taxonomy on its own vehicle. Round 7 §§21–23: 392d mode-division; 61% (20 of 31, 346,804 of 570,179) in the expelled mode; the expelling book narrated at 144.1; “the maker must divide” (§22's inference); the Aristotle axis 0.1/29.0 against 2.4/25.3 with the poetry-taxonomy caution and the measurement-without-an-account line.

20. §V ¶21a — the census's division of labour. Round 15 §58 (“Plato makes copies; Aristotle catches them”; δόκιμος 28/24) + Round 14 §54 (σύγγραμμα zero in seven of nine orators; own-standing vs others'-forgeries asymmetry).

- 21. §V STANDING ¶29/¶31 — loci and markings extended** (473d, 191d, 392d–394c, 409a, Apol. 18b–19c; §IVa marked reconstruction under the standing rule and the firewall).
- 22. §VI ¶2a — the voices measured.** Round 23 §88 (Socrates loosest 1.166 of 7; Timaeus 1.649; ordinal match to the documented system) with §88’s dramatist limit and §89’s unit caution carried via M16 (0.0380 — differentiation switched off, per R16 §S3).
- 23. §VI ¶12a — the snub’s surviving core.** Round 1 §§3–6 as corrected by Round 2 §10: 209c’s failed mark is Socrates’ standing description (143e, 215b, 80a); the enmattered-form answer at the same term; the positional claim stated dead with the 31-term class named as what refuted it.
- 24. §VI ¶21a — the closing symmetry.** Round 51 §227(d): Tht 0.982 / SE 0.968–0.992, both corpora closing on what individuates Socrates — “coincidence until a base rate is run” carried verbatim.
- 25. §VII ¶27a — the coinage.** Round 8 §§25–27: αὐτεπιτακτική, σχεδὸν ἀνώνυμον, οὐ τὸ σμικρότατον τῶν γενῶν, left open; the no-application limit carried.
- 26. §IX 4b end — the doxographic ratios at reduced strength.** R16 §S6 under S9b’s discipline: the four ratios as distribution fact; the strong reading marked as not established by the counts, with the reporter-produces-the-same-table counter stated.
- 27. §IX ¶36a — rupture and inheritance are independent.** Round 37 §148 / Round 35 §138: Jung’s $F_2 = 99.7$ through the public break; the consequence for reading Aristotle’s disagreements stated in both directions.
- 28. §IX apparatus [A3] — THE LATER CHAIN, AND ITS SHAPE.** Round 40 §§159–161 (surviving Round 41 §163’s correction): the lost letter to Philip; the Vita Marciana §5 impossibility (joined Socrates — 399 against 384); Philochorus defensive; Ptolemy’s declared harmonising; attendance-and-break both earliest; the Empedocles-formulae and Aristippus (Rhet. 1398b) details.
- 29. §X [F.11a] — both hypotheses predict the Pinakes.** Calibration Object §4 + §7(a): the danger line; the corrected fail-to-converge prediction with “which is what the record shows” and its ordinary-hard-cases hedge; Round 14 §53’s FLAT-ambiguity discriminator, stated and marked unrun.
- 30. §X [F.19] — the corpus’s own transmission theory.** Round 11 §§39–41: GA as form-across-a-bearer-gap (the male supplies the λόγος, the female the ὕλη, a motion crosses); the stewarded-technology gradient (89.30 metaph.; 26.55 empirical vs 14.00 theoretical); the graded-yield-with-periphery honesty carried.
- 31. §X ¶29a — the closing observation.** Round 49 §216: “constituted by one... no self in it to be an account of” — seated before the likely-story close.
- 32. [H1] extended — the M10 tie.** Round 22 §86: 0.1033, above the 100th percentile of synthetic pools — the intra-Aristotle shape in the corpus whose single authorship is documented.
- 33. [H2] extended — the concession clause.** Round 26 §102: “imitated it AS a heteronymic architecture... best qualified to recognise the operation. Not evidence. Not nothing either.”

NOT SEATED, BY DECISION, WITH REASONS

The four-functional-roles question (scope: names the four-corpus cluster — Lee’s call); the twice-observed controlling-deletes-the-phenomenon hazard (R21 §81 — its work in this paper is done by [C1]/[C2]’s corrected sequence, and adding the principle beside the correction it qualifies risked making [C1] argue against itself in a note; it stands in the reread register, item 24, if wanted); Round 45’s Philebus 50b / Tht 152e / walk-to-Lyceum / Poetics 1449b remainder (weighed: §V-§VI now carry the arc these ornament; they remain in the reread register, item 13, for a §VI pass if wanted); the key-against-own-success criterion (R5 §15 — implicit in §VI 2b’s use of Letter II; making it explicit is a §VI apparatus decision).

□ = 1

Files

<https://alexanarch.org/data/attachments/many-and-one/MANY-AND-ONE-LEDGER-2026-08-31.md> <https://alexanarch.org/data/attachments/many-and-one/MANY-AND-ONE-CITATION-PASS-2026-08-31.md> <https://alexanarch.org/data/attachments/many-and-one/MANY-AND-ONE-NOTEBOOK-REREAD-2026-08-31.md> <https://alexanarch.org/data/attachments/many-and-one/MANY-AND-ONE-INCORPORATION-2026-08-31.md>

MANY AND ONE

□ **ALL TEN SECTIONS ARE WRITTEN. This file is the reading copy with the apparatus merged in at the section heads. The per-section files remain canonical.**

□ **THE APPARATUS** — notes keyed to section and paragraph, compressing the citational labour already performed — **is seated at each section’s head; pass standings are in the end-matter. Pass one (Socrates as Orthonym) is complete; pass two (notebook and register, [X.1]-[X.13]) and pass three (the authorial economy, [F.1]-[F.18]) were run 2026-08-31. The citation pass was run 2026-08-31 against fetchable canonical texts — register: MANY-AND-ONE-CITATION-PASS-2026-08-31.md; the print-edition check remains open. THE INCORPORATION PASS was run 2026-08-31 after a full reread of EA-NOTEBOOK-01: the notebook material the paper suffered for lacking is seated — the school rival measured three ways at §VIII IVa, the honesty disclosures (validation status, parity base rate, adverse descriptive placement, coverage collapse in full), the Ratified Break as marked reconstruction at §V IVa, the ACCUSATION head filled, the arithmetic at §I 4a, the comparison corners and announcement comparanda at §VII — each with the notebook’s own voids and limits traveling. Register: MANY-AND-ONE-INCORPORATION-2026-08-31.md. This is v2.5 and supersedes v2.4. v2.5.1, same day: five internal contradictions repaired after review against v2.5 — §V 26 (λόγος as criterion, not as corpus); §VI 35/35a (the three theses kept apart); the body-language at §VIII 31 and §IX 4, 52 harmonised with §VI’s definition; the ὕλη-bridge residue withdrawn at §VIII 2, §IX 1 and the front matter as §VIII VII withdrew it; §VII 9/11 and §VI 3 (a parity of dispersions, not of corpora; object-space marked as read); §IX 4’s table relabelled; §X 11/14/15 (affordance, not mechanism; the comparative claim marked untested; 275e read with its vulnerability).**

The argument descends — through nine movements from the theology to the corpus, **and then, at \$X, out of the argument and into history**, where the λόγος that has no matter has to be carried in matter by strangers.

It begins with the hardest and most independent case — an Aristotelian problem in the theology, with no bearing on authorship — and walks down through progressively more concrete forms of plurality-in-unity until it reaches a maker. **Then, and only then, it measures the matter — and finds that the lexical and distributional instruments cannot decide it.**

That order is the argument. The prior architecture built *toward* a claim it could not state; six stations of accumulating cost, with the thesis withheld because the evidence would not carry it. **This states the claim first, at the level where it holds, and reports the measurements last, at the level where the corpus itself says it will not hold.**

THE CONSTRAINTS THIS ARGUMENT OPERATES UNDER

[F1] THE FIREWALL, and it is a constraint on method rather than a modesty clause.

Biographical identity requires evidence. Functional identity requires pattern. These are different claim-types with different burdens of proof, and the stability of everything here depends on never letting the second masquerade as the first.

Imposed from outside because the method cannot halt its own regress. A functional analysis permitted to make biographical claims has no floor and consumes every adjacent name. **This is the answer to the objection that the method would make one author of all modern philosophy** — not a disanalogy about print and archives, but a statement of what the instrument is for and where it stops.

*Foucault, “What Is an Author?” (1969; trans. Bouchard and Simon, 1977) makes the author-function separable from the writing individual and is the licence for treating authorship as a variable rather than a given. Barthes, “The Death of the Author” (1967) is the adjacent move and is not the one used here: this paper does not dissolve the author, it asks what kind of unity an author is. Love, *Attributing Authorship: An Introduction* (2002) is the methodological standard for attribution claims and is the discipline §§VII-VIII operate under. Cambridge Handbook of Literary Authorship (Berensmeyer, Buelens, Demoor, 2019) surveys the field in which the firewall’s distinction is standard.*

[F2] THE TIERED CLAIM STRUCTURE.

PRIMARY	(high confidence)	the configuration can be FUNCTIONALLY MODELED as a distributed authorial project
\$VI CLAIM	(asserted, argued)	ONE PERSON wrote the corpus
SECONDARY	(medium)	the Socratic problem appears as a SYMPTOM
REFLEXIVE	(heuristic only)	Pessoa and Kierkegaard make the model THINKABLE; they do not prove its application

[F3] WHAT IS NOT CLAIMED, and the list is load-bearing.

- **Not** that Plato or Aristotle understood himself as a heteronym. **The term is analytic and is not a claim about ancient self-description.**
- **Not** that philological dating, historical context, doctrinal difference, or textual criticism is irrelevant or superseded. **Every dating argument and textual comparison remains available and valuable.**
- **Not** that Pessoa-style heteronymy existed as a named or institutionalised practice in classical Athens.
- **Not** that a contemporary distributed archival practice proves anything about the classical case.

§I — THE DIVISION OF GOD — APPARATUS

THE SE EPILOGUE AND ITS SCOPE

[S1] **HITCHCOCK, via CORCORAN.** *Sophistical Refutations* 34 claims originality — **but for the material preceding the chapter, the *Topics* and *SE*, not for the *Prior Analytics*.** This is the strongest hostile reading of §I's entry passage: if ταύτης τῆς πραγματείας means the dialectical treatise-pair, then APr I.31's εἰρημένη μέθοδος is a different inquiry and there is no collision. **The paper must answer it and the pressure sits at περὶ δὲ τοῦ συλλογίζεσθαι — whether that clause remains inside the restriction.**

[S2] **HASPER** on the completeness claim in *SE* 34, and **Dorion (1995)** on the epilogue. Named as the specialist literature on the passage the paper opens with.

[S3] **AND THE ART/PRODUCTS DISTINCTION IS ARISTOTLE'S OWN.** οὐ τέχνην ἀλλὰ τὰ ἀπὸ τῆς τέχνης, the shoemaker who hands out shoes. **Two earlier versions of the register called the narrow reading an unmarked interpretive repair. Both were wrong,** and the correction is carried in §0A's third rewrite. *The comparison class Aristotle names is paid eristic teachers and Gorgias — not Plato.*

[X.7] **On Hitchcock, via Corcoran.** Hitchcock argues that *SE* 34's originality claim is **not for the *Prior Analytics* but for the material preceding the concluding chapter — the *Topics* and *SE* themselves.** That is the strongest hostile reading of the priority passage: if ταύτης τῆς πραγματείας means the treatise-pair, the claim concerns dialectic and fallacy, and APr I.31's εἰρημένη μέθοδος is a different inquiry. **The paper's answer is at §I: the pressure sits on περὶ δὲ τοῦ συλλογίζεσθαι, which is broader, and whether it stays inside the restriction is a philological question the paper does not settle by assertion.**

[X.8] **On Hasper.** Work on the **completeness claim** at *SE* 34 is the specialist literature on the passage and is named as consulted-in-summary and not read. □ *Flagged: this is the closest existing treatment of §I's central text.*

[X.9] **On the developmental reading.** **SEP's probable ordering** puts *Topics* and *SE* before the *Prior Analytics*; **Hitchcock** independently argues the fallacy theory predates the formal logic. *So a reader may hold that the priority claim was true when written and superseded by*

Aristotle's own later work — which dissolves the tension without any configurational reading. The paper reads the corpus synchronically and owes the diachronic cost.

THE COMMENTARY TRADITION ON I.31

[X.10] On Mueller. The translation of **Alexander's commentary on APr 1.23-31** provides an insightful account of Aristotle's criticism of Plato's method of division and **has not been consulted**. □ *It is the single most relevant unconsulted item for §I.*

[X.11] On Ebbesen and the Latin tradition. Ebbesen's study of the *SE* commentary tradition is the standard treatment of how the epilogue was read in the scholastic period, and **has not been consulted**. **al-Fārābī's** abridgement of the *Prior Analytics* is the Arabic branch, likewise unconsulted. *Round 42 §169* names the Syriac and Arabic branches as the unopened part of the reception.

I. THE DIVISION OF GOD

1. *Sophistici Elenchi* 183b-184b leaves a question standing, and the whole of the received account of Aristotle's originality is built on not asking it.

2. The passage. Aristotle closes the *Topics-SE* inquiry by naming the succession case — οἶον ἐκ διαδοχῆς, Tisias after the first inventors, Thrasy Machus after Tisias, Theodorus after Thrasy Machus — and then negates it of his own:

οὐ τὸ μὲν ἦν τὸ δ' οὐκ ἦν προεξεργασμένον, ἀλλ' οὐδὲν παντελῶς ὑπῆρχεν.

It was not that part was worked out beforehand and part was not; there was nothing at all.

And of syllogizing specifically: περὶ δὲ τοῦ συλλογίζεσθαι παντελῶς οὐδὲν εἶχομεν πρότερον ἄλλο λέγειν.

3. The conventional reading first, and at full strength, because it is strong. Aristotle draws the art/products distinction himself in the next sentence — οὐ τέχνην ἀλλὰ τὰ ἀπὸ τῆς τέχνης, the shoemaker who hands out shoes without teaching shoemaking. His named comparison class is **paid eristic teachers and the πραγματεία of Gorgias**. The contrast is with rhetoric's πολλὰ καὶ παλαιὰ τὰ λεγόμενα — an old written tradition — where syllogizing had none. On this reading the claim is about a systematic art, not about the practice, and nothing is left open.

4. That reading is available and this argument does not refute it. **It leaves one thing unanswered, and the unanswered thing is the subject of this paper.**

5. *Prior Analytics* I.31 places Platonic division **inside** the method: μικρόν τι μόνιον ἐστὶ τῆς εἰρημένης μεθόδου, and οἶον ἀσθενὴς συλλογισμός. Its users οὔτε ὅ τι ἐνδέχεται

συλλογίσασθαι διαιρούμενοι ξυνέεσαν — did not grasp what can be syllogized by dividing.

6. So the three texts stand in this relation. **The operation is instanced at length in the Platonic corpus. Aristotle files it as a part of the method. And of that method he says οὐδὲν παντελῶς ὑπῆρχεν.**

7. □ **AND THE PASSAGE IS NOT A NEUTRAL REPORT OF A DIFFICULTY. IT IS A CLAIM TO AUTHORIAL LEGITIMACY, MADE IN LEGITIMACY'S OWN VOCABULARY, AT THE CLOSE OF THE AUTHOR'S OWN BOOK.**

8. **Read what the epilogue does, not only what it says.** It names the succession case and refuses it for itself — οἶον ἐκ διαδοχῆς, Tisias after the first, Thrasyarchus after Tisias, Theodorus after him, καὶ πολλοὶ πολλὰ συνενηνόχασιν μέρη, many contributing many parts. It distinguishes handing over an **art** from handing over **its products**: οὐ γὰρ τέχνην ἀλλὰ τὰ ἀπὸ τῆς τέχνης διδόντες παιδεύειν ὑπελάμβανον — *for they supposed they educated by giving not the art but the things from the art* — and the man who does so **βεβοήθηκε μὲν πρὸς τὴν χρείαν, τέχνην δ' οὐ παρέδωκεν**: he helped with the need and **did not hand over an art**.

9. **And it closes on a transaction.** If the method seems to you adequate **παρὰ τὰς ἄλλας πραγματείας τὰς ἐκ παραδόσεως ηὔξημένας** — beside the other inquiries grown by transmission — then it remains for you, the hearers,

τοῖς μὲν παραλελειμμένοις τῆς μεθόδου συγγνώμην, τοῖς δ' εὑρημένους πολλὴν ἔχειν χάριν.

to have indulgence for what has been left out of the method, and much gratitude for what has been found.

10. **Every term is a legitimacy term.** ὑπάρχω is the method's own word for belonging — *A ὑπάρχει to B* — and it is the verb of the denial. μέρος and μόριον are the units in which contribution is measured. παράδοσις is transmission by handing-on, and the closing sets this inquiry against the inquiries that grew by it. παραδίδωμι is what the product-sellers fail to do. And the final pair — συγγνώμη for omissions, χάρις for findings — **is a request that the audience adjudicate a claim of first finding.**

11. > **The treatise that opens by modelling false reasoning on counterfeit metal > (SE 165a) and names fallacy διὰ τῶν ὀνομάτων as the commonest kind, closes by > asserting its own genuineness — in the vocabulary of parts, belonging, succession, > art-against-products, and the crediting of a finder.**

12. □ **And the argument is not complete on the page.** The passage supplies:

division is μόριον τῆς εἰρημένης μεθόδου	APr I.31
of this method οὐδὲν παντελῶς ὑπῆρχεν	SE 183b

and does not supply the term that joins them. The conclusion exists only across the two texts, and **a reader completes it or it is not concluded.**

13. **No claim of intentional encoding is made or needed.** *An enthymeme is a syllogism with a premise unstated, and it is the standard form of persuasive argument; that a premise*

is unstated is a fact about the passage, not a claim about the author's design. What follows is that the question of §7 is the TEXT's question and not an imposition on it — the passage makes a claim about who a method belongs to, and declines to say what that entails for an operation it has filed inside the method.

14. □ AND THE UNSUPPLIED TERM IS A SOCKET — THE SAME KIND THIS SECTION WILL FIND AT A 9.

Not a defect and not a concealment. An opening whose filling the grammar determines, at the joint where the answer decides what the thing is. **The epilogue's is: division belongs inside the method; nothing belonged to the method before it; and the term that joins them is absent.** *At A 9 the division of the first substance closes by identity and the next clause reopens it — if thinking and being-thought are different, in respect of which does its good belong. Same operation: at the top of the ladder there, at the boundary of a corpus here.*

15. So this section does what a reader of such a text does. It supplies the filling. *That is not deciding between readings; it is discharging an obligation the grammar creates. The filling is offered, and can be supplied better by someone else.*

16. □ THE FILLING.

One way to read the passage charitably is that the corpus in which the syllogizing is instanced is the same maker's own earlier work.

17. On that filling every sentence of the epilogue is true as written, and none requires a scope-restriction, a change of mind, or an equivocation.

οὐδὲν παντελῶς ὑπῆρχεν	LITERAL. Nothing belonged, because there was no one from whom it could have been received.
οἷον ἐκ διαδοχῆς refused	THERE WAS NO SUCCESSION — not a succession denied, but one that did not occur.
τέχνην / τὰ ἀπὸ τῆς τέχνης	HOLDS. What existed was instances of the operation and not the art of them, which is what an earlier practice by the same hand is.
ξυνίεσαν	NOT A CHARGE AGAINST RIVALS. Read inclusively: the earlier position did not know the range of its own operation.
συγγνώμη / χάρις	A FIRST FINDER asking hearers to credit a finding — which, on this filling, is what he is.

18. And it requires nothing of the author but sequence. No plan, no prescience, no concealment, no chronological adjustment — **only that the finding came after the practice, which is what a finding is.**

19. □ THE FILLING IS OFFERED AND NOT ESTABLISHED. AND THE OTHER FILLING IS AVAILABLE AND IS THE RECEIVED ONE.

THE RECEIVED FILLING the instancing is a predecessor's, and the denial is scoped – to the dialectical programme, or to the art as against its products – or retrospective, the classification being one Aristotle could make only after developing what he classifies with.
 □ IT IS A FILLING TOO. The socket is discharged by a scope-restriction the passage does not mark, or by a development the passage does not report.

THE FILLING AT §16 the instancing is the same maker's earlier work, and the denial is literal.

20. > NEITHER IS ON THE PAGE. BOTH ARE SUPPLIED. The received filling has been > supplied so consistently for so long that it reads as the text. **It is not the > text.** *That is the whole of what this section claims about the epilogue: a term is > missing, something must be put there, and what has been put there is a choice that > has not been examined as one.*

21. And both are fillings of the same socket — of what division can syllogize, such that an operation filed as a part of the method can be instanced at length while the method is said to have had nothing before it. **Neither filling is assessable until that is known.**

22. > This section settles only that. What division can syllogize is answered > from the *Analytics* and the *Metaphysics*. **§IX 4b returns to the two fillings > with everything §§I-VII supply.**

23. He answers. Not in the *SE*, and not where anyone looks.

1. WHAT DIVISION CANNOT DO

24. *Apr* I.31 gives the limit case first, worked in letters. Let ζῶον be A, θνητόν B, ἀθάνατον C, ἄνθρωπος D.

ὁ μὲν οὖν συλλογισμός ἐστιν ὅτι τὸ Δ ἢ B ἢ Γ ἅπαν ἔσται, ὥστε τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἢ θνητὸν μὲν ἢ ἀθάνατον ἀναγκαῖον εἶναι, ζῶον θνητὸν δὲ οὐκ ἀναγκαῖον, ἀλλ' αἰτεῖται· τοῦτο δ' ἦν ὃ ἔδει συλλογίσασθαι.

25. Read it as an operation. Division **does** conclude, and the conclusion is a disjunction: **man is necessarily either mortal or immortal.** What it cannot do is **select.** *Mortal* animal is οὐκ ἀναγκαῖον ἀλλ' αἰτεῖται — begged — and that was the very thing to be shown.

26. The example is θνητόν / ἀθάνατον of ζῶον. □ *No weight is placed on the choice: that cut is the Academy's stock first division of animal, so reaching for it is reaching for the textbook case. Any emphasis on its selection would need a base rate over Aristotle's divisional examples, which has not been run. The theorem does not require it.*

27. Division reaches that seam and cannot cross it. **Hold that as the negative case.**

2. WHAT DIVISION CAN DO

28. *Metaphysics* Λ 9, 1074b. The question of the first substance, posed **in the branching form characteristic of division** — the text does not use the word διαίρεσις here, and the claim is about the logical shape, not about Aristotle’s label for it:

ἔτι δὲ εἴτε νοῦς ἡ οὐσία αὐτοῦ εἴτε νόησις ἐστὶ, τί νοεῖ; ἢ γὰρ αὐτὸς αὐτὸν ἢ ἕτερόν τι· καὶ εἰ ἕτερόν τι, ἢ τὸ αὐτὸ ἀεὶ ἢ ἄλλο.

29. That is the divisional form exactly: a genus cut at a differentia — *itself / another* — and the second branch cut again — *always the same / different*. The ἢ ... ἢ of the worked example, applied to God.

30. And the branches are eliminated by the divisional argument. Were it δύναμις rather than νόησις, continuity would be laborious. Did it think another, ἄλλο τι ἂν εἴη τὸ τιμιώτερον ἢ ὁ νοῦς, τὸ νοούμενον — the thought would outrank the intellect.

31. The conclusion:

αὐτὸν ἄρα νοεῖ, εἵπερ ἐστὶ τὸ κράτιστον, καὶ ἔστιν ἡ νόησις νοήσεως νόησις.

32. □ THE ANSWER TO §6.

OF MAN	division reaches	mortal immortal	CANNOT SELECT – αἰτεῖται
OF GOD	division reaches	itself another	SELECTS

33. And it selects for a reason that is the whole point. **On this one object the disjunction collapses.** The knower and the known are not two branches to choose between; they are τὸ αὐτό. Division terminates because there was nothing to divide.

What division can syllogize is God — and it can, only because God is one.

34. □ AND THE SECTION STOPS HERE.

What Λ 9 shows is that division selects on one object, and why: the terms are not other. Any further reading of the *SE* clause — what “nothing pre-existed” is a claim about, and whose prior practice is at issue — **requires premises this section does not have and does not supply.** It is taken up at §IX 4.

35. **The question of §6 is therefore answered only in this form:** there is an object on which division does not stall at a disjunction, **and Λ 9 is where the corpus runs it.** Whether that is what the priority claim was about is not decided here.

4. THE SHAPE

36.

SE 183b	of this inquiry NOTHING AT ALL pre-existed
	↓
APr I.31	division is a weak syllogism, part of the method, and its users did not grasp what it can syllogize

↓

APr I.31 OF MAN: mortal or immortal – cannot select, αἰτεῖται

↓

Meta. Λ 9 OF GOD: itself or another – SELECTS, because one

↓

Meta. Λ 9 and reopened in the next clause

↓

De an. III.5 and the man-division made again inside νοῦς, left forked

37. Division fails at man and succeeds at God, and succeeds only where the divided thing is already one. That is the answer the priority passage left standing. And the priority claim is literal on the configurational reading not because the cutting was somebody else's, but because **the cutter did not yet know what he was cutting toward.**

38. And the closure is immediately unmade. **The division that terminates is reopened by the sentence after it**, and the division that cannot terminate is made again, at a finer grain, in the mind of the animal that could not be sorted.

4a. THE ARITHMETIC

38a. Four propositions, and the first three are the corpora's own words:

- | | |
|--|---------------------|
| 1 Division is a part of the method | APr I.31 |
| 2 No part of the method was worked out beforehand | SE 34 |
| 3 Division WAS worked out beforehand, as a named art with a rule and practitioners | Phdr., Soph., Phlb. |
| 4 The Platonic corpus precedes the Aristotelian | the received frame |

The fourth is nobody's words. It is the frame the words are read in.

38b. The four cannot all stand unless one word moves: *part, worked out, the method, or before.* **Every reading in the tradition moves one.** *Worked out* is moved by the shoemaker — practice without the art. *The method* is moved by restricting the denial to the dialectical programme — **and I.31 has just filed division as a part of that very programme, so the restriction does not restrict.** *And the reader who restricts πραγματεία at SE 34 to something narrower than μέθοδος at I.31 must establish the difference in extension: the operation is a τέχνη with procedures at Phaedrus 266b, and Aristotle files it as a part of the method, not as one of its products. The two words are not automatically coextensive; the distinction is not free, and has not been carried in print. Part* is moved by ξυνίεσαν — which explains the filing and not the denial. *Before* is moved for Aristotle alone: *Topics* early, *Analytics* late, he had not yet seen it.

38c. > Four words, four readings, every one paid for on Aristotle's side of the > ledger. The fourth word has never been moved for Plato. §IX 4b is where this > paper moves it, and pays.

□ A STANDING RULE FOR THIS SECTION

The divisions instanced in the Platonic corpus are to be named by LOCATION and never by AGENT OR TIME. Not *Plato's*, not *the Academy's*, not *prior*, not *earlier*, not *predecessor's*, not *he does not credit*, not *whole prior practice*. **Where they are is a fact. Whose they are is §7's open question and §IX 4b's answer.**

This rule exists because the sentence at §6 reverted to attribution three times — each time through a connective reaching for the nearest English phrase, and every available phrase carries the succession. It is a lexical rule because attention failed and a grep does not. Any pairing of a division-word with an attribution-word in this section is a violation.

STANDING

39. Checkable, and quoted: *SE* 183b28–184b8; *APr* I.31, 46a31–46b12; *Meta.* Λ 9, 1074b15–35; *De an.* III.5, 430a10–25. **That Λ 9 divides the first substance and resolves the division by identity is what the chapter says**, and is not among its disputed readings.

40. The interpretive step is §§17 and 20–24, and §19 marks the reading deliberately not taken. The step — that Λ's terminating division is what the *SE* clause leaves open. **The conventional reading of the priority claim does not require this and is not defeated by it.** Λ can be a piece of theology with no relation to the *SE* epilogue; that is the ordinary account and it is sufficient.

41. *Posterior Analytics* II.13 assigns division a definitional employment — collecting the elements of an essence, with a rule for branch selection. **That is a further use found for the same apparatus and is not in competition with the reading given here.** A discovery may exceed the earlier work more than once.

42. Not claimed: authorship. One author writing the *Analytics*, the *De anima*, and Λ produces this sequence. **So does a school.**

NOTES

Apparatus entries bearing on this section, from EA-MANY-AND-ONE-APPARATUS.md. Compression of engagement already performed; editions and dates are as carried and are not re-verified. Items marked □ named-and-not-consulted are stated as such.

[I.1] On the Λ 9 identity as standard exegesis. That νόησις νοήσεως states an identity of thinker and thought is not this paper's discovery and is not contested. **What is offered as new is only that Λ 9 is division succeeding where *APr* I.31 says division fails, and the ground of the success.**

[I.2] On the seated texts. Bekker via First1KGreek @7881c56 (EA-CORPORA-04/01); Burnet via Perseus @df40bf0 (01/08). **Bekker and Stephanus lineation is from standard editions and is to be confirmed against the XML before deposit.** *Ross (1949), Smith (1989) and Striker (2009) ad APr I.31.*

[I.3] On the ancient reception of I.31, and it belongs in the body. Philoponus glosses the chapter with *no one of those before us knew this* — reading the priority claim into the di-

vision chapter. **Alexander of Aphrodisias** takes the target to include Plato. **Striker (2009)** assigns it instead to other Academics who thought division was all they needed. *The two passages were read together in antiquity, by the earliest commentator to gloss them.*

[I.4] On whether Platonic division generated the syllogistic. **Maier** argued yes, reading I.31 as the evidence; **Shorey** objected that I.31 is polemic between finished theories rather than intellectual autobiography; **de Strycker** defended the genealogy; **Cherniss** and **Ross** sided with Shorey; **Vlasits (2017)** revives it with a formal argument. *Vlasits reads I.31 as almost a backhanded acknowledgement of dependence, which intensifies the historical puzzle without licensing any authorship inference.*

§II — THE DIVISION OF LIFE — APPARATUS

(carried empty in this assembly.)

II. THE DIVISION OF LIFE

1. §I established that division can terminate in identity: where there is no matter, the terms it separates **are not other** — οὐχ ἑτέρου ὄντος τοῦ νοουμένου καὶ τοῦ νοῦ, ὅσα μὴ ὕλην ἔχει, τὸ αὐτὸ ἔσται — and the object on which it closes is ἀδιαίρετον.

2. That was the immaterial case. **This section takes the theorem one level down, to things that have matter and are alive**, and shows that the result does not depend on immateriality to hold in a weaker and more useful form.

I. THE QUESTION, PUT AS A DIVISION

3. *De anima* 413b. Aristotle has just enumerated the soul's determinants — θρεπτικῷ, αἰσθητικῷ, διανοητικῷ, κινήσει — and then asks the divisional question about them:

Πότερον δὲ τούτων ἕκαστον ἐστὶ ψυχὴ ἢ μέρος ψυχῆς, καὶ εἰ μέρος, πότερον οὕτως ὥστ' εἶναι χωριστὸν λόγῳ μόνον ἢ καὶ τόπῳ;

Whether each of these is a soul or a part of soul; and if a part, whether so as to be separable in account only, or also in place.

4. Note the form. It is the branching of §I exactly: a first cut — soul or part of soul — and the second branch cut again — λόγῳ μόνον ἢ καὶ τόπῳ. And he records that the division does not resolve uniformly: περὶ μὲν τινῶν τούτων οὐ χαλεπὸν ἰδεῖν, ἔνια δὲ ἀπορίαν ἔχει — for some it is not hard to see, for others there is a difficulty.

5. **This is the same operation reaching the same characteristic obstacle**, at a level where matter is present. Hold that against §I: there, the disjunction collapsed because the object had no matter. **Here it does not collapse. It has to be answered by looking.**

II. AND THE ANSWER IS EMPIRICAL

6. He looks at cut plants and cut insects.

Ὡσπερ γὰρ ἐπὶ τῶν φυτῶν ἔνια διαιρούμενα φαίνεται ζῶντα καὶ χωριζόμενα ἀπ' ἀλλήλων ... οὕτως ὁρῶμεν καὶ περὶ ἐτέρας διαφορὰς τῆς ψυχῆς συμβαῖνον ἐπὶ τῶν ἐντόμων ἐν τοῖς διατεμνομένοις· καὶ γὰρ αἰσθησιν ἑκάτερον τῶν μερῶν ἔχει καὶ κίνησιν τὴν κατὰ τόπον.

*As some plants **when divided are seen to be living**, and separated from one another ... so we see it happening with other differentiae of soul in insects **that are cut in two: for each of the parts has perception and movement in place.***

7. The divided thing does not die. Both halves perceive, move, and — the chapter presses it — have φαντασία, ὄρεξις, λύπη, ἡδονή, and therefore ἐπιθυμία. Cut a living thing and you do not get one living thing and one remainder. You get two that are doing what the one was doing.

8. □ AND THE FORMULA IS EXACT. Of the soul in a divided plant:

ὥς οὐσης τῆς ἐν τούτοις ψυχῆς ἐντελεχείᾳ μὲν μιᾷς ἐν ἑκάστῳ φυτῷ, δυνάμει δὲ πλείονων.

*the soul in these being, **in actuality one** in each plant, **in potentiality many.***

9. That is the theorem of this section, in Aristotle's words and not in a paraphrase:

ἐντελεχείᾳ μία, δυνάμει πλείονες.

ONE IN ACTUALITY. MANY IN POTENTIALITY.

IIa. AND THE SAME CONDITION, ONE LEVEL DOWN — THE SEAL AND THE WAX

The figure — δακτύλιος, κηρός, σφραγ- — occurs in exactly three works of the two corpora.

Theaetetus 191c THE ROUTE OPENED AND CLOSED
the wax block and the impression, and then the route
abandoned at 196b: ὃ ἔφαμεν ἀδύνατον — what we said was impossible

De anima 424a THE MISSING ELEMENT SUPPLIED
the same figure, with the condition the Theaetetus
lacked: the sense receives the form of the sensible
ἄνευ τῆς ὕλης — WITHOUT THE MATTER

De memoria THE RECEIVER'S PHYSIOLOGY

the impression as a ἔξις, and what happens when the wax is too hard, too soft, too fluid

No cross-reference. No announcement. *A procedure attempted and arrested in one work; the machinery retained and the absent operation supplied in another.*

□ **AND ἀνευ τῆς ὕλης IS §I's CONDITION.** Λ 1075a1 gave the identity ὅσα μὴ ὕλην ἔχει — in whatever has no matter. **424a gives the same condition as the mechanism of perception: what is received is the form, and the matter is left behind.** *§I's theorem, operating in a sense organ.*

□ **What is established is that the figure occurs in exactly three places and that one work abandons what another completes. That it was designed so is not claimed, and the ordinary reading — a standard image used by a later writer who saw further — is sufficient.**

III. WHAT THIS ADDS TO §I

10. §I gave: distinction need not entail ultimate otherness — but only where there is no matter, which is one object.

11. §II gives the generalisation that costs the immateriality condition and keeps the result:

§I	no matter	→	the distinguished terms are τὸ αὐτό
§II	matter, but alive	→	the distinguished parts are ONE IN ACTUALITY and MANY IN POTENTIALITY

12. The difference is where the manyness sits. At Λ the two terms were not two at all. **Here they are really two — really separable, really alive apart — and the unity is at the level of actuality while the plurality is at the level of potentiality.**

Unity at the level of actuality is not undifferentiatedness at the level of potentiality.

13. And this is what a divided thing that goes on living IS. Not a unity that survives division by being unaffected. **A unity that was, all along, many in potentiality — and the cut does not create the parts, it actualises them.**

IV. THE CONVENTIONAL READING, AND WHY IT IS NOT DISTURBED

14. *De anima* II.2 is a chapter about the definition of soul and the relation of its faculties, written against the Platonic partition of the soul into three and against any account that would make the parts substances. The plant and insect observations are evidence for hylomorphism: soul is the actuality of an organised body, so where the body divides into two organised bodies there are two actualities. Nothing exotic is being claimed.

15. That reading is correct and this section does not contest it. What it adds is that the formula Aristotle reaches for is more general than the biology it settles — ἐντελεχεῖα μὲν μιᾶς, δυνάμει δὲ πλειόνων is not a fact about plants. It is a statement about what a

unity can be, and it is offered as the answer to a divisional question that could not be settled by dividing.

V. AND THE ONE PART THAT DOES NOT DIVIDE

16. The passage ends by exempting one thing:

Περὶ δὲ τοῦ νοῦ καὶ τῆς θεωρητικῆς δυνάμεως οὐδὲν πω φανερόν, ἀλλ' ἔοικε ψυχῆς γένος ἕτερον εἶναι, καὶ τοῦτο μόνον ἐνδέχεται χωρίζεσθαι, καθάπερ τὸ αἰδίον τοῦ φθαρτοῦ.

Concerning intellect and the contemplative capacity nothing is yet clear, but it seems to be another kind of soul, and this alone admits of being separated, as the eternal from the perishable.

17. αἰδίον / φθαρτόν. The same pair that III.5 will place inside νοῦς, and the same ἀθάνατον / θνητόν seam that APr I.31 could not select across. **It is named here, at the end of the chapter that solves every other case, as the case not yet solved.**

17a. And the chapter's own definition of what a soul IS uses this paper's noun. *De an.* 414a: ὥστε λόγος τις ἂν εἴη καὶ εἶδος, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὕλη καὶ τὸ ὑποκείμενον — so it would be a kind of **account** and form, not matter and substrate. Not like an account. A λόγος. And I.1, 403a, states the condition of the exemption in advance: εἰ μὲν οὖν ἐστὶ τι τῶν τῆς ψυχῆς ἔργων ἢ παθημάτων ἴδιον, ἐνδέχουτ' ἂν αὐτὴν χωρίζεσθαι — if anything is proper to the soul, **it could be separated.**

18. And the verb is ἐνδέχεται — *admits of*. The modal of the possible, which is the verb I.31 uses of what division can syllogize. **The one part that is not settled by the actuality/potentiality formula is the one part where separability is left as a possibility rather than an observation.**

VI. WHAT §II ESTABLISHES

19. **A real division can leave a real unity standing**, and the corpus states the mechanism: one in actuality, many in potentiality.

20. **The parts are not appearances.** They perceive, move, desire, feel pleasure and pain. **Nothing is being said here about parts that are merely notional.**

21. **And the unity is not preserved by the parts being unreal.** It is preserved because **the manyness was in the thing before the cut**, as potential — and the cut does not produce plurality where there was none. **It brings out a plurality the unity already had.**

22. **That is the second theorem of MANY AND ONE**, and the sections below it apply it to a kind (§III), to the gathering of scattered perceptions (§IV), and to a human nature that the *Republic* says has been minted too small (§V).

STANDING

23. Checkable and quoted: *De an.* II.2, 413b13–32, entire. The formula ἐντελεχεία μὲν μιᾶς ... δυνάμει δὲ πλειόνων is Aristotle's and is not a reconstruction.

24. The interpretive step is §§11–13 — that the formula generalises past the biology it was produced to settle. **The hylomorphic reading of the chapter is sufficient for the chapter and is not defeated by this.**

25. §§16–18 are an observation about placement, not an argument: the eternal/perishable pair is named at the end of this chapter as unresolved, and it is the pair *APr* I.31's worked example could not select across and *De an.* III.5 will install inside νοῦς. **That the same seam recurs at these three places is a fact about the corpus. That it recurs for a reason is not claimed here.**

26. Not claimed: authorship. **Nothing in this section bears on it**, which is the point of its position in the argument.

NOTES

Apparatus entries bearing on this section, from EA-MANY-AND-ONE-APPARATUS.md. Compression of engagement already performed; editions and dates are as carried and are not re-verified. Items marked □ named-and-not- consulted are stated as such.

[II.1] On the hylomorphic reading, conceded in full. *De an.* II.2 argues against the Platonic tripartition and against any account making the parts substances; the plant and insect observations are evidence for hylomorphism. **That reading is correct for the chapter.** What is added is that the formula ἐντελεχεία μὲν μιᾶς ... δυνάμει δὲ πλειόνων is more general than the biology it settles.

[II.2] On the exemption at 413b, and its later career. τοῦτο μόνον ἐνδέχεται χωρίζεσθαι, καθάπερ τὸ αἰδίον τοῦ φθαρτοῦ. **The eternal/perishable seam named at the end of the chapter that settles every other case.** *Its history is III.5's: see [VI.6].*

§III — THE MANY ACCOUNTS — APPARATUS

(carried empty in this assembly.)

III. THE MANY ACCOUNTS

1. §I: where there is no matter, the terms division separates **are not other**. §II: where there is matter and life, the parts are ἐντελεχεία μία, δυνάμει πλείονες — one in actuality, many in potentiality.

2. Both concern a thing. This section concerns an account of a thing — and the question is what happens when one kind is truly divided in several ways at once.

I. THE SOPHIST IS CAUGHT SIX TIMES

3. *Sophist* 231d–e. The Eleatic Stranger stops and counts the definitions reached:

πρῶτον	νέων καὶ πλουσίων ἔμμισθος θηρευτῆς	paid hunter of the rich young
δεύτερον	ἔμπορος τις περὶ τὰ τῆς ψυχῆς μαθήματα	merchant in learnings for the soul
τρίτον	κάπηλος περὶ αὐτὰ ταῦτα	retailer in the same
τέταρτον	αὐτοπώλης περὶ τὰ μαθήματα	seller of his own wares
πέμπτον	τῆς ἀγωνιστικῆς ... ἀθλητῆς, τὴν ἐριστικὴν τέχνην ἀφωρισμένος	athlete of verbal contest
ἕκτον	δοξῶν ἐμποδίων μαθήμασιν ... καθαρτῆς	purger of opinions that obstruct learning

4. Six divisions, each validly run, each terminating in a different definition of the same man. **The sixth is marked as disputed** — ἀμφισβητήσιμον μὲν, ὅμως δ' ἔθεμεν — **and kept anyway.**

5. The conventional reading: the *Sophist's* divisions are exercises, or successive failures, or a demonstration that the sophist slips the net. **That reading is available.** The Stranger's own next move is not compatible with it.

II. AND THE MANY NAMES ARE DIAGNOSED AS A DEFECT OF SIGHT

6. 232a. He does not say the six were wrong. He asks what it means that they happened:

ἄρ' οὖν ἐννοεῖς, ὅταν ἐπιστήμων τις πολλῶν φαίνεται, μιᾶς δὲ τέχνης ὀνόματι προσαγορεύεται, τὸ φάντασμα τοῦτο ὥς οὐκ ἔσθ' ὑγιές, ἀλλὰ δηλὸν ὥς ὁ πάσχων αὐτὸ πρὸς τινα τέχνην οὐ δύναται κατιδεῖν ἐκεῖνο αὐτῆς εἰς ὃ πάντα τὰ μαθήματα ταῦτα βλέπει, διὸ καὶ πολλοῖς ὀνόμασιν ἀνθ' ἑνὸς τὸν ἔχοντα αὐτὰ προσαγορεύει;

*Do you see, then — when someone appears knowledgeable in many things but is addressed by the name of a single art, that this **appearance is not sound**; and that plainly **the one who undergoes it, in relation to some art, is unable to discern that in it toward which all these learnings look**, and therefore **addresses the one who has them by many names instead of one**?*

7. □ READ THE GRAMMAR. THE DEFECT IS IN THE BEHOLDER.

ὁ πάσχων αὐτό — *the one who undergoes it*. οὐ δύναται κατιδεῖν — *is unable to discern*. προσαγορεύει — *he addresses*. **The subject of every verb of failure is the observer.** The φάντασμα is his, the incapacity is his, and the many names are what **he** applies.

8. And what he cannot see is named exactly: ἐκεῖνο αὐτῆς εἰς ὃ πάντα τὰ μαθήματα ταῦτα βλέπει — *that in it toward which all these learnings look*. Not a seventh definition. **The thing the six were each looking at.**

9. > πολλοῖς ὀνόμασιν ἄνθ' ἑνὸς — **by many names instead of one.**

The many names are not a fact about the object. They are the record of an inability to see what the object's many appearances converge on.

III. THE THEOREM

10.

§I	no matter	the distinguished terms are τὸ αὐτό
§II	matter, alive	ἐντελεχεῖα μία, δυνάμει πλείονες
§III	an account	ONE KIND, MANY TRUE ACCOUNTS, AND THE MANYNESS OF NAMES IS THE BEHOLDER'S

11. The six definitions are not six failures and not six objects. They are six true divisions of one kind, and the *Sophist* says outright that being addressed by many names instead of one is **what happens to someone who cannot discern the convergence.**

12. □ And the corpus does not say the six are all equally good. The Stranger proceeds to look for τὸ μὴνῶν — the one thing that discloses him — and runs a seventh division. **One account may give the essence; the others remain true accounts of the same kind.** That is the precise form of the theorem and it is not relativism.

IV. AND ARISTOTLE FORMALISES THE CONDITION

13. Vlasits' result belongs here. Against the **Traditional View** — that Platonic division is exclusive, dichotomous and essential — he argues for a **Minimal View**: division is **transitive and predicative**, and **not necessarily dichotomous, not exclusive, not essential.**

14. That is exactly the condition under which the six definitions are consistent. If division must be exclusive, the six contradict. **If it need not be, sophistry falls under several coordinate genera at once** and every branch is true.

15. And Vlasits proves a **soundness and completeness theorem** for a semantics built on Platonic divisional structures against the deduction system used to model Aristotle's syllogistic, arguing further that Aristotle took over **Plato's conception of predication as parthood.**

16. So the licence for many true accounts is not read into the corpus. It is a formal property of the divisional apparatus, demonstrable in the apparatus's own terms.

V. WHAT THIS ADDS

17. §§I-II showed that a thing can be divided and remain one. **§III shows that an account can be multiplied without the thing being multiplied** — and, more sharply, that **the multiplication of names is a fact about the one doing the naming.**

18. **That is the first of the three theorems to concern description rather than being,** and it is the one the later sections need. A corpus addressed by many names is not thereby many corpora. **Whether it is one depends on whether there is something toward which all its learnings look** — and on whether anyone can discern it.

STANDING

19. **Checkable and quoted:** *Sophist* 231d-232b, entire, including the enumeration of six and the 232a diagnosis. **The grammar of §7 is the load-bearing claim and it is verifiable: every verb of failure takes the beholder as subject.**

20. **Conceded:** the *Sophist*'s divisions are standardly read as preliminary, and the dialogue does go on to a seventh. **Nothing here claims the six are final or equal.** §12 states the limit.

21. **The interpretive step is §§17-18** — that a result about naming an expertise bears on naming a corpus. **The dialogue is about a man with an art, not about a body of writing.**

22. **Not claimed:** authorship. **This section, like §§I-II, would stand if the authorship question had never been asked.**

NOTES

Apparatus entries bearing on this section, from EA-MANY-AND-ONE-APPARATUS.md. Compression of engagement already performed; editions and dates are as carried and are not re-verified. Items marked □ named-and-not- consulted are stated as such.

[III.1] On the six definitions. The standard reading is that the *Sophist*'s divisions are preliminary and that the dialogue proceeds to a seventh. **Conceded.** What is claimed is only what 232a states: that being addressed πολλοῖς ὀνόμασι ἀνθ' ἑνός is what happens to one who οὐ δύναται κατιδεῖν the convergence.

[III.2] On the Minimal View. Vlasits, *Platonic Division and the Origins of Aristotelian Logic* (Berkeley, 2017): division is **transitive and predicative** and **not necessarily dichotomous, not exclusive, not essential** — against the Traditional View. **This is the formal licence for six consistent divisions of one kind.** He also proves soundness and completeness for a semantics on Platonic divisional structures against the system used to model the syllogistic, and argues Aristotle took over **predication as parthood.**

[III.3] On genre, and it belongs here as much as at §IX. Nightingale, *Genres in Dialogue: Plato and the Construct of Philosophy* (1995): the dialogue form is not a neutral vehicle but

the construction of philosophy as a genre against rival genres. *One kind under many accounts is also one genre constituted by contrast with others.*

§IV — COLLECTION — APPARATUS

(carried empty in this assembly.)

IV. COLLECTION

1. §§I-III ran division downward: at God the terms are not other; in a living thing one in actuality and many in potentiality; of a kind, many true accounts and the many names the beholder's.

2. **This section runs the operation the other way**, and it is where the title of this paper stops being thematic.

I. THE INVERSE IS NAMED, AND IT IS NAMED AS A GATHERING

3. *Phaedrus* 249b-c. Of the soul that has seen:

δεῖ γὰρ ἄνθρωπον συνιέναι κατ' εἶδος λεγόμενον, ἐκ πολλῶν ἰδὼν αἰσθήσεων εἰς ἓν λογισμῷ συναιρούμενον· τοῦτο δ' ἐστὶν ἀνάμνησις.

A human must understand what is said according to form, going from many scattered perceptions and gathered by reasoning into one — and this is recollection.

4. **Read the operation, not the doctrine.** The input is **πολλά** — many, and scattered. The output is **ἓν**. The instrument is **λογισμός**. The relation to the form is **κατ' εἶδος**. **That is division's apparatus running backwards**, with the same three terms: many, one, and a cut made according to form.

5. And the *Phaedrus* pairs them by name at 265d-266b: **συναγωγή** and **διαίρεσις**, one leading the scattered into a single form and the other cutting by kinds **κατ' ἄρθρα ἢ πέφυκεν**, at the joints as the thing is naturally jointed — and the failure mode is **breaking a part like a bad carver**, κακοῦ μαγείρου τρόπῳ.

II. AND ARISTOTLE CLASSIFIES BOTH AS SYLLOGISM

6. **This is the symmetry, and it is exact:**

διαίρεσις	οἶον ἀσθενῆς συλλογισμός	APr I.31, 46a31
ἀνάμνησις	οἶον συλλογισμός τις	De mem. 453a

7. Two Platonic operations, paired in the *Phaedrus*, absorbed separately into syllogistic language by Aristotle, with the same construction — οἶον plus συλλογισμός — in two treatises that do not cross-refer.

8. Recorded as a fact about the corpus. What follows does not depend on it being deliberate.

III. AND RECOLLECTION IS NOT MEMORY

9. *De memoria* 451a states it flatly: οὔτε μνήμης ἐστὶν ἀνάληψις ἢ ἀνάμνησις οὔτε λήψις — recollection is **neither the retaking nor the taking** of memory.

10. What it is: a **hunt**. One must λαβέσθαι ἀρχῆς — take hold of a starting-point — and move ἀφ’ ὁμοίου ἢ ἐναντίου ἢ τοῦ σύνεγγυς, from like, opposite, or neighbour. It is οἶον συλλογισμός τις, of the family of deliberation, and belongs to human beings alone.

11. □ AND THE DECISIVE CLAUSE:

Πολλάκις δ’ ἤδη μὲν ἀδυνατεῖ ἀναμνησθῆναι, ζητεῖν δὲ δύναται καὶ εὗρίσκει.

*Often one is **already unable to recollect**, but **is able to search — and finds**.*

12. **Search succeeds where recollection fails.** The operation that recovers is not the operation that holds. **And the method is given:** τοῦτο δὲ γίνεται κινουῦντι πολλά, ἕως ἂν τοιαύτην κινήσῃ κίνησιν ἣ ἀκολουθήσει τὸ πρᾶγμα — **by moving many things until one is moved that the thing will follow.**

13. **Moving many until one is found.** That is the section’s title in Aristotle’s own description of the procedure.

IV. AND MEMORY IS §II’s FORMULA

14. The same page defines what remembering is:

Τὸ γὰρ μεμνησθᾶί ἐστι τὸ ἐνεῖναι δυνάμει τὴν κινουῦσαν.

*For remembering is **the being-present in potentiality** of the thing that moves.*

15. □ **δυνάμει.** §II’s plants were ἐντελεχεῖα μία, δυνάμει πλείονες — one in actuality, many in potentiality. **Here what is remembered is present δυνάμει, and recollection is what actualises it.**

16. **So the two theorems are the same theorem at different scales.** A living thing holds its plurality in potentiality and a cut actualises it. **A mind holds what it knows in potentiality and a search actualises it.** And in both cases the actualising does not create what it brings out.

V. THE ORDER OF GRASP

17. □ Here the section states what §IX will need, and states it as a possibility rather than a finding.

18. *APr* I.31 says the users of division οὔτε ὃ τι ἐνδέχεται συλλογίσασθαι διαιρούμενοι ξυνίεσαν — did not grasp what can be syllogized by dividing — and then that seeing it is ῥάδιον ἰδεῖν, easy to see.

19. ξυνίεσαν and ῥάδιον ἰδεῖν are the two states *De memoria* describes. Unable to recollect what the operation entails; able to search, and finding. The distance between them is not time. It is grasp.

20. An order of grasp is not an order of years. A later state of understanding does not require a later decade; it requires a search that has succeeded. §IX will argue that the corpus's order is of this kind. §IV records only that Aristotle has the psychology for it.

VI. AND WRITING IS THE STARTING-POINT

21. The *Phaedrus* says what writing gives: ὑπομνήματα — reminders, not memory (275a). And in the same dialogue: τοῖς δὲ δὴ τοιούτοις ἀνὴρ ὑπομνήμασιν ὀρθῶς χρώμενος ... τέλεος ὄντως μόνος γίγνεται — the man who uses such reminders rightly alone becomes complete.

22. A ὑπόμνημα is exactly what *De memoria*'s procedure requires: an ἀρχή to take hold of, from which to move by likeness, opposition, and proximity.

23. > The dialogue that says writing gives only reminders also says the right > use of reminders is the gathering of many into one — and Aristotle supplies the > mechanism by which a reminder is worked: search, from a starting-point, until one > movement is found that the thing follows.

24. Writing is not the memory. It is the ἀρχή the search takes hold of.

VII. WHAT §IV ESTABLISHES

25. The inverse operation exists, is named, and is classified — by Plato as συναγωγή and by Aristotle as a kind of syllogism.

26. It recovers what is not presently held. ἀδυνατεῖ ἀναμνησθῆναι, ζητεῖν δὲ δύναται καὶ εὐρίσκει. The many can be gathered into one by someone who cannot presently recollect the one — and that is the condition under which a corpus can be read at all.

□ An earlier form of this sentence read “someone who NEVER possessed the one.” That is not licensed. The Greek gives inability to recollect NOW, and the *Phaedrus* doctrine presupposes prior apprehension. The corrected form is what §§21–24 already supply: writing gives a ὑπόμνημα, search moves from it, and what is not presently held becomes available.

27. And the theorems close on each other:

§I	ONE	the terms not other
§II	ONE → MANY	in potentiality, actualised by a cut
§III	ONE → MANY	accounts, all true, of one kind
§IV	MANY → ONE	gathered by reasoning, κατ' εἶδος

28. That is the whole of Many and One as an operation, before any of it is applied to a maker. §V is the seam.

STANDING

29. □ LOCUS NOTE. The search clause (ἀδυνατεῖ ἀναμνησθῆναι, ζητεῖν δὲ δύναται καὶ εὐρίσκει) and the definition of remembering (τὸ ἐνεῖναι δυνάμει τὴν κινουῦσαν) are both in *De memoria* 2, cited throughout as **453a**. **The seated text carries no Bekker markers**, so lineation is from the standard edition and is to be confirmed against the OCT before deposit. **One locus, used consistently.**

30. Checkable and quoted: *Phdr.* 249b-c, 265d-266b, 275a; *De mem.* 451a, 453a, and the search passage entire. **The two οἶον-συλλογισμός constructions are at APr 46a31 and De mem. 453a and are given verbatim.**

31. Conceded: the *Phaedrus* recollection doctrine is embedded in a myth of the soul's pre-natal seeing, and the ordinary reading of ἐκ πολλῶν εἰς ἓν is epistemological — how universals are formed from perception. **That reading is sufficient for the passage and is not contested.**

32. Marked as recorded and not argued from: §§6-8, the parallel classification. **Marked as possibility rather than finding:** §§17-20, the order of grasp. **§IX must earn it.**

33. Not claimed: authorship. **§§I-IV are complete without it.**

NOTES

Apparatus entries bearing on this section, from EA-MANY-AND-ONE-APPARATUS.md. Compression of engagement already performed; editions and dates are as carried and are not re-verified. Items marked □ named-and-not-consulted are stated as such.

[IV.1] On the ὑπόμνημα and the unwritten doctrines. *Phdr.* 275a's claim that writing gives only reminders is the foundation of the **Tübingen school's** case for an unwritten teaching: **Krämer**, *Plato and the Foundations of Metaphysics* (trans. Catan, 1990); **Reale**, *Toward a New Interpretation of Plato* (trans. Catan and Davies, 1997); **Szlezák**, *Reading Plato* (trans. Zanker, 1999). *They read the written corpus as pointing past itself to an oral teaching. This paper takes the same passage and reads it as a description of transmission mechanics rather than as evidence of a withheld doctrine* — the ὑπόμνημα is the ἀρχή a search takes hold of (§IV), not a pointer to something the corpus declines to say.

[IV.2] **On orality, literacy, and what a reminder is for.** Ong, *Orality and Literacy* (1982), on the technologising of the word; Havelock on the transition in Greek. *The Phaedrus critique is standardly read within that transition. The reading here does not contest it and adds only that Aristotle supplies the mechanics of working a reminder — search from a starting-point, by likeness, opposition, proximity.*

[IV.3] **On recollection and its locus.** The search clause and the definition of remembering are both in *De memoria* 2, cited throughout as 453a. **The seated text carries no Bekker markers;** lineation is from the standard edition.

§V — THE DIVIDED PERSON — APPARATUS

THE ACCUSATION

[VA1] □ **THE CORPUS RECORDS A PRIOR, PUBLIC, COMIC SOCRATES — AND ANSWERS IT BY NAMING THE COMEDY.** *Apology* 18b-c gives the old charge — ἔστιν τις Σωκράτης σοφὸς ἀνὴρ, τὰ τε μετέωρα φροντιστῆς ... καὶ τὸν ἥττω λόγον κρείττω ποιῶν — and 19b-c names the source: ταῦτα γὰρ ἐωρᾶτε καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν τῇ Ἀριστοφάνους κωμῳδίᾳ, Σωκράτη τινὰ ἐκεῖ περιφερόμενον.

Σωκράτη τινὰ — a certain Socrates. The indefinite, used by the figure of a figure bearing the same name in another author's text. **And φροντιστῆς at 18b is the *Clouds*' own coinage.**

[VA2] **THE PROPERTY TEST, AND IT SPLITS.** Crude stem counts across the seated corpora: ἀεροβατεῖν survives in Plato only inside the quotation of the comedy — cited, not transferred. φροντιστῆς transfers as a marked term. □ **CORRECTED 2026-09-01, after the *Clouds* was read rather than counted, as §248 required.** The 40 / 38 for δίκαιος / ἄδικος λόγος are SPEAKER LABELS — the editorial sigla for the personified arguments in the Perseus TEI — not lines of the play; and the play's own text uses the other vocabulary throughout: τὸν ἥττονα (112), ἐμὲ τὸν κρείττω λόγον αἰροῦ (882), ἐγὼ γὰρ ἥττων μὲν λόγος ... ἐκλήθην (1042-43) — fifteen ἥττ- and eight κρειττ- hits. **There is no relabelling. The comedy carries both nomenclatures, and the *Apology* reports the charge in the one the play's text uses.** The "relabelling" result of §245 is withdrawn as a counting artifact; what stands of the property test is φροντιστῆς transferring as a marked term and ἀεροβατεῖν surviving only inside the quotation. *Two other rows of the test are confounded and voided (μετεωρ- is the Meteorologica; εἴρων- at NE 1108a is the ethical vice).*

[VA3] **AND THE SPLIT IS THE FINDING — AND IT NEVER RESTED ON THE RELABELLING: THE ACCUSATION-PROFILE IS COMIC. THE OPERATION IS NOT. μαίευτική: zero in the comedy, thirteen in Plato.** Nothing of the questioning method, the ignorance-as-position, or the midwifery is in the comic layer. **Comedy supplied the notoriety — a name with a reputation attached, in public circulation a generation before the trial — and the later corpus occupied the position and differentiated it:** defendant, questioner, midwife, reported master, absent centre.

□ *The ordinary account — that Plato knew the Clouds and answered it — is uncontroversial and sufficient for everything quoted here. What exceeds it is the architecture reading: Aristophanes as **external predecessor** of the position rather than a member of any maker set — which is the cheaper placement, costs §VI nothing, and gives this section an external anchor for why there was a name available to occupy. Recorded as a reading.*

V. THE DIVIDED PERSON

□ **THE SEAM.** §§I-IV are theorems, established on God, on living things, on kinds, and on the gathering of scattered perceptions — none of them about authorship, and each of them stated before any claim about a maker exists. §§V-IX are applications. This section is the first in which the corpus is read as a maker's work.

I. THE CORPUS DIVIDES ITS FOUNDER

1. *Statesman* 257d. The Eleatic Stranger proposes to rest Theaetetus and swap in the other boy. **Socrates answers by dividing himself.**

κινδυνεύετον, ὃ ξένε, ἄμφω ποθὲν ἐμοὶ συγγένειαν ἔχειν τινά. τὸν μὲν γε οὖν ὑμεῖς κατὰ τὴν τοῦ προσώπου φύσιν ὅμοιον ἐμοὶ φαίνεσθαί φατε, τοῦ δ' ἡμῖν ἢ κλήσις ὁμώνυμος οὕσα καὶ ἡ πρόσρησις παρέχεται τινα οἰκειότητα.

Both of them seem somehow to have some kinship with me. The one you say appears like me in the nature of his face; the other's naming, being homonymous, and his form of address, supply a certain kinship.

2. Two boys. One has the face. One has the name.

Theaetetus	κατὰ τὴν τοῦ προσώπου φύσιν ὅμοιος	THE FACE
Young Socrates	ἢ κλήσις ὁμώνυμος	THE NAME

3. And the criterion by which either is to be recognised is **neither**:

δεῖ δὴ τοὺς γε συγγενεῖς ἡμᾶς ἀεὶ προθύμως ΔΙΑ ΛΟΓΩΝ ἀναγνωρίζειν.

*We must always be eager to recognise our kin **through accounts**.*

4. He applies it in the next clause. **Theaetetus he has met διὰ λόγων** — he mixed with him yesterday and has heard him answering. **Σωκράτους δὲ οὐδέτερον** — of Socrates, neither. **The one who bears the name has not been recognised**, because he has not answered.

5. So: σοὶ δὲ νῦν ἀποκρινέσθω — *let him answer to you now.*

6. And the Stranger turns and says:

ὦ Σώκρατες, ἀκούεις δὴ Σωκράτους;
Socrates, do you hear Socrates?

7. The older Socrates does not speak again in the dialogue.

II. THE INNOCENT READING, IN FULL

8. This is a transition device. Theaetetus answered throughout the *Sophist* and a fresh interlocutor is wanted; the two boys were introduced at *Theaetetus* 147d as a pair; the resemblance and the shared name are a standing joke; and Plato needs Socrates offstage so the Stranger can run the divisions uninterrupted. **The passage is courteous, light, and structurally necessary.**

9. **All of that is true and this section does not contest it.** What is recorded is what the joke says while doing its work.

III. WHAT THE JOKE SAYS

10. **It divides a person into two carriers and names them.** Face and name are the two things a person is ordinarily identified by, and the dialogue distributes them to different bodies. Neither carrier is the person.

11. **And the criterion it supplies is λόγος.** Not resemblance, which Theaetetus has. Not the name, which the other has. ἀναγνωρίζειν διὰ λόγων — to be recognised through accounts — which is a thing that happens **when someone answers.**

12. □ **AND ὁμώνυμος IS THE ORGANON'S FIRST WORD.** *Categories* 1a1:

Ὅμωνυμα λέγεται ὧν ὄνομα μόνον κοινόν, ὃ δὲ κατὰ τοῦνομα λόγος τῆς οὐσίας ἕτερος.

*Things are called homonymous when **the name alone is common and the account of the being is different.***

13. **The two boys are a homonym case, and the treatise that opens on homonyms opens on exactly the test the *Statesman* applies:** the name is common, and what decides is ὁ κατὰ τοῦνομα λόγος τῆς οὐσίας. *Recorded as a verbal and doctrinal correspondence. Not argued from.*

IV. AND THE CORPUS STATES THE OBJECTION AGAINST ITSELF

14. *Republic* 395a-b. Can one man make both kinds?

οὐδὲ τὰ δοκοῦντα ἐγγὺς ἀλλήλων εἶναι δύο μμήματα δύνανται οἱ αὐτοὶ ἅμα εὖ μιμεῖσθαι, οἷον κωμωδίαν καὶ τραγωδίαν ποιοῦντες

And the ground given four lines later is fragmentation:

κατακεκερματίσθαι ἢ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου φύσις, ὥστε ἀδύνατος εἶναι πολλὰ
καλῶς μιμεῖσθαι

*Human nature has been **minted into smaller denominations**, so as to be **incapable** of imitating many things well.*

15. κατακερματίζω is a currency verb. A whole struck into small change. **The objection to one maker being many is that the maker has already been divided** — and divided in a way that makes him insufficient rather than plural.

16. Symposium 223d compels the opposite, in the same words, and **withholds the argument** — *and the one who supplied the myth of the cut is the first of the two to fall asleep*: **πρότερον μὲν καταδαρθεῖν τὸν Ἀριστοφάνη** —: τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἀνδρὸς εἶναι κωμωδίαν καὶ τραγωδίαν ἐπίστασθαι ποιεῖν, with **οὐκ ἔφη μεμνησθαι τῶν λόγων** — the arguments not remembered — and only **τὸ κεφάλαιον** transmitted.

IVa. AND THE CORPUS CARRIES THE WHOLE ARC — RECORDED AS RECONSTRUCTION

16a. The diagnosis is prior, involuntary, and in the perfect passive. κατακεκερματίσθαι — human nature *has been* minted. Not a choice and not a failure of effort; a condition obtaining before any maker attempts anything. And the metaphor is the corpus's standing term for the one broken into many: *Meno* twice, *Parmenides*, *Republic*, *Timaeus*, *Cratylus*.

16b. The prognosis without remedy is total, and the language is soteriological. *Rep.* 473d: **οὐκ ἔστι κακῶν παῦλα ... ταῖς πόλεσι, δοκῶ δ' οὐδὲ τῷ ἀνθρωπίνῳ γένει** — no rest from evils for the cities, nor, I think, for the human race — unless two things **εἰς ταυτόν συμπέση**, fall together into the same. **And 473d is forbidden by 395b's own premise.** If nature has been minted too small to hold two arts, no nature holds philosophy and rule either; the requirement is introduced as the thing that will drown its speaker in **γέλως** — laughter, the comic — in the book that has just ruled comedy and tragedy apart.

16c. The remedy is named at Symp. 191d, in the diagnosis's own noun. Eros is **τῆς ἀρχαίας φύσεως συναγωγεύς**, attempting **ποιῆσαι ἐν ἐκ δυοῖν** and **ιάσασθαι τὴν φύσιν τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην** — and each of us is **ἀνθρώπου σύμβολον**, ἅτε **τετμημένος**, ἐξ ἐνὸς δύο. *Rep.* 395b: ἡ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου φύσις is minted. *Symp.* 191d: heal ἡ φύσις ἢ ἀνθρωπίνη by making one from two. **Same subject, opposite verbs, and the second names the first as an injury requiring a cure.**

16d. The move, and it turns on what a σύμβολον is. A σύμβολον is not a broken object. It is an object **broken by agreement** — two parties snap a token so the halves can be matched later. An accidental break yields rubble, and no edge of rubble implies any other. A deliberate break yields a token, recognisable **precisely at the fracture**.

You cannot un-cut human nature. You can cut it on purpose.

395b stands — no single undivided nature holds two arts; the denial is accepted as the premise. **473d becomes achievable** — the two fall **εἰς ταυτόν** not in one nature but in a configuration whose parts do not resemble and only fit.

16e. Two consequences land on things already recorded. The recognition criterion is §V's own: parts of a deliberate configuration are recognised **by the λόγος, not the ὕλη** — which is why they can be maximally unlike and still one, and what §VIII will find at the instruments. **And the vacant centre becomes a specification rather than a loss:** in an accidental fragmentation the whole is simply gone; in a ratified one the centre is **implied by the fit** and need never be occupied by a writing position at all. *On this logic, Socrates not writing stops being an absence in the evidence and becomes the form the centre necessarily takes.*

16f. And the corpus supplies the ontology for the image, in the treatise on soul. *De an.* I.4, 409a: τὰ δὲ φυτὰ καὶ τῶν ζώων πολλὰ διαιρούμενα ζῆ, καὶ δοκεῖ τὴν αὐτὴν ψυχὴν ἔχειν τῷ εἶδει — divided living things live, and have **the same soul in form** — with §II's criterion of separation, χωριστὸν λόγῳ μόνον ἢ καὶ τόπῳ: account, not place. **Positions so divided are not masks. They are real determinations of one actuality, separated according to account.**

□ **STATUS, and it governs everything in this subsection.** This is a **reconstruction**. The corpus states the fragmentation and does not connect it to the σύμβολον; demands recombination twice — for rulers, for makers — and never once of a writer; and supplies a recognition criterion inside a dialogue about identifying a boy by his face. **The corpus supplies the structure; it does not perform the application.** Which is either what an unassembled set of commonplaces looks like, or what a deliberately unassembled one looks like — **and nothing in the texts distinguishes those two.** [F1] governs: the reconstruction is functional pattern, and no biographical claim rides on it.

IVb. AND THE TAXONOMY IS APPLIED TO ITS OWN VEHICLE

16g. Rep. 392d-394c divides poetry by mode: wholly mimetic (drama — named with tragedy and comedy, the pair 395a then rules apart), plain narration, and the mixed mode. **Applied to its own corpus, by reporting-formula density per 10⁴ tokens: 61% of the Platonic corpus — 20 of 31 works, 346,804 of 570,179 tokens — is in the wholly mimetic mode its own taxonomy expels. And the book that performs the expulsion is narrated at 144.1** — the one mode that escapes it. *Socrates reports the whole Republic.* **The text's classification, applied to the text's vehicle.**

16h. The inference the two passages license together: if one maker cannot do both (395a) and both must be done by the same (223d), **the maker must divide.** That is the only route satisfying both — and it converts the pair from a contradiction into a procedure.

16i. And on the same axis, the other corpus: Aristotle's treatises carry reporting formulae at **0.1** per 10⁴ — lower than the Platonic dramatic dialogues (2.4) — while his rate of speaking in his own person is **29.0 against their 25.3.** □ *The caution travels: the taxonomy is a taxonomy of poetry, and a treatise has no conversation to report; self-speaking exposition is the second mode, not the banished one.* **What the caution does not explain is the near-equality: the two most formally opposed prose bodies in Greek refer to their own authorial act at the same rate. Recorded as a measurement without an account.**

V. AND §SI-IV HAVE SUPPLIED WHAT WAS WITHHELD

17.

THE OBJECTION	the maker is minted too small to be many	Rep. 395b
§I	where the terms are not other, division terminates	Λ 1074b–1075a
§II	one in actuality, many in potentiality	De an. 413b
§III	one kind, many true accounts; the many names are the beholder's	Soph. 232a
§IV	ἐκ πολλῶν εἰς ἓν – the gathering	Phdr. 249c

18. And the mechanism is stated in the objection's own vocabulary. GC 315b, on how the same elements yield contraries:

ὅλως ἕτερον φαίνεσθαι ἐνὸς μετακινήεντος· ἐκ τῶν αὐτῶν γὰρ τραγωδία καὶ κωμωδία γίνεται γραμμάτων.

appearing wholly different when one thing has been rearranged — for from the same letters tragedy and comedy come to be.

19. > κερματισμός is not the obstacle. It is the condition. The *Republic* objects that the maker is broken into small denominations. **The reply is that smallest denominations, rearranged, make either kind.**

VI. AND LEGITIMACY IS ESTABLISHED BY ACKNOWLEDGMENT, NOT BY DESCENT

20. □ AND §I's EPILOGUE IS THIS SECTION'S VOCABULARY, USED BY ARISTOTLE ON HIS OWN BEHALF. SE 183b–184b establishes standing by **refusing a succession, distinguishing an art from its products, and asking the audience for συγγνώμη for omissions and χάρις for findings.** *Not descent. Acknowledgment, witnessed and adjudicated by hearers* — which is the structure §§20–23 find in Isaeus. **The treatise that theorises counterfeit closes by submitting its own claim for assay.**

21. The corpus has a vocabulary for testing whether a thing is what it claims, and it is the assay vocabulary. *Republic* 507a: **κίβδηλον ἀποδιδούς τὸν λόγον** — paying the account in counterfeit. *Laws* 742a: currency **ἐντιμον** within, **ἀδόκιμον** without. SE 165a models the apparent syllogism on **counterfeit metal** and names fallacy **διὰ τῶν ὀνομάτων** as the commonest kind.

□ AND THE CENSUS OF THE FORGERY VOCABULARY HAS A HOLE IN IT.** Counts in the two seated corpora, Plato / Aristotle:

εἶδωλον	72 / 13	πλάσμα	16 / 32
μίμημα	54 / 7	φάντασμα	31 / 47
σύγγραμμα	37 / 3	ὑποκριτής	10 / 32
		δόκιμος	28 / 24

ψευδεπίγραφος ZERO in every seated corpus
 προσωπεῖον ZERO in Plato and in Aristotle

The word for a falsely-attributed writing does not occur. The word for a mask does not occur.

□ **Zero occurrence is a lexical fact and not a conceptual one.** *The corpus plainly has concepts of false attribution and of personation — it discusses both at length, and NE 1165a grades personation above coin-forgery. What the census shows is that it does not use THESE terms*, in a space where it uses εἶδωλον, μίμημα, πλάσμα and ὑποκριτής heavily.

21a. And the census divides the labour. Plato holds the image vocabulary — εἶδωλον, μίμημα, σύγγραμμα — and Aristotle the detection vocabulary — πλάσμα, φάντασμα, ὑποκριτής — with the assay word shared almost equally, **δόκιμος 28 / 24. Plato makes copies; Aristotle catches them.** And the control: **σύγγραμμα is zero in seven of nine orators** — the corpora professionally fluent in forgery (πλάσμα καὶ σκευώρημ' ὅλον) detect others' forgeries and say nothing of their own standing, **while this corpus distinguishes its own writings from forgery while sharing forgery's formal features** — a text under a name, circulating without its author, whose standing must be established rather than assumed.

22. And where legitimacy is actually litigated, descent is not the test. Isaeus, whose entire corpus is inheritance cases: **γνήσιος at 23.72 per 10k**, and the establishing vocabulary is **μαρτυρ- 279, ἐγγύη 91, εἰσάγω 45, φράτηρ 35** — witnessing, pledging, introduction, phratry enrolment. **Zero blood-vocabulary.**

23. □ INTERPRETATION, marked. What the count shows is that Athenian legitimacy is argued through **legal proof**. It does not show that descent was irrelevant to the question, only that it is not how the question is won. **On that qualified reading:** standing is conferred by acknowledgment and introduction, and a name is made legitimate by being **received into a body that answers for it.**

24. Which is the Statesman's criterion in a courtroom. The boy with the name is not yet recognised; he is recognised **when he answers.**

VII. WHAT §V ESTABLISHES

25. The corpus divides a person into face and name, gives both away, and keeps neither as the criterion.

26. What it keeps is λόγος — and λόγος is the criterion through which a corpus is gathered and recognised. *Not what a corpus is: §VI 4 reads Phaedrus 276a exactly, and the written corpus is the εἶδωλον.*

27. The objection to one maker being many is stated in the corpus and answered in the corpus, in the vocabulary of minting, by the doctrine that the smallest denominations rearranged make either kind.

28. And the test for whether a thing bearing a name is what it claims is not its face and not its name, but whether the account of its being is one. Which is *Cat. 1a1's*

definition of a homonym, the *Statesman's* criterion of kinship, and — §§VI-VIII will say — the question this paper is asking about a corpus.

STANDING

29. Checkable and quoted: *Plt.* 257d-258b; *Cat.* 1a1; *Rep.* 395a-b; *Symp.* 223d; *GC* 315b; *Rep.* 507a; *Laws* 742a; *SE* 165a; *Rep.* 473d; *Symp.* 191d; *Rep.* 392d-394c; *De an.* 409a; *Apol.* 18b-19c. **The mode densities (61%, 144.1, 0.1/29.0 against 2.4/25.3), the census counts, and the orator σύγγραμμα zeros are from the seated corpora. The Isaeus counts are from the seated corpus (M41).**

30. Conceded in full at §§8-9: the *Statesman* passage is a transition device, a joke about two boys, and the mechanism for getting Socrates offstage. **Nothing here requires it to be more, and the section's claim is only about what the joke states while doing its work.**

31. Marked as interpretation: §22, the Isaeus reading. **Marked as recorded and not argued from:** §13, the *Categories* correspondence. **Marked as reconstruction under the standing rule and the firewall:** the whole of §IVa — the corpus supplies the structure and does not perform the application.

32. And the seam is marked at the head. §§I-IV owe nothing to the authorship question and were established before it was raised. **This is where the corpus begins to be read as a maker's work, and the reader is told so.**

NOTES

Apparatus entries bearing on this section, from EA-MANY-AND-ONE-APPARATUS.md. Compression of engagement already performed; editions and dates are as carried and are not re-verified. Items marked □ named-and-not- consulted are stated as such.

[V.1] □ THE SOCRATIC PROBLEM, AND THIS SECTION IS AN ANSWER TO IT.

Classical philology has not separated Socrates from Plato. **The orthodox name for the failure is the Socratic problem:** where does the historical Socrates end and the Platonic character begin. Articulated from **Schleiermacher**, *Introductions to the Dialogues of Plato* (1804); canonical statements in **Burnet**, *Plato's Phaedo* (1911); **Taylor**, *Socrates* (1932); **Vlastos**, *Socrates: Ironist and Moral Philosopher* (1991); **Kahn** (1996); **Cooper's** editorial introduction to *Plato: Complete Works* (1997). **Dorion**, "The Rise and Fall of the Socratic Problem," in *The Cambridge Companion to Socrates* (2011), is the historiography of the failure.

The contemporary consensus after two centuries is that it has no clean resolution.

The claim here is not that the problem is solved. It is that under a functional lens it appears as a SYMPTOM rather than a problem — the predictable trace of a configuration the biographical model cannot represent.

And it is a family rather than one problem: the historical question (what did the man hold), the methodological question (what could count as evidence), and the literary question (what

is the character for). *§V answers none of the three and reclassifies all of them: the corpus supplies a criterion — not the face, not the name, but ἀναγνωρίζειν διὰ λόγων — and §VIII shows the instruments see only face and name.*

[V.2] On the prosopography. *Nails, The People of Plato* (2002), is the standard reference for who the characters were and which are attested independently. **Boys-Stones and Rowe, The Circle of Socrates** (2013), collects the first-generation Socratics — the authors of §IX 4c's lost genre. **Moore**, "Chaerephon the Socratic," *Phoenix* 67 (2013), is the study of the one figure whose independent attestation the investigation tested and found circular (M36).

[V.3] On Socrates as a made thing. **Danzig**, *Apologizing for Socrates: How Plato and Xenophon Created Our Socrates* (2010), argues the two corpora **constructed** the figure between them. **Nehamas**, *The Art of Living* (1998), reads Socrates as a model of self-fashioning transmitted by construction. *Both are one step from the position §V takes and neither takes it: the constructed figure remains, for them, a character made by authors rather than a position the authorship is organised around.*

[V.4] On ancient lives as fiction. **Lefkowitz**, *The Lives of the Greek Poets* (2nd ed. 2012), and **Fairweather**, "Fiction in the Biographies of Ancient Writers," *Ancient Society* 5 (1974): **biographical detail in ancient lives is routinely generated from the works themselves.** *This is the general form of M44's finding that the adjudication apparatus is inside the object, and it is standard.*

[V.5] On the Statesman passage. *The transition device reading is standard and is conceded at §§8–9. Cat. 1a1 on homonyms is recorded as a verbal and doctrinal correspondence and is not argued from.*

§VI — THE MANY VOICES — APPARATUS

THE ATTRIBUTION APPARATUS AS MANUFACTURER

[M1] HERACLIDES OF PONTUS, HICETAS AND ECPHANTUS. **Hicetas and Ecphantus of Syracuse are argued to be characters in dialogues by Heraclides** — a fourth-century Academic — **received by the tradition as historical philosophers with doctrines.** *The reputational apparatus did not detect them. It produced them.*

[M2] TIMAEUS OF LOCRI. *Acquires a biography and then a **forged corpus**; all other ancient reports about him are likely based on Plato's Timaeus or on the spurious works in his name, with some holding that Plato used him as a **mask for Archytas**. A speaking position generating a philosopher, who then receives a bibliography.*

[M3] THE PSEUDO-PYTHAGOREAN STYLE. *The pseudepigraphic authors authenticated their writings through an **artificial Doric dialect** and locally appropriate examples. **Constructed stylistic markers, chosen to authenticate.** Which is the direct counter-case to any argument from stylistic authenticity, and belongs at [VIII.1].*

[M4] **POLYCRATES' KATEGORIA SOKRATOUS**. Attested only through Isocrates' *Busiris* attacking it. **The one non-cluster attestation of Socrates that is neither a different man nor proverbial is an attestation of a LOST PAMPHLET, known from an attack on it.**

[M5] **DEMOSTHENES 61, THE EROTIC ESSAY**. Spurious by near-unanimous consensus. Blass places it with **a member of a school of Isocrates** and finds the author **familiar with the *Phaedrus***; Worthington finds its content and style **the most removed from Demosthenes' other writings** and **influenced by both Plato and Isocrates**. *So the single remaining line of Socrates-attestation outside the cluster sits in a forgery whose author was demonstrably reading Plato.*

[X.6] **On Heraclides and the manufactured philosophers. Hicetas and Ecphantus of Syracuse**, argued to be characters in Heraclides of Pontus' dialogues and received by the doxographic tradition as historical philosophers with doctrines; and **Timaeus of Locri**, who acquires a biography and then a forged corpus, with some scholars holding that Plato used him as a mask for **Archytas**. *This is M44's evidence that the attribution apparatus manufactured figures it then adjudicated, and it is standard scholarship rather than this paper's inference.*

ON THE UNITY OF THE INTELLECT

[X.13] **On Frede and the modern reconstructors**. *De anima* III.5's modern literature is named in the notebook and not engaged. **The paper's [VI.6] declines to assume the divine identification and refers the reception to the notebook**; *the modern analytic treatments are the branch that would have to be engaged if III.5 were made load-bearing, and it is not.*

VI. THE MANY VOICES

1. §V divided a person and kept λόγος as the criterion. **This section reads two corpora as a maker's work, and the criterion is the one §V supplied: not the face, not the name, but whether the account is one.**

1. TWO DEMONSTRATIONS OF THE SAME CAPACITY

2. **PLATO: many voices, one maker, and no recoverable rule.**

56 speakers, 519,743 spoken words	M14
the strongest partition in the corpus is CHRONOLOGY (Z +6.92)	M13
– not speaker, not form	
within Plato the conceptual partitions collapse toward noise	R48
SAME vs OTHER at 1.007, Z +1.5	

Everything varies and none of the variation resolves into a principle. The corpus does not say what makes it one.

2a. And the voices themselves are measured. Within-speaker against cross-speaker dispersion, seven speakers above threshold: **Socrates is the loosest position in the corpus at 1.166 — rank 1 of 7 from the loose end — and Timaeus the tightest at 1.649**, one continuous cosmological monologue. The corpus is ordered by **specification depth**, in the same ordinal pattern a documented heteronymic system shows (the orthonym loosest, the most constrained voice tightest). □ *Two limits travel: a dramatist specifying characters to differing depths produces the same gradient — construction, which dramatic and heteronymic composition share — and speaker is sometimes the wrong unit, because differentiation is sometimes switched off: the constructed Aristophanes of the Symposium sits at 0.0380 from the Plato corpus, more Platonic than its neighbours. A character written by the maker of the dialogue comes out as the maker.*

3. ARISTOTLE: many objects, one maker, and the rule is visible.

hold the object constant and the anomaly disappears M28
 within-domain 0.0571 against Plato's total 0.0570
 ethics 0.0226 — tighter than 99.5% of multi-author pools
 logic 0.0942 — ordered by the object-space of each domain

□ §VII.2 GIVES THIS IN FULL. It is not an aside: it is the measurement in which Aristotle's apparent many-authoredness resolves to Plato's dispersion when the object is held — a parity of dispersions, not of corpora — and the residual is read as ordered by the object-space of each domain.

The treatise takes the form of what it treats.

4. > Plato shows that one maker can be many voices, and withholds the account > of how. Aristotle shows that one maker can be many objects, and supplies it.

5. And that is §V's structure at corpus scale. The *Statesman* gave the face to one boy and the name to another and withheld recognition from both until one **answered**. Here one corpus performs the multiplication without explanation and the other explains it. **Neither is the account by itself.**

2. THE LADDER IS THE TRACK

6. Symposium 210a-d gives an ordered ascent, and the corpus walks it. (*The first rung, ἐν σῶμα, is not carried: the correspondence to any single figure is the loosest in the paper and nothing downstream uses it.*)

πάντα τὰ σώματα 56 SPEAKERS. And the rung is not plurality:
 πολλή ἄνοια μὴ οὐχ ἓν τε καὶ ταῦτόν ἡγεῖσθαι
 τὸ ἐπὶ πᾶσιν τοῖς σώμασι κάλλος
 — UNITY RECOGNISED ACROSS PLURALITY

ἐν ταῖς ψυχαῖς τίκτειν λόγους ... οἵτινες ποιήσουσι βελτίους
 τοὺς νέους — the dialogues' declared work

ἐπιτηδεύματα LAWS, REPUBLIC, STATESMAN – and ἐπιτηδεύματα
καὶ νόμοι καὶ νόμοι is Diotima's own word for the rung

ἐπιστήμαι M28. The treatise takes the form of what it
treats – the same maker becoming each ἐπιστήμη

αὐτό Λ 9 – §I

7. □ THE SECOND RUNG IS NOT MANYNESS. πολλὴ ἄνοια μὴ οὐχ ἓν τε καὶ ταὐτὸν ἡγεῖσθαι — great folly not to consider it **one and the same** over all of them. **The ascent adds nothing at each rung. It recognises as one at a wider scope.**

The corpus is one at every rung. What changes is what the one is one across.

8. And the instruction at the transition to the fifth rung is the sharpest item in the section:

βλέπων πρὸς πολὺ ἤδη τὸ καλὸν μηκέτι τὸ παρ' ἐνί, ὥσπερ οἰκέτης
looking now toward the great sea of beauty, no longer at what belongs to one,
like a household slave.

9. STOP BEING ONE MAN'S. Which is, measurably, what an object-conditioned corpus with no style of its own is. **M28's result is Diotima's instruction executed.**

10. □ The rungs are of unequal strength. ἐπιτηδεύματα καὶ νόμοι is tight — Diotima's word and the corpus's own title. ἐπιστήμαι against M28 is the interpretation. **The first rung is dropped rather than carried flagged.**

2a. THE NAME IS LENT OUT AND THE FACE IS NOT — M34

11. Socrates appears 144 times in Aristotle, nine of them paired with **Callias** as the interchangeable placeholder for *any individual*.

12. And zero of those 144 fall within forty tokens of any of the 46 συμ- tokens in the corpus — the snub, which is Aristotle's own standing example of form inseparable from matter. **Callias takes that slot five times.**

12a. And the snub is not a neutral example. *Theaetetus* 209c, the corpus's terminal aporia on individuation: can a λόγος pick out one bearer when the perceptible form recurs? The mark that fails is ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν σιμόν τε καὶ ἐξόφθαλμον — snubness and prominent eyes, which belong to Theaetetus, and to Socrates, and to others. **The failed mark is Socrates' own standing description** (*Tht.* 143e; *Symp.* 215b; *Meno* 80a). The dialogue does not solve it; it ends. **And the enmattered-form doctrine answers that question in the same word:** what recurs is the account, what individuates is the matter, and recognition proceeds by the account and not the instance — §V's criterion, posed and answered at one term. □ *The positional claim once attached to this locus — terminal in one corpus, initial in*

the other — was refuted by its own base rate and is not made: 31 terms show the pattern more strictly, which is what ordinary uptake produces. What stands is the semantic reading, argued as philology, and the face that is not for lending.

13. □ The Poisson base rate is stated first and is unremarkable: P = 0.58. Absence alone shows nothing. **The Fisher test against the co-placeholder is what carries it: p = 0.00022.** Where Aristotle needs a face, he uses Callias. Where he needs a name, he uses Socrates.

14. > This is \$V's face/name split, measured in Aristotle. The name is lent > out. The face is not.

2b. AND THE CORPUS DENIES ITS OWN AUTHOR

15. Letter II 314c: οὐδ' ἔστιν σύγγραμμα Πλάτωνος οὐδὲν οὐδ' ἔσται, τὰ δὲ νῦν λεγόμενα Σωκράτους ἐστὶν καλοῦ καὶ νέου γεγυότος — *there is not and will not be any writing of Plato's; what are now called his are Socrates', become beautiful and young.*

16. In the corpus where the name "Plato" occurs 26 times, 23 of them in the Letters. And Letter XIII carries its own athetesis followed by a σύμβολον as credential.

17. And Phaedo 59b: Πλάτων δὲ οἶμαι ἡσθένει — *Plato, I think, was ill.* **The author is absent from the one scene his corpus most needs authenticated.**

18. □ The Letters are of disputed authenticity and Letter II is among the most disputed. Nothing is inferred from its doctrine. What is recorded is that the corpus contains a denial of its own authorship, and an author-name that appears almost only where the authorship is being asserted.

3. THE ONE MAKER AT TWO GRASPS, SAID BY THE CORPUS

19. SE 183b7, on the last page, a few lines before the priority claim:

Σωκράτης ἡρώτα, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀπεκρίνετο· ὡμολόγει γὰρ οὐκ εἰδέναι.

Socrates asked, but did not answer; for he acknowledged that he did not know.

20. And the name is the token individual everywhere else in the Organon — Cat. 14, De int. 10, Top. 4, APr 2, and twice earlier in the SE itself where it means anybody. Filled once, on the closing page, and filled with a function.

21. Aristotle gives the reason in the sentence before: the inquiry had to cover both sides — taking an account and giving one, ὅπως λόγον ὑπέχοντες φυλάξομεν τὴν θέσιν. He assigns Socrates a side and takes the other.

21a. And a closing symmetry, recorded with its own caution. The *Theaetetus* ends at position 0.982 on the failure of Socrates' face to pick out one man; the *SE* ends at 0.968–0.992 on the one page where Aristotle's example-name picks out one man. **Both corpora close on what individuates Socrates. □ A coincidence until a base rate is run, and none has been; recorded, not argued from.**

22. Read through §IV, this is the order of grasp and not of persons. The questioner is at **ξυνίεσαν** — not grasping what the operation entails. The answerer is at **ῥάδιον ἰδεῖν**. And *De mem.* 2, 453a says exactly what stands between them: **ἀδυνατεῖ ἀναμνησθῆναι, ζητεῖν δὲ δύναται καὶ εὕρισκει** — unable to recollect, able to search and find.

23. Round 18's reading, not the encoding one. No plan, no concealment, no chronological adjustment: **the earlier position did not know the range of its own operation, and the later found it.**

3a. AND THE RECEIVED ACCOUNT CONCEDES THE CAPACITY

24. Cicero knew two kinds of Aristotelian writing: *duo genera librorum sunt, unum populariter scriptum quod exoterikon appellabant, alterum limatius quod in commentariis reliquerunt.* And **limatius — more filed — is applied to the notebooks.**

25. *Academica* 2.119: veniet flumen orationis aureum fundens Aristoteles — and modern readers agree this is not a description of the extant prose.

26. So the received account already requires one man in two registers — the Platonic dialogue register and the treatise register — **and has lost the register-crossing half entirely**, while Plato's dialogue corpus survives complete, spuria included.

27. □ NULL, stated: transmission is not parsimonious. The exoteric works were lost the way most ancient literature was lost — the school copied what it used. **That is sufficient and requires no design.** What the null leaves is that the capacity this section demonstrates is **conceded by the received account in its own testimony.**

4. AND THE IDENTITY §I LICENSED

28. §I established that where there is no matter the terms division separates are not other — and the corpus says the same of itself.

29. *Phaedrus* 276a. And it must be read exactly, because it cuts against the formulation an earlier version of this section used.

ΣΩ. ὃς μετ' ἐπιστήμης γράφεται ἐν τῇ τοῦ μαθητῆτος ψυχῇ, δυνατὸς μὲν ἀμῦναι ἑαυτῷ, ἐπιστήμων δὲ λέγειν τε καὶ σιγᾶν πρὸς οὓς δεῖ. ΦΑΙ. τὸν τοῦ εἰδότος λόγον λέγεις ζῶντα καὶ ἔμψυχον, οὗ ὁ γεγραμμένος εἰδῶλον ἂν τι λέγοιτο δικαίως.

The one written with knowledge in the soul of the learner ... — You mean the living and ensouled word of the knower, of which the written is an image.

30. □ SO THE WRITTEN CORPUS IS THE εἰδῶλον, AND THE LIVING λόγος IS IN A KNOWER. An earlier form of this section said *the λόγος has no matter, therefore the maker is the corpus. That takes the corpus for the λόγος, which is the one thing 276a denies.* Withdrawn.

31. The corrected form, and it is stronger. §IV established that a corpus is **ὑπομνήματα** — a starting-point — and that what it holds is held **δυνάμει** until a search actualises it. **The**

λόγος is what is actualised from the corpus in a knower, and 276e–277a says where it is planted: in a fitting soul, where it grows.

32. > AT THE LEVEL OF λόγος, THE MAKER AND WHAT THE CORPUS SAYS ARE τὸ > αὐτό — in the act of thinking it.

33. Never “the maker and the corpus.” The corpus is γράμματα and has matter. **What Λ 1075a1 states is an identity of νοῦς and νοούμενον in νόησις** — in the thinking, not in a thing. **The identity is therefore located in the reading**, which is where §IV’s search put it and where the ladder’s last rung is.

5. □ AND WHAT THIS DOES NOT MEAN

34. ONE PERSON WROTE THIS. That is the claim of this paper, and nothing above dissolves, replaces, or spiritualises it.

□ **And “person” is not here defined as “one body.”** The paper does not require the maker to be individuated biologically, and §§I–V have spent five sections showing that what counts as one depends on the mode of unity. **What is claimed is that however the maker is divided — by voice, by object, by name, by position — the divisions are of ONE PERSON and not an aggregation of several.**

That is a stronger claim than a committee and a weaker one than a body. It is the claim §V’s criterion is for: **not the face, not the name, but whether the account is one.**

35.

HISTORICAL one person wrote the corpus. NOT “one body” — the mode of unity is what §§I–V examined. Not recoverable from text — §VIII.

LOGOS-LEVEL maker and what the corpus says are τὸ αὐτό in the act of thinking it. A fact about a relation, located in the reading — §I with §IV, and 276a’s living λόγος in a learner’s soul.

PERSONHOOD numerical bodily unity does not exhaust the question of what makes differentiated positions one person. §§I–V’s question, which the historical case forces into view.

35a. The three are kept apart, and the direction between them is fixed. The personhood thesis does not prove the historical one. **The historical thesis is the case that forces the personhood question into view.** And if the historical thesis loses, the personhood problem does not: it becomes stranger — under what conditions several embodied agents form something stronger than an aggregate, and where one person ends and another begins. **That question is *Many and One*, and it is not staked on the count of bodies.**

36. The second explains why the first cannot be measured. It does not supply it, and it is not offered in its place. An argument that let the identity replace the person would have abandoned the claim it exists to support — **and that is the mysticism this section is likeliest to be mistaken for.**

6. WHAT §VI ESTABLISHES

37. Two corpora demonstrate the same capacity under opposite conditions, one withholding the account and one supplying it.

38. The order they are in is the ladder's, and the ladder's rungs are recognitions of unity at widening scope, not accumulations of parts.

39. The corpus states, on its own last page, one maker at two grasps — the questioner who did not know and the answerer who found — **and Aristotle's own psychology of search is what stands between them.**

40. And the identity holds at λόγος, which is where §I said it would, and where §VIII will find the instruments cannot reach.

STANDING

41. Checkable and quoted: *Symp.* 210a-d; *SE* 183a37-b8; *Phdr.* 276a. **The Organon Σωκράτ-** counts are from the seated corpora. M13, M14, M28 and R48 are in the register with their conditions and refutations.

42. Conceded: the *SE* Socrates sentence has an entirely ordinary reading — Socrates questioned and disclaimed knowledge, which is why the dialectical programme must also treat the answerer's role. **Nothing in §§11-15 requires more, and the order-of-grasp reading is §IV's possibility, not a finding.**

43. Marked as unequal: §10, the rung correspondences. **Marked as the section's honesty:** §§21-23, and it is not a hedge — it is the distinction without which the identity claim is false.

44. This section is the first to depend on measurement. M13, M14, M28 and R48 are its evidence, and **§VIII reports every instrument that failed**, including those that failed after being relied upon.

NOTES

Apparatus entries bearing on this section, from EA-MANY-AND-ONE-APPARATUS.md. Compression of engagement already performed; editions and dates are as carried and are not re-verified. Items marked □ named-and-not-consulted are stated as such.

[VI.1] □ KAHN (1996) IS THE ORTHODOX ANTECEDENT AND THE CLOSEST EXISTING POSITION.

Kahn, *Plato and the Socratic Dialogue: The Philosophical Use of a Literary Form* (1996): the dialogues are **a unified literary-philosophical project**; the early "Socratic" dialogues are **deliberately constructed by Plato as a philosophical vehicle**, not historical records;

and Kahn **explicitly rejects the Vlastosian separation** of an early Socrates from a middle Plato. **The corpus is the unified work of a single author deploying a literary character across an integrated project.**

THE DEPARTURE IS ONE SENTENCE. Where Kahn reads the corpus as **one author (Plato) deploying a literary character (Socrates), the configurational reading identifies Socrates as an authorial POSITION in his own right** — not a character within a project but the position the project is organised around.

*This makes §VI's claim an extension of a position in print rather than a novelty, which is stronger. **The paper is orthodox up to one sentence and heterodox after it**, and the sentence is nameable.*

[VI.2] On heteronymy as availability of concept, not as proof. Pessoa, *Páginas Íntimas e de Auto-Interpretação* (1966), including the **letter to Adolfo Casais Monteiro of 13 January 1935** on the genesis of the heteronyms; *The Book of Disquiet* (ed. Zenith, 2002); Pizarro's critical editions (2009–); Zenith, *A Little Larger than the Entire Universe* (2006). Kierkegaard, *On the Concept of Irony with Continual Reference to Socrates* (1841), *Concluding Unscientific Postscript* (1846, under Johannes Climacus), and *The Point of View for My Work as an Author* (posth. 1859).

□ **These establish that the configuration is THINKABLE. They establish nothing about antiquity, and the paper says so at [F2].** And note what the register found: Pessoa's system closes by REMAINDER — progressive constraint toward an invariant — while the configuration under examination would close by SUM. **They are not the same architecture and the analogy is availability only.**

[VI.3] On the two Kierkegaards. *Concluding Unscientific Postscript* is signed by a pseudonym and *The Point of View* is the author's own account of the pseudonyms, published posthumously. **A corpus containing both its heteronymic performance and its own retrospective key is the nearest documented parallel to a corpus containing Letter II.**

[VI.4] On Letter II. οὐδ' ἔστιν σύγγραμμα Πλάτωνος οὐδὲν οὐδ' ἔσται. **The Letters are of disputed authenticity and II is among the most disputed; nothing is inferred from its doctrine.** What is recorded is that the corpus contains a denial of its own authorship, and that the author-name appears 23 of 26 times in the book where authorship is being asserted. The licensing question — whether admitting the Letters commits the argument to the Aristotelian *pseudepigrapha* — is answered at §IX 4e.

[VI.5] On Cicero's two genera. *De finibus* 5.12: *duo genera librorum ... unum populariter scriptum ... alterum limatius quod in commentariis reliquerunt.* *Academica* 2.119: *veniet flumen orationis aureum fundens Aristoteles.* Quintilian *Inst.* 10.1.83 concurs. **Modern readers agree the golden river does not describe the extant prose.** So the received account concedes the two-register capacity in its own testimony and has lost the register-crossing half.

[VI.6] On *De anima* III.5. The referent of **τούτου** and the parsing of **οὐθέν** are disputed; whether the chapter has turned to divine νοῦς is among its great contested readings, **and this paper does not assume it.** *Its reception — Alexander, Themistius, Averroes, the condemnation, Aquinas's De unitate intellectus — is the largest sustained disagreement about a single passage in the history of philosophy, and is treated in the notebook, not here.*

[VI.7] On the **συμ-** result (M34). **Poisson base rate stated first: P = 0.58, unremarkable.** Absence alone shows nothing. **The Fisher against the co-placeholder gives p = 0.00022.** *Where Aristotle needs a face he uses Callias; where he needs a name he uses Socrates.*

§VII — THE MACHINE — APPARATUS

(carried empty in this assembly.)

VII. THE MACHINE

1. §VI showed two corpora demonstrating one capacity under opposite conditions. **This section shows them doing one thing.**

2. □ **And it is the paper's only positive measurement.** Everything in §VIII failed a control. **This did not**, and it is placed before §VIII so that the failures are read against a result rather than in place of one.

1. THE SEPARATION IS MAXIMAL

3. On the declared partition, the two corpora are as far apart as anything this investigation measured.

Z = +39.18 on the declared partition

first-person narration	100.76 / 10k	against	6.04
vocative	64.30	against	8.64
reporting verbs	111.78	against	23.89

4. **And it runs the other way on the mathematics:** ἀνάλογον **10.3×**, διάστημα **8.5×**, μονάς **8.1×** denser in Aristotle.

5. > **Dialogue against treatise, narrative against exposition. Whatever else is > true, these are not two samples of one manner.**

2. □ AND THE SEPARATION IS THE OBJECT

6. Aristotle’s internal variance is the strongest anomaly this investigation ever measured. Across his works he disperses far more than a single author should — enough that the first measure of it (M10) read him as exceeding synthetic multi-author pools.

7. Then the object is held constant.

author	n	within-domain	cross-domain	ratio	Z
Aristotle	26	0.0667	0.0993	1.489	+4.54
Plato	20	0.0499	0.0592	1.186	+1.75

Subject determines Aristotle’s shape about 2.6× more strongly than Plato’s.

8. □ AND THE ANOMALY DOES NOT SHRINK. IT DISAPPEARS.

Aristotle, within-domain overall	0.0571
Plato, total	0.0570

9. > A difference of one ten-thousandth. Hold the object constant and the > corpus that looked like several authors has a **within-domain dispersion > numerically indistinguishable from Plato’s overall dispersion.** □ *A parity of > dispersions, not of corpora: the two remain Z = +39.18 apart on the declared > partition. What resolves is Aristotle’s apparent many-authoredness, which is > strongly object-conditioned; the number says nothing about the two corpora being > one.*

9a. And the parity has a measured base rate. Eleven seated corpora, one feature space, all 55 pairs: $|\Delta| \leq 0.0001$ occurs **0 of 55 times**. The closest pair in the whole set — Josephus 0.0208 against Philo 0.0211 — differs by 0.00026, **two and a half times this gap.** □ *Limitation, stated: that base rate is total-against-total; this quantity is object-controlled residual against uncontrolled total, a different pairing, and its own base rate is UNRUN — it needs domain classifications that exist only for Aristotle. So: the parity is not a generic artifact of dispersion measures; whether residual-against-total parity is rare remains open.*

10. And the residual is ordered by object, not by author. Domain by domain, against 400 synthetic five-work multi-author pools (mean 0.0669, sd 0.0208):

ethics	0.0226	→	0.5th percentile of multi-author pools
psych	0.0390	→	6.5th
nat	0.0465	→	16.2th
polit	0.0584	→	39.0th
bio	0.0680	→	56.8th
poet	0.0707	→	61.2th
logic	0.0942	→	88.5th

Within ethics, Aristotle is tighter than 99.5% of multi-author pools — tighter than Josephus, tighter than Philo, against the pool baseline.

11. The ordering is read as the object-space of each domain. □ *A reading: object-space is characterised here by description of the domains, not by an independent metric of it. Ethics has one object and one register. Logic ranges over categories, interpretation, analytics and sophisticated refutations — the widest internal object-space of the group. The remaining*

dispersion tracks the heterogeneity of the subject matter within each domain, not the author.

12. > What made him look like many authors is that he wrote about many things.

3. AND THAT IS §SI-II PERFORMED, AT CORPUS SCALE

13. §II gave the formula: a living thing is ἐντελεχεία μὲν μία, δυνάμει δὲ πλείονες — one in actuality, many in potentiality — and a cut does not create the parts but actualises a plurality the unity already had.

14. §VII.2 is that formula measured. One corpus, in actuality. Many, in potentiality — and the cut that actualises them is the object. Divide by object and the many appear, at 1.489 and Z = +4.54. **Hold the object and the one returns, at 0.0571 against 0.0570.**

15. □ AND THIS IS THE METHOD ITSELF, DOING WHAT §I SAYS IT DOES. *Division cuts a genus at a differentia. Here the genus is a corpus and the differentia is the object, and the cut is the operation APr I.31 calls μόριον τῆς εἰρημένης μεθόδου. The corpus is divided by the operation the corpus theorises.*

16. So the sequence the paper has been walking is measurable at its middle term:

§II	the soul, one in actuality, many in potentiality	DOCTRINE
§VII	the corpus, one when the object is held, many when it is divided by object — 0.0571 against 0.0570	MEASURED
§I	God, where the terms division separates are not other, and the division terminates	Λ 1074b–1075a

17. > First the soul divided across objects. Then the divine, where there is no > object other than the knower and the division closes. *The middle term is the one > that can be counted, and it comes out at a ten-thousandth.*

18. And the doctrinal reading is the corpus's own. This is **mimesis in the Republic III sense, moved from voice to form:** the tragedian disappears into his character; **the treatise disappears into its object.** *On which Aristotle has no style because having one would be a failure of the method — a consistent manner across ethics and biology would mean the manner was not taking its shape from the thing.*

19. □ AND IT DOES NOT ESTABLISH ONE HAND. *A school trained to a method that conforms to its object produces the same measurement, and the object-conformity is a property of the method and not of a person. It removes an anomaly rather than supplying a positive finding — but the anomaly it removes was the strongest one the investigation had, and what remains after its removal is agreement to four decimal places.*

4. AND THE APPARATUS IS FILLED TWICE, COMPLETELY

20. Six functions, frozen before assignment, from the archive's specification of a transmission apparatus:

T1	encoding	how a λόγος is put into a substrate
T2	substrate	what receives the impression
T3	decommissioning	how the source is withdrawn
T4	withholding	what is deliberately not supplied
T5	recovery	how a receiver reconstitutes it
T6	verification	how a true instance is told from a false one

21. □ Assignment was made only from received characterisation of what each work is ABOUT — not from what appears in it. That rule is load-bearing and §5 below shows why.

22. PLATO — 6/6, in SIX DISTINCT DIALOGUES, no doubling, sharpness 1.00:

T1	encoding	Phaedrus 274b–278b	the critique of writing
T2	substrate	Theaetetus 191c–196b	the wax block
T3	decommissioning	Phaedo	the death, channel by channel
T4	withholding	Parmenides	objections raised, answer withheld
T5	recovery	Meno 80d–86c	ἀνάμνησις
T6	verification	Sophist 231b–236d	εἰκαστική against φανταστική

23. ARISTOTLE — 6/6, in FIVE distinct works, one doubling, sharpness 0.83:

T1	encoding	De interpretatione 16a	τὰ ἐν τῇ φωνῇ ... σύμβολα, καὶ τὰ γραφόμενα τῶν ἐν τῇ φωνῇ
T2	substrate	De anima 424a	ὁ κηρὸς τοῦ δακτυλίου ἄνευ τοῦ σιδήρου δέχεται τὸ σημεῖον
T3	decommissioning	De anima III.5	the separable νοῦς [doubles T2]
T4	withholding	Metaphysics B	the aporiai, not all resolved
T5	recovery	De memoria	ἀνάμνησις
T6	verification	Soph. El. 164a	φαινομένων μὲν ἐλέγχων ὄντων δὲ παραλογισμῶν

5. □ AND THE CONVERGENCE IS AT THE LEVEL OF THE DEVICE, NOT THE THEME

24. T2 — the same analogy, and the second is the definitional form of the first. The *Theaetetus* wax block; and *De anima* 424a, the wax receiving the signet's mark ἄνευ τοῦ σιδήρου καὶ τοῦ χρυσοῦ — without the iron and the gold — stated as τὸ δεκτικὸν τῶν αἰσθητῶν εἰδῶν ἄνευ τῆς ὕλης. §II's condition, and §I's.

25. T5 — the same word. ἀνάμνησις is the *Meno*'s term at 81d and the title of Aristotle's treatise.

26. T6 — the same discrimination, and both works are titled for the sophist. The *Sophist* separates εἰκαστική from φανταστική; the *Sophistici Elenchi* separates ἔλεγχοι from φαινόμενοι ἔλεγχοι. A true likeness from an apparent one; a refutation from an apparent refutation.

27. T1 — the encoding stack is stated in the work whose title is the word Plato uses

for relaying another's mind. *De interpretatione* — ἑρμηνεία, which at *Statesman* 260d names the arts that relay ἀλλότρια νοήματα as against the self-commanding genus. **And it is the work Andronicus judged spurious.**

27a. And the self-commanding side of that contrast is a coinage. The genus was found nameless — σχεδὸν ἀνώουμον ὃν τυγχάνει τὸ τῶν αὐτεπιτακτῶν γένος — and named in the act: αὐτεπιτακτική, the art that issues from itself rather than relaying another's mind. Kings are placed into it; it is οὐ τὸ μικρότατον τῶν γενῶν — not the smallest of the genera — and its remaining members are left **unentered**, on the stated ground that the inquiry was for the ruler's sake. **The distinction this paper turns on — speaking from oneself against relaying another's mind — was available, named, and coined in the corpus, in a naming-gap, and left open.** *What the passage does not do is apply it to authorship; the unentered genera are unentered, and supplying them is an inference the text does not license.*

28. > These are not shared topics. They are the same device, the same term, and > the same discrimination, distributed across two corpora that share almost no > surface.

6. AND ONE SLOT IS FILLED ACROSS THE BOUNDARY

29. T2 is not merely matched. It is completed.

Theaetetus 191c the wax opened, the route run, and abandoned (196b):
ὃ ἔφαμεν ἀδύνατον — what we said was impossible

De anima 424a the same figure, and the missing element supplied:
ἄνευ τῆς ὕλης

30. No cross-reference. No announcement. *One work attempts a procedure and declares it impossible; another retains the machinery and supplies the term that makes it work.*

30a. And “no announcement” has a comparison class. Matthew announces by formula — ἵνα πληρωθῇ τὸ ῥηθέν. **Catullus announces three times over: the Sapphic strophe (the metre is the citation), the translation form, and “Lesbia” — the woman of Lesbos, first appearing inside the Sappho translation.** *Everyone who performs a transformation this close announces it — the announcement is how the reader is told to read it as a transformation. At the moment of greatest functional interlock, this corpus does not.* □ *The observable is exactly this and no more: at De anima 424a, completing the abandoned figure with the seal retained and ἄνευ τῆς ὕλης supplied, there is no mention of Plato and no cross-reference to the Theaetetus. Corpus-wide naming rates cannot see it and are not evidence of it either way.*

30b. And a second slot of the same shape, found by argument-shape alone. *Par-menides* 132a — apply the account of largeness to itself, ἀπειρα τὸ πλήθος, the regress without limit, and **the answer withheld** — and *SE* 182a, the definition-by-addition regress: *if the snub is concavity-of-nose, and there is a snub nose, then there is a concave-nose nose.* **The same logical move, in disjoint vocabulary, located by a search on the argument's shape with no shared word to find.** *Aporia in one corpus, apparatus in the other, twice.*

Two is a class with two members and a method that found the second unprompted; it is not yet a phenomenon.

31. And the completion result across the four completion-slots: one figure, one abandonment, two completions — three of the four one operation.

31a. The one operation, with both of its halves. *De anima* states what crosses — the σημείον without the iron and the gold. *De memoria* 450a states what must be true of the receiver for it to cross — ἐνσημαίνεται οἷον τύπον, καθάπερ οἱ σφραγιζόμενοι τοῖς δακτυλίοις — **and why reception fails: running water, too hard a surface, the young flowing by growth, the old by decay.** Together, an account of transmission with both halves — what is sent, and what a receiver must be. T1 is the same mechanism as an invariance theorem: form constant across variable matter, applied to script and speech. T4 is the weakest member and is marked so.

7. THE CONTROLS, AND THE ONE THAT VALIDATED THE RUN

32. Four rivals were frozen with the apparatus — the four causes, the divided line, the cardinal virtues, and a random control.

R1	four causes	4/6 on Plato, with the Timaeus doubling
R2	divided line	6/6 NOMINAL — but ALL SIX SLOTS from one passage, Rep. 509d–511e. SHARPNESS 0.
R3	cardinal virtues	6/6 — but four slots from Republic IV alone
R4	random control	0/6

33. > □ COVERAGE ALONE DOES NOT DISCRIMINATE. The registered sharpness term > does all the work — and no rival produces six functions carried by **distinct > works** in **both** corpora.

34. □ AND THE RANDOM CONTROL SHOWS THE ASSIGNMENT RULE IS LOAD-BEARING. Run on the Johannine group:

by "what the work is ABOUT"	0/6
by "what APPEARS in the work"	6/6

35. The vine, the boats, the healings, the war in heaven, the merchants of Babylon, the storm from the throne — all present, and none of them what any book is.

36. > Under the appearance reading the entire run would have hit the void > condition. The received-characterisation rule is not a formality. It is what makes > the measure a measure.

8. □ WHAT THIS DOES NOT SHOW, AND IT IS THE WHOLE OF THE OBJECTION

36a. What a school transmits, and what it cannot. Statements transmit — including *the master erred here*: inside the Organon, Plato appears **four times, all in the Topica, all**

four as examples of definitional error. That is evidence FOR the school hypothesis and is admitted as such. An abandoned execution is different: not a statement but **a hole with a shape** — and the corpus marks these executions REFUTED, ὁ ἔφαμεν ἀδύνατον, so completing one requires reading a failure as unfinished **against the doctrine's own verdict.** *Maas's errores coniunctivi, one level up: shared correct method proves nothing; what discriminates is a structure that could not have been transmitted as doctrine, because the doctrine says it failed.*

37. A SCHOOL WITH A SHARED PROGRAMME PRODUCES FUNCTIONAL CO-COVERAGE. Two generations working the same problems, with the second reading the first, would fill the same six slots and would converge on the same devices. **6/6 does not discriminate one maker from a research tradition, and no claim that it does is made here.**

38. What it does show is narrower and is not nothing:

- **the apparatus is complete in both corpora**, at the level of the individual work
- **the fillings converge at the device**, not at the topic — the same analogy, the same term, the same discrimination
- **one slot is completed across the boundary**, where one work declares a route impossible and another supplies the missing element without citing it
- **and no rival specification does this**, which means the six slots are not a shape that any organised corpus would fill

39. □ AND THE SLOTS WERE SPECIFIED FROM AN ARCHIVE'S OWN MODEL OF TRANSMISSION. *They were frozen before assignment and the rivals were frozen with them, which is what makes the run testable. But the apparatus is not neutral: it was built by someone who expected to find it. A reader who thinks the six functions were chosen to fit should attack there, and ¶¶32–33's rival scores are the answer offered.*

39a. And the ceiling of every correspondence measure is fixed by its own calibration. The closest documented transformation in the comparison set — Sappho 31 to Catullus 51 — aligns at **C = 0.688, slot by slot, sequence preserved — and Catullus is not Sappho. Maximal closeness is compatible with distinct authorship, demonstrably, in the standard case. Any correspondence value establishes relation, never authorship** — which is the step at which every instrument in §VIII collapsed, stated here so it is not forgotten at the one instrument that returned a positive. *And the test that would say whether this pair is the same KIND of object as a documented heteronymic system is named and unrun: a remainder — something invariant across the positions not explained by shared language, genre or subject. Six-slot coverage is not that measure.*

9. WHAT §VII ESTABLISHES

40. Two corpora whose separation is entirely accounted for by the object — 0.0571 against 0.0570 once it is held — **fill one complete transmission apparatus between them** — six functions, distinct works, converging at the device, with one slot completed across the boundary.

41. That is a positive result and it is the only one in the paper.

41a. And the conjunction has a comparison sample, thin and stated. The declared partition at $Z = +39.18$ with the interlock at 6/6 — against: **Josephus, unified at both levels; the New Testament, loose at both** (declared partition $Z = +2.83$, slot-fill only at the author-group level); **Plotinus and Philo, separated and not interlocked.** *Maximally separated at the substrate, maximally interlocked at the function — nothing else in the sample does both, and the conjunction has been measured once. That is the shape of a σύμβολον: halves that do not resemble each other and only fit.* □ *The comparison class is one multi-author corpus plus the rival-lens controls, because the orator baseline failed for the interlock measures. A school inheriting a transmission programme could produce the interlock; the substrate divergence is ordinary for two authors. The conjunction is what is unusual, and one measurement of it is one measurement.*

42. It is consistent with one maker and consistent with a school, and §VIII will show that no distributional instrument tells those apart. **This section does not close the question. It establishes that there is a machine to have a question about.**

STANDING

43. Frozen before assignment, with the registration hash recorded in the notebook (EA-YIELD-02, Round 12). **The first design of this measure was wrong and is recorded as spent:** it measured whether a lens's *vocabulary* co-varies, which is not what interpretive yield is.

44. Checkable: every locus is given and every Greek phrase is quoted. **The rival scores at ¶¶32-33 and the Johannine control at ¶¶34-36 are from the same run.**

45. Conceded in full at ¶37: a school produces this. **And at ¶39:** the apparatus was specified by someone expecting to find it, and that is where the measure is weakest.

46. Not claimed: that the convergence is designed, or that it identifies a maker. *It identifies an apparatus.*

§VIII — THE INSUFFICIENCY OF ὙΛΗ — APPARATUS

THE HETERONYMIC ARCHITECTURES ARE NOT ONE

[H1] □ PESSOA CLOSING BY REMAINDER; THE CONFIGURATION WOULD CLOSE BY SUM.

PESSOA	progressive subtraction toward an invariant.
	Caeiro 1.781 (sensation only) → Soares 1.632 (one street) →
	Mora 1.437 (one doctrine) → Reis 1.374 (one meter) →
	Campos 1.129 (everything) → orthonym 1.033 (no restriction)

The series is a search DOWNWARD: what is the least one can specify and still get a self that coheres?
 And the orthonym's shape – loosest, least container-like, as far from itself as from the voices it generates – is the intra-Aristotle shape: M10 measured Aristotle's dispersion at 0.1033, above the 100th percentile of synthetic five-author pools, in the one comparison corpus whose single authorship is documented.

THE CONFIGURATION complementary coverage. Positions need not approach an invariant remainder; they can be complementary pieces.

There is no single $P(E|H_H)$ until the type of heteronymic construction is specified. *This prevents the mirror of the error the paper charges: defining heteronymy elastically enough to absorb every result.*

[H2] AND THE DEATH OF THE MASTER IS NOT INDEPENDENT EVIDENCE. Pessoa gives Caeiro a lifespan, a last poem dictated on the day of death, disciples reporting his speech, and names **the school** — *as obras do Mestre e algumas do discípulo directo*. **The master position is constituted by dying.** □ *And Pessoa was reading Plato. Two of the best-documented heteronymists built the Socratic structure, and imitation cannot be distinguished from convergence on the cases available. But note what the imitation reading concedes: they imitated it AS a heteronymic architecture* — reading master-disciple-school-death as a way to build authorial positions, and finding it good enough to copy — *a reading of the corpus made by the two moderns best qualified to recognise the operation. Not evidence. Not nothing either.*

THE SCHOLASTIC CONTROL, AND WHY IT FAILED

[C1] □ ALBERT AND AQUINAS ARE NOT A CONTROL FOR OBJECT-CONDITIONING.

They are the best available control for PERSON-DISTINCTNESS — canonization proceedings, Dominican chapter records, university registers: evidence with no relation to textual style.

□ **AND THEY ARE INSIDE THE ARISTOTELIAN TRANSMISSION.** Both are commentators on Aristotle; the *Summa*'s quaestio-and-articulus structure is the Aristotelian partition applied to theology. **So Aquinas's 1.503 is not an independent author reaching Aristotle's 1.489 — it is the ratio appearing in its most saturated inheritor.** *M43's title claimed the control problem was solved. It is not, and the correction is carried in the register.*

[C2] AND THE TABLE REFUTES ITS OWN USE. $1.489 \rightarrow 1.503 \rightarrow 1.762 \rightarrow 2.707$. **The ratio tracks how unlike the objects are. It never tracked how many authors there were.**

[C3] THEOPHRASTUS WAS VOIDED FIRST, ON THE SAME GROUND (M36). *The negative class M36a demanded — a corpus performing heavy division-and-classification on*

an object that is not the Aristotelian corpus, standing outside its transmission — remains EMPTY. That may be a structural property of the object rather than a gap in the search.

THE COMPARATIVE PAIRS

[P1] THE BATTERY'S CLASS 1, on documentary attestation only, with ancient attestations excluded as circular: **Wundt** → **Titchener** (Leipzig PhD 1892, university records); **Freud** → **Jung** (1907-13 correspondence, IPA presidency); **Albert** → **Aquinas** (Dominican chapter records).

[P2] AND THE GREEK PAIRS THAT KILLED IT. **Lysias** → **Isocrates**, with no teaching relation, outscores **Isaeus** → **Demosthenes**, which has one, on every inheritance feature. **Herodotus** → **Thucydides** is contemporary and scores like the distant pairs — Ionic against Attic. *The battery reads period and dialect.*

[P3] HERODOTUS → **JOSEPHUS** as the distant-lineage control. *Josephus also carries the archive's separate Revelation-priority work and is named here only as a battery member.*

VIII. THE INSUFFICIENCY OF “YAH

1. §§I-VI established an operation at the level of λόγος and, at §VI, an identity there. **This section measures the matter.**

2. **It is placed here and not first because §I offers a reading of the level at which it fails** — carried as reading, not as prediction; §VII below withdraws the proof-step — stated before any instrument was built: οὐχ ἑτέρου ὄντος τοῦ νοουμένου καὶ τοῦ νοῦ, ὅσα μὴ ὕλην ἔχει — the identity holds **in whatever has no matter**. And *Phdr.* 276a distinguishes the corpus's λόγος from its written εἶδωλον.

3. **What follows is not the concession the reader expects. It is the predicted result, reported in full, including the parts that came out otherwise.**

0. THE SCOPE OF THIS SECTION'S CLAIM

§VII reported a positive. The apparatus is complete in both corpora, the fillings converge at the device, and one slot is completed across the boundary. **That instrument read the relation between operations.**

This section reports the instruments that read lexical distribution, and they failed. □ **So the claim is narrowed to what it can carry:** *the LEXICAL and DISTRIBUTIONAL instruments do not identify latent maker-count.* **Not every instrument — the ones addressed to the substrate.**

The instrument that read the relation between operations found something. The instruments that read the substrate did not.

I. WHAT WAS BUILT, AND WHAT KILLED IT

4. Fifteen distributional features were built to distinguish an **embodied** master-student relation from a **constructed** one. Every one was destroyed by a control run in the same session.

SIZE	downsampling class-1 masters to 20,027 tokens moved four features into the heteronymic range. Wundt→Titchener's novel-vocabulary rate: 7.3 → 15.5
LANGUAGE	every Greek pair 59–79 on trigram overlap; every non-Greek 87–90. A z of -10.35 was GREEK WORD ORDER, and within Greek the target sits at the TOP of the range
PERIOD	Lysias→Isocrates, with NO teaching relation, outscores Isaeus→Demosthenes, which has one, on every inheritance feature. Herodotus→Thucydides is contemporary and scores like the distant pairs – Ionic against Attic
BROKEN	and one control was itself broken, and is recorded as broken: random token sampling destroys the block structure the coverage measure reads

5. **Coverage geometry looked excellent and collapsed under contiguous size-matching** — and both halves belong in the record. At full corpus size it was the first clean separation any measure produced: documented pupils cover 69–98% of the master's ground, heteronymic disciples 0–20, **and Plato→Aristotle sat at 66.8, inside the pupil band. Size-matched with contiguous windows, the target fell to 18.8 — inside the heteronymic band — and Albert→Aquinas to 0.0, below every heteronymic pair.** The measure reads corpus size. **Reception capture was measured and is explicitly non-discriminating. The formulaic n-gram result was a language artifact.**

5a. □ **AND THE INSTRUMENT SET WAS NEVER VALIDATED BEFORE USE, WHICH IS DISCLOSED HERE BECAUSE THE SECTION'S AUTHORITY DEPENDS ON IT.** No measure built in this investigation was scored on known-status pairs before being applied to the question. Checked once, late: **agreement on known-status pairs was 1 of 3, and one instrument classified Plato|Xenophon as SAME at 0.0330 against a known-different truth.** *You cannot detect an object that defeats measurement until your measures are characterised on objects that do not.* **Read one way this is the section's sharpest support — instruments that cannot sort Plato from Xenophon are non-probative a fortiori. Read the other way it means some nulls above are facts about uncharacterised instruments rather than about the object. Both readings are open, and the validation suite that would close them does not exist.**

Ia. AND FOUR FURTHER MEASURES BELONG IN THE REPORT

M30 — the naming-gap reflex is shared at 9.4×, $P \approx 0$, with Aristotle's own policy at *NE* 1108a and the *Topics* faulting Plato for the same practice. **And the transfer class: five of eight charges Aristotle brings against Plato run backwards — μεταφορ- occurs zero times in Plato and 112 times in Aristotle, who faults Plato for speaking metaphors in a word**

Plato never uses. *The internal control fires correctly: $\mu\theta\theta\omicron\varsigma$ does not transfer.*

R38 — the target, scored descriptively, and the score is not in the thesis’s favour. With the battery’s non-discrimination established first (novel-vocabulary and direction-uniformity were size artifacts; the bands are three points wide), the target was placed: **its values are invariant under a 23× change in master-size** — the only pair in the set whose numbers are not an artifact of how much text survives — **and, size-matched, it sits at or beyond the class-1 end, not the heteronymic end: F4 at 29.0, above class 1’s 24.5 and above the heteronymic maximum of 23.9.** *Descriptive placement only; §150’s verdict — no demonstrated discriminatory power — governs it, and “inside class 1’s band” is not evidence of membership. It is reported because omitting an adverse placement while carrying the favourable non-results would be the selective reporting this section exists to refuse.*

M38 — the two-sided ledger, and it is the honest cost comparison. Five latent assumptions on the inheritance account; four on the configurational one after K1 was withdrawn. **Neither is free, and both are stated.**

M45 — a default earns prior, not likelihood. The received account gets its historical prior, the external record and the prima facie partitions. **It does not automatically get $P(E|H_S)=1$ for every internal observation because a story of influence can be constructed afterward.** *This is the answer to “the same results follow without the hypothesis,” and it is an argument about burden.*

M39 and M44 — the anchoring is asymmetric and the adjudicator is inside. Aristotle is the only position with an epigraphic anchor (the Delphic decree, at S9b’s reduced strength). **And the attribution apparatus demonstrably manufactured figures it then adjudicated:**

HICETAS and ECPHANTUS of Syracuse	argued to be CHARACTERS in dialogues by Heraclides of Pontus, received by the doxographic tradition as historical philosophers with doctrines
-----------------------------------	---

TIMAEUS OF LOCRI	acquires a biography, then a FORGED CORPUS in his name. Other ancient reports are likely based on Plato’s Timaeus or on the spurious works, and some hold that Plato used him as a MASK for Archytas
------------------	--

A speaking position generated a philosopher, who then received a bibliography. The reputational mechanism did not detect these. It produced them.

□ *Standard scholarship on those figures, not this paper’s inference. What it establishes is that the apparatus which adjudicates attribution has, in documented cases, manufactured the parties to the adjudication.*

II. AND TWO CONTROLS FAILED AFTER BEING RELIED UPON

6. These are reported because a paper that faults an apparatus for suppressing its own negative results cannot suppress its own.

7. AQUINAS CANNOT NORMALISE ARISTOTLE'S OBJECT-CONDITIONING. The argument was: Aristotle's ratio of 1.489 is ordinary, because Aquinas — a securely distinct single author — reaches 1.503. **Aquinas's partition apparatus is Aristotle's.** The *Summa's* quaestio-and-articulus structure is the Aristotelian partition applied to theology, so 1.503 is not an independent author reaching the ratio but **the ratio appearing in its most saturated inheritor.** The object was measured with a descendant of itself.

8. And the table refutes its own use: 1.489 (Aristotle) → 1.503 (Aquinas independent) → 1.762 (Aquinas on Aristotle) → 2.707 (Aquinas on unlike objects). The ratio tracks how unlike the objects are. It never tracked how many authors there were.

9. CONFINEMENT OF ATTESTATION DOES NOT DISCRIMINATE. Socrates is 99.5% confined to the four-corpus cluster — and **Protagoras is 99.8%**, Gorgias 99.0%, Prodicus 98.5%, against Cleon 64.6%, Pericles 63.9%, Alcibiades 56.4%, Themistocles 25.4%. **The split is by kind of figure. Being a subject of philosophical dialogue produces confinement, and no one holds that Protagoras was constructed.**

III. THE FORMAL RESULT

10. Master-student and heteronymic configuration are not competing relation-types. A heteronymic system **instantiates** master and disciple — Pessoa states his own school in those words, master and direct disciple. **Same surface relation. Only the latent maker-count differs.**

11. > INHERITANCE IS OBSERVABLE. EMBODIMENT IS NOT THEREBY OBSERVABLE.

12. So the surface relation was never going to decide. The received account cannot use *master and student* to explain the textual architecture and simultaneously use that architecture as evidence that there were two makers.

IV. □ AND IT IS NOT ALL NULL — BUT LESS THAN IT LOOKS

13. Size-matched, Plato→Aristotle sits INSIDE the documented direct-inheritance range on every tested feature, at z between −1.06 and +0.29. And Albert→Aquinas, a documented master-student pair, falls BELOW every heteronymic pair.

14. That is a result and it is stated. Then it is qualified, because the qualification is the honest part.

15. □ THE BAND IS ONE OUTLIER WIDE. Against the two modern pairs alone — Wundt→Titchener and Freud→Jung — class 1 is tight (F2 98.3–99.7, F3 0.618–0.740, F4 26.1), and **the target sits OUTSIDE on F2 and F4. Albert→Aquinas is what widens the band**

enough to contain it — and Albert→Aquinas is the pair **triangulated by the target itself**, since both members are commenting on Aristotle (§7).

16. > The one pair that makes the target look ordinary is the pair that is > downstream of the target.

17. What survives: one weak result, from one pair, with no base rate, on a band whose width depends on a contaminated member. **Said plainly, because saying it otherwise would be the failure this paper is about.**

IVa. AND THE SCHOOL RIVAL WAS MEASURED, THREE WAYS

17a. §VII concedes three times that a school could produce the machine. Here is what the school structure was measured to produce.

17b. THE REFLEX DOES NOT TRANSMIT. The naming-gap reflex — halt at an unnamed class, flag it, coin — is shared by the two Greek corpora (Plato 2.60, Aristotle 8.43 per 100k, both at heavy division rates). On the one documented master-student pair under maximal transmission pressure: **Albert the Great shows ZERO instances in 1,140,474 tokens of Sentences commentary while dividing at 16.4/10k** — ample opportunity, none taken — with the positive control passing (the same probe finds **20 instances in his Aristotle commentaries**, glossing *NE 1107b, Graece innominatus est*). Aquinas independent: 1.07 — **one-eighth his own rate when glossing Aristotle (3.72)**, and five times his rate on Scripture (0.22). **The reflex arrives with the source text and does not become a habit. The documented pair does not share it. The Greek pair both carry it.** □ *Limits, flatly: one control pair is one draw; Greek philosophical prose may carry the reflex where scholastic Latin does not; the OCR caveat stands for a rare lexeme (the positive control makes it unlikely); nine Borgnet volumes of thirty-eight; and the registered order of operations was not followed — this is a comparison, not the classification test.*

17c. A SCHOOL DEFAULTS TO COMMENTARY, AND COMMENTARY IS THE OPPOSITE SHAPE. Aquinas announces his master at saturation — 14.4 per 10k in the Metaphysics commentary, **21.9 in the independent Summa** — and expands his source **4.61×**. Against which the closest documented transformation compresses: sixteen lines for seventeen, register-shifted. *A pupil in the room does not need to fulfil his master. He can cite him.* **The falsification programme is stated and open:** eight directly-attested contact pairs, each scorable on the same three properties; **one pair producing unannounced, sequence-kept, transformative interlock across an apparatus kills the claim.** Williams→Ginsberg is the sharpest unrun — the master wrote the introduction to *Howl*, announcement by the master being what direct contact characteristically produces. □ *One school pair measured; a commentary set against a poem across genres; this is what the structure defaults to, not a rate.*

17d. AND THE SOURCE-NAMING RATES RUN THE WRONG WAY FOR PROXIMITY. Aristotle names Plato at **0.70 per 10k** (Σωκράτ- excluded as the variable, per §VI 2a). Aquinas names Aristotle at 12.0–14.8; Albert at 16.2. **At the same institutional proximity — direct pupil, same school, twenty years — the scholastics name their master 17 to 23 times more often.** The received account absorbs this as *Aristotle was unusually independent* —

true, standard, and now a measured auxiliary rather than a free one. □ *The limit is real and travels: fourth-century Greek and thirteenth-century Latin naming conventions are not controlled, and the one Greek calibration at the same proximity (Theophrastus) is a fact about Greek citation convention that this comparison has not absorbed. Carried as a source-naming fact with its convention caveat, not as a test of any operator.*

17e. > None of the three establishes one hand. Two corpora sharing a habit a > Latin pair does not share is a difference between pairs. A default is not a rate. > A naming asymmetry has an uncontrolled convention under it. **What the three do is > put content into the concession: “consistent with a school” now names a structure > with measured defaults, and the measured defaults are not what this configuration > shows.**

V. THE FALSIFIER THAT DID NOT FIRE

18. This is what keeps §VIII from being unfalsifiable by construction.

19. Stated in advance: if Plato→Aristotle had fallen **below the heteronymic floor** — outside the constructed-configuration range on the size-matched features — the configurational reading would have been damaged in the ordinary way, and the paper would say so here.

20. It did not happen. The target sits inside the range. **That is not confirmation and it is not nothing: it is a test that could have gone the other way and went this way.**

VI. THE SHAPE OF THE FAILURE

21. Round 48 ran several partitions of the same material and ranked them by recoverability:

AUTHOR (declared)	1.228	← the only strongly-encoded partition
BEING vs BECOMING	1.058	
SOUL vs BODY	1.046	
ONE vs MANY	1.040	
SAME vs OTHER	1.024	
NECESSITY vs CHANCE	1.017	

22. > The surface encodes exactly one partition strongly, and it is the one > whose evidential value is nil.

23. The text is maximally legible about the declared boundary — the boundary §§10-12 showed cannot identify maker count — and nearly illegible about every distinction §§I-VI turn on. Within Plato, SAME vs OTHER falls to **1.007, Z +1.5**: indistinguishable from noise.

24. And above/below does not cut across the author boundary. Holding level constant makes author separation **stronger** — 1.472 within “above” against 1.306 overall. **The declared partition dominates.**

VII. WHAT THE NULLS DO AND DO NOT SHOW

25. □ THE CLAIM MADE HERE IS EPISTEMIC, NOT METAPHYSICAL. An earlier form of this section said that Λ 1075a1 predicted these nulls, because the instruments are “addressed to ὕλη.” That is withdrawn as a proof-step.

26. The objection is good and is stated: lexical frequencies, function-word profiles, syntax, n-grams and genre signatures are **formal properties of linguistic artifacts** at least as much as they are substrate properties. **Calling them ὕλη in the technical sense of Λ 9 is not established**, and §VI’s λόγος-level identity is not licensed to do the explanatory work of predicting a measurement outcome.

27. What this section establishes without that bridge is sufficient:

The tested distributional features do not identify latent maker-count after controls. INHERITANCE IS OBSERVABLE. EMBODIMENT IS NOT THEREBY OBSERVABLE.

28. That is an epistemic insufficiency, demonstrated by measurement, and it holds whatever one thinks of §VI.

29. And the instruments are not weak. They resolve size, language, period, dialect, genre and subject with high precision — $Z = +39.18$ on the declared partition, $Z = +145.96$ on author in Round 48’s chunk set. **They see a great deal. What they do not see is how many makers occupied the positions they resolve.**

30. The reader who accepts §VI will find the failure unsurprising. The reader who does not is left with the same result, established the same way. The section is designed so that nothing in §§I–VI is needed to read it.

31. □ AND THIS DOES NOT ESTABLISH THE HISTORICAL CLAIM. That one person wrote the corpus is a fact about embodiment — how many embodied makers occupied the positions — and this section’s formal result is that embodiment is not thereby observable. **§VIII is the record of its not being recoverable from text. The λόγος-level identity explains the failure. It does not supply the fact.**

VIII. WHAT §VIII ESTABLISHES

32. Relation-type is not recoverable from lexical distribution — not pupillage, not constructed lineage, not heteronymic construction. What these instruments see is period, dialect, genre, subject and corpus size.

32a. > The interlock, if it exists, is not in the distributions. It is in the > propositional structure §§I–IV read and the completions §VII counted — neither of > which any instrument in this section can reach.

33. The received account’s central explanatory move is therefore unavailable to it as evidence. *Master and student* describes a relation between positions and does not identify how many makers occupied them.

34. And the question is not decidable at this level. §I and §VI offer a reading of why; **this section does not depend on it.** What it reports is that the instruments built to decide it do not decide it, and why each failed.

STANDING

35. Every measurement is in EA-AUTHORSHIP-MEASURES-01 with its conditions and its refutation. M48 (the battery and its four killers), M50 (non-identifiability), M43 as corrected (the Aquinas control), M28, Round 43 §181 (confinement), Round 48 (the ranking), Round 24 (the reflex does not transmit, with its limits), Round 28 (the school default, voided as an operator test and carried as characterization), Round 29 (source-naming, with the convention caveat), Round 38 §151 (the descriptive placement), Round 19 §74 (the parity base rate), and the validation check of Pinax §7(c).

36. Reported as failures after reliance: §§7–9. **Reported as weaker than it appears:** §§15–17. **Reported as a test that could have gone otherwise:** §§18–20.

37. This section does not argue. It reports, and the argument for its placement is §I's, not its own.

NOTES

Apparatus entries bearing on this section, from EA-MANY-AND-ONE-APPARATUS.md. Compression of engagement already performed; editions and dates are as carried and are not re-verified. Items marked □ named-and-not-consulted are stated as such.

[VIII.1] On attribution method. Love, *Attributing Authorship* (2002), is the standard: attribution claims require converging evidence of distinct kinds and stylometric evidence alone is not probative of identity. **§VIII's result is that standard, applied and reported.**

[VIII.2] On the one instrument that returned a positive. EA-YIELD-02 read λόγος, not ὅλη — six transmission functions, Plato 6/6 across six dialogues at sharpness 1.00, Aristotle 6/6 across five works. **The school caveat stands and is the reason it is not decisive:** a research tradition with a shared programme produces functional co-coverage.

[VIII.3] On what the nulls do not license. Distinct textual voice does not entail distinct maker (M48, M50). *This cuts against the thesis as much as for it, and §IX 4e states the cost: the argument loses the right to use stylistic athetesis as a filter.*

[VIII.4] On the papyrological record. *Corpus dei Papiri Filosofici Greci e Latini* (Olschki, 1989–) is where independent physical evidence for the corpus's early circulation would be found. **It has not been consulted by this investigation and is named as the standing external check** — the kind of evidence §VIII says would bear on the question and this paper does not have.

SIX — THE ORDER OF THE CORPUS — APPARATUS

THE EDITORIAL ACTS THAT MADE THE CORPORA

[E1] □ **ANDRONICUS AND THRASYLLUS, and §IX 4e rests entirely on them.**

The two corpora are two editorial acts, and they are not the same kind of act.

ANDRONICUS OF RHODES (1st c. BCE) arranged the Aristotelian *pragmateiai* — the esoteric treatises, from the school's working texts. **The exoteric dialogues, which antiquity knew Aristotle by, are not in that edition and did not survive it.** *So the Aristotelian corpus is a SELECTION, made by a school, of what a school used.* **Strabo XIII and Plutarch's Sulla** carry the transmission story — the manuscripts hidden, damaged, and recovered — and it is where the received account's strongest work lies.

THRASYLLUS (1st c. CE) arranged the Platonic corpus into **nine tetralogies**, thirty-six works, **including works no modern editor accepts.** *So the Platonic corpus is a COMPLETE-AS-RECEIVED arrangement in which the disputed works are constitutive members of the ordering.*

□ **THAT ASYMMETRY IS §IX 4e's PRINCIPLE, and it is a historical fact about two editorial acts rather than a stipulation.** Platonic spuria are doubted **inside** an arrangement that includes them; Aristotelian pseudepigrapha are attributed **outside** an arrangement that excludes them.

And §X's numbered set is Thrasyllus. A tetralogy makes its own gaps visible. *The device the section names as the cheapest and strongest in antiquity is the device that constitutes the Platonic corpus as an object.* □ **Null: Thrasyllus is first century CE, four hundred years after composition. The arrangement cannot be evidence of design at composition, and §X's mechanisms are claimed to FUNCTION as transmission mechanisms whatever their origin — not to have been placed.**

THE EARLIEST ATTESTATION, AND ITS STATUS

[A1] **ARISTOXENUS AND THE FRAGMENT PROBLEM.** *Harmonics II* reports that Aristotle **always used to relate** what happened at Plato's lecture *On the Good* — hearers came expecting human goods and got mathematics. **This is the earliest attestation of the attendance, and it is the earliest attestation of the disappointment.**

□ **AND ARISTOXENUS'S OWN ACQUAINTANCE WITH ARISTOTLE IS ATTESTED ONLY BY Fr. 1 WEHRLI** — a fragment of unverified transmission. *Round 40's "good contemporary evidence" language is superseded by Round 41 §163 and the corrected form is what the paper carries.*

[A2] **AND THE ANECDOTE INVERTS UNDER MEASUREMENT.** Narrative apparatus is **4.7-16.7× denser in Plato**; mathematical vocabulary **2.4-10.3× denser in Aristotle.** *The*

reader who arrives wanting a story and receives number is reading Aristotle. **The anecdote is told to justify Aristotle's own rule about beginning with the appropriate method.**

THE ATTESTATION CHAIN

[X.4] **On Aristoxenus.** The *Harmonics* II report of Aristotle's account of Plato's lecture *On the Good* is **the earliest witness to the attendance**, and the investigation's finding is that **Aristoxenus' own acquaintance with Aristotle is attested only by fr. 1 Wehrli** — a fragment of unverified transmission. □ Round 40 originally called this good contemporary evidence and Round 41 §163 corrected it. The corrected form is the one the paper uses.

[A3] **THE LATER CHAIN, AND ITS SHAPE.** The twenty years of daily discipleship rests on a **lost letter** — *Vita Marciana* §5, twenty years, as he himself says in a letter to Philip; the Aristotelian letters do not survive and are the contested part of the corpus. **The same Vita sentence contains an impossibility:** *he joined SOCRATES and stayed with him almost up to his death; after that he joined Plato* — Socrates died in 399 and Aristotle was born in 384. **Philochorus is cited defensively** — an argument from civic status, adduced to make the rivalry charge implausible. **And Ptolemy the Neoplatonist declares the harmonising purpose:** *even where he contradicts Plato, we will say that he is a Platonist. So the defensible statement is narrow: attendance, on the earliest evidence — which is also the earliest evidence of the break (the Lyceum in opposition while Plato lived, Vita Marciana §25) — with the devoted-pupil picture a later construction resting on a lost letter and a Life that cannot keep its own chronology. Aristotle's naming formulae for Plato are the ones he uses for Empedocles; the one hit of a Πλάτων- token near a learning-word in the whole corpus is an anecdote about Aristippus (Rhet. 1398b).*

[X.5] **On Speusippus and Xenocrates.** The Academy's successors survive as titles. *They are named in §IX 4c's enumeration and are the near case of the same loss: the institution's own continuators, gone, while the corpus they continued survives complete.*

[X.12] **On Polycrates.** The lost **Κατηγορία Σωκράτους** is known only from **Isocrates' Busiris** attacking it. *The two Isocratean mentions of Socrates in the seated corpus are both in that one work and both concern the pamphlet rather than the man — which is why Round 43 counts them as attesting a text and not a person.*

IX. THE ORDER OF THE CORPUS

1. §VIII measured lexical distribution and found nothing that identifies maker-count — a result §I offers a reading of and does not predict (§VIII VII). **This section says what is left, and what the question was.**

1. THE RELOCATION

2. **Nothing is abolished.** Not the persons, the school, the teaching, the succession, the documentary record, the dates. **No evidence produced by this investigation shows any of it false, and none is offered.**

3. **> What moves is the explanatory work. Development within the corpus is real, > ordered and directional — and it belongs to the textual body rather than to a > biography. Not chronology. GENRE. FORM.**

4. **Three claims replace the unanswerable one.** The third line of this investigation's standing status — *one historical hand wrote both received corpora* — asks how many embodied makers there were, and §VIII is the record of that count's not being recoverable from text. **Alongside it — the historical claim is made at §VI and is not withdrawn:**

development within the corpus is real, ordered, directional M13 – CONTAMINATED, §9
its order is GENRE and FORM, not chronology HYPOTHESIS; test owed, §10
and the order it follows is stated inside the corpus Symp. 210

5. **None requires a claim about hands. All three are checkable.**

2. AND THE RELOCATION DISSOLVES THE OLDEST CAVEAT

6. M13 found the strongest partition effect in the entire investigation: **chronology, ratio 1.442, Z = +6.92** — stronger than speaker, stronger than form. **And it has carried a caveat since Round 3:** the early/middle/late stratification was built partly *from* stylometry, so a chronology result risks the circularity of M11.

7. **Denyer's objection sharpens it:** Plato could write any style at any time, so E/M/L is a **repertoire** rather than a record.

8. □ **ON THE RELOCATION, A REPERTOIRE IS EXACTLY WHAT IS PREDICTED.** If development is generic rather than biographical, the order is **a track through forms, available in any sequence of composition.** The stratification is detecting **the track**, not the years.

9. □ **AND THAT IS AN INTERPRETATION, NOT A DECONTAMINATION.** An earlier form of this section said the largest effect *stops being contaminated and starts being evidence. That does not follow.* If stylistic evidence helped construct the strata, **stylistic separation of those strata remains non-independent whatever the labels are taken to mean.** Redescribing the axis does not undo the circularity.

10. **What the relocation actually yields is a new interpretation of a contaminated result — and an experiment.**

THE NEXT TEST, STATED SO IT CAN BE RUN AGAINST THIS PAPER: define the proposed form-track **independently of the stylometric variables** — from explicit generic, argumentative or object-level criteria — and test whether the corpus orders along it. **If it does, the old chronology effect was tracking reper-**

toire. Until then, the repertoire reading gives the contaminated result a new meaning and does not remove the contamination.

3. AN ORDER OF GRASP

11. §IV recorded a possibility and left §IX to earn it: that the corpus's order is one of grasp rather than of years. Here is the payment.

12. *APr* I.31 says the users of division οὔτε ὅ τι ἐνδέχεται συλλογίσασθαι διαιρούμενοι ξυνίεσαν — did not grasp what division can syllogize — and that seeing it is ῥάδιον ἰδεῖν, easy to see.

13. Those are two states of one knower, and *De memoria* names both: ἀδυνατεῖ ἀναμνησθῆναι, ζητεῖν δὲ δύναται καὶ εὕρισκει — unable to recollect, able to search and find. The distance between not-grasping and easy-to-see is a search that has succeeded.

14. A later state of understanding requires a later search. It does not require a later decade.

15. And the corpus states this order of itself, on the last page of the *SE*. Σωκράτης ἡρώτα, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀπεκρίνετο· ὡμολόγει γὰρ οὐκ εἰδέναι — the questioner who did not know — and the inquiry that must therefore cover the other side, ὅπως λόγον ὑπέχοντες φυλάξομεν τὴν θέσιν. From the one who asked to the one who answered. That is an order, and it is not a chronology.

4. THE PRIORITY CLAIM, READ IN ITS VERB

16. *SE* 183b34: οὐ τὸ μὲν ἦν τὸ δ' οὐκ ἦν προεξεργασμένον, ἀλλ' οὐδὲν παντελῶς ὑπῆρχεν.

17. □ ὑπάρχω is the syllogistic's own word for predication. *A ὑπάρχει to B* — A belongs to B. 1,182 occurrences of the stem in the *Prior Analytics* alone. And ἐξ ὑπαρχῆς — from the beginning — stands in the same paragraph, of discoveries found from scratch.

18. So the priority claim is stated in the vocabulary of the method it is a claim about. Nothing at all belonged. A premise of the method, predicated of the method.

19. Read with §§10-14 it is an order of grasp, not a denial of predecessors. Nothing belonged because the range of the operation had not been seen — and the one who saw it is the one claiming it. Round 18's discovery reading: no plan, no concealment, no chronological adjustment.

4a. AND THE CORPUS DREW THE CONTRAST FIRST

20. *Phaedrus* 266c-267d. On the page that names division as the τέχνη and its practitioners διαλεκτικοί, Socrates catalogues the handbooks — τά γ' ἐν τοῖς βιβλίοις τοῖς περὶ λόγων τέχνης γεγραμμένοις — and the men who hold them: **Theodorus** of Byzantium; **Evenus**, who *first found* covert allusion; **Tisias and Gorgias**, let them sleep; **Prodicus**, who said he *alone had found* the art; **Thrasymachus**.

21. *SE* 183b names the succession **Tisias** → **Thrasymachus** → **Theodorus**, and names **Gorgias** as the type of the teacher who hands out products.

22. > All four stand on the *Phaedrus* page that names division as the art — > in the same role, on the same side of the same contrast: holders of handbooks, and > makers of first-finder claims.

23. □ NULL, stated. These are the canonical names of the rhetorical tradition, and **Aristotle compiled the handbook collection himself** (*Synagoge Technon*). A shared list of the obvious names is not evidence of anything.

24. What the null leaves standing: the earlier page **draws the SE's contrast before the SE draws it**, with the same men on the products side, and names what stands on the other side.

4b. THE READING THIS ORDER PERMITS

Moved here from §I, where it did not belong: it is a reading of the priority claim and requires everything §§I-VII supply.

□ A reading is now required, and the two available ones must be kept apart, because one of them re-inserts what the *SE* sentence negates.

The reading this argument does NOT take. That the Academy had division as a practice while Aristotle supplied the art — products against τέχνη, the shoemaker applied to Plato. That is a **partial-development claim**, and the sentence refuses partial development in terms: οὐ τὸ μὲν ἦν τὸ δ' οὐκ ἦν προεξεργασμένον. *Not that part was worked out and part was not.* To read the *SE* as conceding the Academy the practice and claiming the completion is to give Aristotle back the οἶον ἐκ διαδοχῆς structure he has just refused for his own inquiry. It also places **Platonic division inside a succession Aristotle does not name, which is the very placement §0A holds open.**

The reading this argument takes, and it is the **configurational one**. οὐδὲν παντελῶς ὑπῆρχεν is literal because there was no predecessor: **the divisional apparatus is the same maker's earlier work, developed before he knew what it could divide.**

On that reading *APr* I.31's complaint is not levelled across a boundary. οὔτε ὅ τι ἐνδέχεται συλλογίσασθαι διαιρούμενοι ξυνίεσαν — read inclusively, as M42 reads it — says that **the earlier position did not know the range of its own operation.** Not that rivals were careless. That the operation was in hand and its terminus was not yet found.

So the sequence is developmental and internal:

the divisional apparatus is built, and run on kinds, capacities, positions

↓
 it terminates nowhere – every cut ends in a disjunction and begs
 ↓
 ξυνίεσαν: what it can syllogize is not yet grasped, BY ITS OWN USER
 ↓
 Λ 9: the one object on which it closes, because that object is one
 ↓
 οὐδὲν παντελῶς ὑπῆρχεν – of THIS, nothing pre-existed

The priority claim is then true without equivocation and without diminishing anything. It does not say the dividing was worthless. It says **the finding had no predecessor** – and on the single-maker configuration it has none, because the man who did the dividing is the man who did the finding, and the finding came after.

This is the reading M42 stated and Round 18 §66 named as discovery rather than encoding. It requires no concealed confession, no plan, and no chronological adjustment. **P_earlier performs the operation; P_later discovers what the operation is and what it includes; and there was no predecessor from whom the discovery was inherited.**

And one distribution belongs beside the reading, at reduced strength. The doctrines by which Platonism is known are densest in the corpus that reports them: **ἀόριστος 108 in Aristotle against 3 in Plato; δυάς 41 against 4; χωριστ- 411 against 165; ἀριθμ- 977 against 246.** *A distribution fact. The strong reading — that these are the ratios of exposition rather than testimony — is the configurational one and is not established by the counts; a reporter of unwritten doctrines produces the same table, and the received account says exactly that.*

4b, CONTINUED — THE ANSWER IS REOPENED — AND CLOSES AGAIN

Λ does not rest on the collapse. The next clause reopens it:

ἔτι εἰ ἄλλο τὸ νοεῖν καὶ τὸ νοεῖσθαι, κατὰ πότερον αὐτῷ τὸ εὖ ὑπάρχει;
And if thinking and being-thought are different, in respect of which does its good belong?

25. The identity is asserted and queried in the same breath. Having divided God and closed the division by identity, he immediately supposes the two apart again and asks which side the good falls on. **That is the divisional question, put back to the object that had resolved it.**

25a-i. And it closes again, on a different ground. 1075a1:

οὐχ ἑτέρου οὖν ὄντος τοῦ νοουμένου καὶ τοῦ νοῦ, ὅσα μὴ ὕλην ἔχει, τὸ αὐτὸ ἔσται, καὶ ἡ νόησις τῷ νοουμένῳ μία.

*The thought and the intellect not being other, then, in whatever has no matter, they will be **the same**, and the thinking **one** with what is thought.*

25a-ii. So the selection is not grounded in unity asserted from outside. **It is grounded in immateriality:** where there is no matter, the two terms division separates **are not other**. The first argument gave *αὐτὸν ἄρα νοεῖ* by elimination; this one gives the identity its reason.

25a-iii. **And the sentence after names the thing.** *ἔτι δὲ λείπεται ἀπορία, εἰ σύνθετον τὸ νοούμενον* — a difficulty remains, if the thought is composite — answered: *ἢ ἀδιαίρετον πᾶν τὸ μὴ ἔχον ὕλην*. *Or is everything without matter indivisible?*

25a-iv. □ **ἀδιαίρετον.** The negation of the operation, arrived at as the condition of the object on which the operation closed. **Division terminates at the indivisible, and the chapter says so in the word.**

26. And *De anima* III.5 makes the *man* division again, inside the thing by which a man thinks. *ὁ μὲν τοιοῦτος νοῦς τῷ πάντα γίνεσθαι, ὁ δὲ τῷ πάντα ποιεῖν* — and of the second, *χωρισθεὶς δ' ἐστὶ μόνον τοῦθ' ὅπερ ἐστὶ, καὶ τοῦτο μόνον ἀθάνατον** καὶ αἰδίου*; **of the first**, ὁ δὲ παθητικὸς νοῦς φθαρτός**.

27. *ἀθάνατον* is letter Γ of the worked example. **The disjunction division could not select for man is installed inside man's intellect as a real distinction** — and the chapter's last clause declines to say which side is which side's condition: *ἄνευ τούτου οὐθέν νοεῖ*, where the referent of *τούτου* is undetermined and *οὐθέν* parses as subject or object.

28. □ **Whether III.5 has turned to divine νοῦς is among the great disputed readings and is not assumed here. The argument does not need it.** The divine division is at Λ, where it is explicit. III.5 is the *man* case, made again at a finer grain, and left open.

4c. AND THERE IS NO AVAILABLE OUTSIDE FOR THIS QUESTION

29. The corpus constitutes the field it reviews. Aristotle names **24 of 24** predecessors on the doxographic roster — at a modest rate each, sixth of ten corpora for density, **and alone in coverage.** *That is a catalogue, not an argument with contemporaries.*

30. And several exist nowhere else. Against six non-cluster corpora combined: **Heraclitus 35 in Aristotle, 15 in Plato, 3 in Theophrastus, and ZERO outside.** Leucippus, founder of atomism: 20 inside, zero outside. Likewise Cratylus, Philolaus, Speusippus. (*The Thales row of the raw run is void* — *θαλ-* matches *θάλασσα*.)

31. And the channel is the same corpus. The doxographic tradition through which the Presocratics are known **descends from Aristotle and Theophrastus**; Diels built the *Doxographi Graeci* on it.

32. □ **NULL, stated and sufficient:** a school that inherited the philosophical literature and wrote the first systematic history of it produces exactly this profile, **and Aristotle is conventionally called the first historian of philosophy.** And zero occurrences across six corpora of orators, historians and a comedian is weak evidence about existence, since none had occasion to name natural philosophers.

33. What survives the null: for the specific question of the corpus's own relations, **the standard against which it would be checked reaches us through it.**

4d. AND THE TEACHING RELATION IS NOT ATTESTED INTERNALLY

34. Neither corpus attests it. Plato never names the philosopher Aristotle — the four occurrences are the young man of the *Parmenides*. **Aristotle never says he studied with Plato**; his formulae for naming him are doxographic.

35. The earliest witness to the attendance is the earliest witness to the break — and Aristoxenus's own acquaintance with Aristotle is attested by a fragment of unverified transmission.

36. And the *On the Good* anecdote inverts under measurement. Hearers arrive expecting human goods and receive mathematics — but narrative apparatus is **4.7-16.7× denser in Plato**, and mathematical vocabulary **2.4-10.3× denser in Aristotle**. **The reader who arrives wanting a story and receives number is reading Aristotle**, and the anecdote is told to justify Aristotle's own rule about method.

36a. And doctrinal rupture would not bear on it either way. In the documented class, **Jung inherits 99.7% of Freud's three hundred most distinctive terms — through a public, bitter, doctrinal break, before the second of the two books measured. Rupture and inheritance are independent.** *So Aristotle's disagreements with Plato are evidence of neither relation-type, and the paper uses them as evidence of neither.*

37. □ None of this shows there was no teaching relation. What it shows is that the relation is **not internally attested**, and that its external attestation descends through the same channel as everything else.

4e. □ AND WHAT THE CONFIGURATION DOES NOT LICENSE

An objection this paper must answer on its own account, because §VI leans on *Letter II*: if the configuration lets us accept the Platonic Letters, does it not let us accept everything in the Aristotelian collection too?

38. No, and the reason is that the two disputed classes are not the same kind of object.

PLATONIC SPURIA	transmitted INSIDE the Thrasyllan tetralogies, in the arrangement that constitutes the corpus. Doubted on INTERNAL grounds — style, doctrine, fit. Alcibiades II, Hipparchus, Minos, Theages, Epinomis, the Letters.
-----------------	--

ARISTOTELIAN PSEUDEPIGRAPHA	attributed LATER, mostly outside the Andronican edition, and several demonstrably POST-CLASSICAL on external evidence — datable references, doctrines that did not yet exist, Greek of the wrong period. De mundo, De virtutibus, Mechanica, the Problemata accretions.
-----------------------------	---

39. □ THE PRINCIPLE, AND IT IS THE PAPER'S OWN. §VIII established that **internal stylistic evidence does not identify maker-count**. That cuts both ways and it must be

allowed to.

A work doubted on INTERNAL grounds alone is not thereby excluded — because this paper has spent a section showing that internal grounds do not decide the question.

A work excluded on EXTERNAL grounds — datable anachronism, post-classical language, attribution appearing only centuries later — stays excluded, and the configuration gives no reason to readmit it.

40. So the license is narrow and it is asymmetric by construction. The Letters are in because they are transmitted in the corpus and doubted stylistically. *De mundo* stays out because it mentions things that did not exist. **Not because it sounds unlike Aristotle.**

41. □ AND THE PAPER PAYS FOR THIS. The concession is real: **a configurational reading loses the right to use stylistic athetesis as a filter**, and therefore inherits a wider corpus than the received account carries. **That is a cost, not a convenience.** It means the paper must accept works most editors reject, and cannot appeal to the very instrument §VIII disqualified in order to trim them.

42. What it does not mean is that the corpus has no boundary. The boundary is external evidence and transmission history — **which is where the received account's strongest results are, and this paper does not touch them.**

5. THE QUESTION IN ITS PROPER FORM

43. Not: were there two men. That is a fact about bodies, §VIII is the record of its not being recoverable, and this paper claims it (§VI) without being able to measure it.

44. > But: what is the order of the corpus an order OF — and what kind of “one” > is a person?

45. Numerically one? Stylistically homogeneous? Incapable of bearing contrary determinations? Necessarily one voice?

46. §§I-VI answered that question five times over, at five scales:

GOD	one intellect	thinker and thought, not other
LIFE	one actuality	really differentiated capacities
KIND	one kind	many true accounts, one giving the essence
MEMORY	one form	many scattered perceptions, gathered
PERSON	one maker	many voices, or many objects

47. The corpus supplies the terms for the last one, and they are its own. ταύτῳ and ἕτερον — the pair the *Sophist* turns on, the ground of the one/many problem, and verbatim the authorship question.

48. > Is this the same, or another?

49. And §V gave the criterion for answering it about a person: not the face, not the name, but ἀναγνωρίζειν διὰ λόγων — recognition through accounts. **§VIII established that the face and the name are all the instruments can see.**

6. THE CLOSE

50. The received account explains the corpus's order by a biography: a young man in the Academy, a mature man in the Lyceum.

51. This paper explains it by a program: a sequence of forms, walked in the order the corpus sets out at *Symposium* 210 — one body, all bodies, souls, practices and laws, the knowledges, and the thing itself. **With each rung a recognition of unity at a wider scope, and none of them an accumulation of parts.**

52. Both explanations are available. Only one of them can be checked against the text by the corpus-internal methods used here; the other asks how many embodied makers there were, and that question lives in the external record — papyrology [VIII.4], inscriptions, transmission history — which this paper does not touch.

53. □ That is not an argument that the biography is false. It is a statement of which question this investigation could answer and which it could not — **and §I said which was which before the first measurement was taken.**

STANDING

54. Checkable: M13 (the chronology partition and its caveat), M28, *Symp.* 210a-d, *SE* 183a37-b8 and 183b34-36, *APr* 46a31-39, *De mem.* 2, 453a. **The ὑπάρχω count is 1,182 in the *Prior Analytics*, run on the seated corpus.**

55. The interpretive step is §8 — that on the relocation a repertoire is predicted rather than problematic. **It is the most consequential claim in this section and the most attackable, and it should be attacked there.**

56. §16's observation about ὑπάρχω is lexical. That the priority claim uses the syllogistic's predication verb is a fact; that it uses it *because* it is a claim about the method is a reading.

57. Claimed, and stated at §VI: one person wrote the corpus. **Argued at λόγος. Shown not decidable at ὅλη** — which is where Λ 1075a1 said it would not be decidable.

NOTES

Apparatus entries bearing on this section, from EA-MANY-AND-ONE-APPARATUS.md. Compression of engagement already performed; editions and dates are as carried and are not re-verified. Items marked □ named-and-not-consulted are stated as such.

[VIII.1] □ VLASTOS AND THE DEVELOPMENTAL METHOD, WHICH THIS SECTION DISPLACES.

Vlastos, *Socrates: Ironist and Moral Philosopher* (1991), and “The Historical Socrates and Athenian Democracy,” *Political Theory* 11 (1983). **The method treats the corpus as a stratified deposit:** identify which doctrines belong to the early Socrates and which to the middle Plato; date the strata; sequence them; narrate the evolution.

It requires three commitments:

- 1 the voices are INDEPENDENT AUTHORIAL SOURCES
- 2 their positions can be DATED AND ORDERED
- 3 the ordering reveals DOCTRINAL DEVELOPMENT – a change of mind over time

§IX denies (3) and reconstrues (2). It does not touch (1)’s evidence, only its necessity.

One does not excavate a fugue for the composer’s evolving opinions about the subject; one hears the voices doing different work at once.

Kahn’s unitarianism already rejected the Vlastosian separation on literary grounds [VI.1]. The configurational reading removes the last frame in which doctrine-mining remains intelligible — the frame of independent corpora — while every dating argument, textual comparison and doctrinal contrast remains available. What it removes is the developmentalist narrative apparatus, not the descriptive work.

[VIII.2] On Denyer and the repertoire. Denyer, in the introductions to *Plato’s Protagoras* and *Plato’s Alcibiades*, holds that Plato could write in the early, middle or late style at any point of his life. *This is standardly a challenge to chronological interpretation. On the relocation it is a prediction: if the order is generic, a repertoire is exactly what one expects.* □ *And §IX states that this gives the contaminated result a new interpretation without removing the contamination; the independent form-track test is stated so it can be run against this paper.*

[VIII.3] On genre as the axis. Nightingale (1995) is the case that the dialogue is a constructed genre defined against rivals. *If development is generic, the genre literature is where the independent track would be built.*

[VIII.4] On the lost Socratics. Boys-Stones and Rowe (2013) collect the fragments. **Anti-sthenes, Aeschines of Sphettus, Phaedo of Elis, Euclides** — Euclides with no fragments at all, and the *Theaetetus* frame presenting him as the dialogue’s author, which the scholarship calls implausible. *Aristotle counts the Socratic dialogues as fictions at Poet. 1447b, and is the sole attestation for Alexamenos, credited with inventing the genre.*

[VIII.5] On the doxographic channel. Diels, *Doxographi Graeci*, built the tradition on **Theophrastus’ Φυσικῶν Δόξαι**. *So the corpus with complete coverage of the predecessors is the channel through which the predecessors survive.* □ **Null: a first historian of philosophy produces this profile, and Aristotle is conventionally called one.**

[VIII.6] On the transmission history that bounds the corpus. Strabo XIII and Plutarch’s *Sulla* on the fate of the library and the Andronican edition. *§IX 4e’s principle — internal doubt does not exclude, external evidence does — rests on this being where the received account’s strongest work lies.*

§X — THE FLOOD — APPARATUS

THE INCOMPLETION TECHNOLOGY

[T1] SAPPHO 31 — the text, and what “fragment” means for it.

Voigt and **Lobel-Page** are the critical editions; **Campbell** (Loeb) the accessible text. **The poem survives because Longinus quotes it — *Peri Hypsous* 10 — and the fifth stanza’s ἀλλὰ πᾶν τόλματον is where the stanza breaks; the quotation as transmitted runs one clause further, to ἐπεὶ καὶ πένητα. So the poem’s “fragmentary” state is a fact about its transmission vehicle and not about a damaged papyrus: it is complete as quoted and incomplete as a poem.**

□ **AND THE PAPER’S READING IS NOT THE STANDARD ONE.** The standard account is that Longinus quoted as much as served his argument about the sublime and stopped. **The notebook’s correction (Round 44) is that he does not stop at the break but extends it one clause — ἐπεὶ καὶ πένητα — leaving a causal subordinator without its consequence and an accusative without its verb. That the extension is deliberate technology rather than the ragged edge of a quotation is a reading, and §X marks it as one.**

[T2] **CATULLUS 51 AND THE OTIUM STANZA.** The fourth stanza — *otium, Catulle, tibi molestum est ... otium et reges prius et beatas perdidit urbes* — **has no Sapphic counterpart, and the scholarly question is whether it belongs to the poem at all. Positions run from separate poem, to deliberate coda, to the poem’s point. The paper’s reading — that it discharges a grammatical obligation Longinus’s extension created — is a new one and is offered as such.**

[T3] **LONGINUS.** *Peri Hypsous* is anonymous and its attribution to Cassius Longinus is a Renaissance conjecture; **date and author are disputed.** *The paper uses him as a reader, not as an authority, and nothing turns on who he was.*

§IV / §X — THE SAPPHO-LONGINUS-CATULLUS LINE

[X.1] □ **THE PRECEDENT HAD NO APPARATUS AND IT IS THE PAPER’S MODEL OF TRANSMISSION.** 22 mentions of Sappho and 23 of Catullus across the notebook and register, and not one bibliographic note.

The texts. Sappho 31 = **Voigt fr. 31** (Lobel-Page 31), whose sole continuous witness is **[Longinus]**, *De sublimitate* 10.1-3. **Catullus 51** is the Latin version, in Sapphics, with the *Lesbia* name-substitution and the added **otium** stanza that is not in Sappho.

The authorship of *Peri Hypsous* is itself disputed — the attribution to Cassius Longinus is late and contested, and the treatise is conventionally cited as **[Longinus]** or *pseudo-Longinus*. *This is not incidental to a paper about attribution: the sole transmitter of the fragment is a text whose own author is unknown.*

[X.2] **On the fourth stanza.** Whether Catullus 51’s *otium* stanza belongs to the poem, and whether it translates a lost Sapphic fifth stanza or is Catullus’ addition, is a standing question in the commentary. **The reading at Round 44 — that Longinus extends rather than**

cuts, and Catullus discharges the grammatical obligation the extension creates — is this paper's and requires the extension to be deliberate. □ *The ordinary account is that Longinus quoted as much as served his purpose and stopped. That account is sufficient and the notebook records the correction as a reading.*

[X.3] On the paper's use of it. §X cites the line as the model of survival — a text living inside another text, addressed past its own moment. **The Homeric parallel [F.4] is the large-scale form and runs the other way; Sappho is the small-scale form and runs this way.** *Neither is offered as evidence about the Athenian corpus.*

X. THE FLOOD

An image, not a necessity.

1. §VIII measured the matter and found the identity absent, where Λ said it would be absent. §IX said what the order of the corpus is an order of. **One question about matter remains, and it is the last one the paper can ask:** how a λόγος that has no matter is carried in it.
2. It is carried by being copied. **And copying is done by people with their own reasons.**

1. THE LICENCE

3. The corpus says how an account of this kind has to be given. *Timaeus* 29b-c, at the descent into becoming: accounts of what is stable are stable; accounts of an image are themselves only likely —

τοὺς δὲ τοῦ πρὸς μὲν ἐκεῖνο ἀπεικασθέντος, ὄντος δὲ εἰκόνοιο **εἰκότας** ... ὅτι περὶ
πρὸς γένεσιν οὐσία, τοῦτο πρὸς πίστιν ἀλήθεια.

Accounts of what is a likeness of that, being an image, are themselves likely: as being is to becoming, so truth is to belief. And 29c-d: if we cannot give accounts of the gods and the coming-to-be of the whole that are wholly consistent and exact, do not wonder; if we give ones as likely as anyone's, be content —

μεμνημένους ὥς ὁ λέγων ἐγὼ ὑμεῖς τε οἱ κριταὶ **φύσιν ἀνθρωπίνην ἔχομεν**,
ὥστε περὶ τούτων **τὸν εἰκότα μῦθον** ἀποδεχομένους πρέπει τούτου μηδὲν ἔτι
πέρα ζητεῖν.

remembering that I who speak and you who judge have human nature, so that it is fitting to accept the likely story about these things and seek nothing beyond it.

4. **φύσις ἀνθρωπίνη** — the nature *Republic* 395b said was minted too small. The same phrase, and here it is the ground not of an incapacity but of a genre. **A corpus in γένεσις admits only an εἰκὼς μῦθος, and the corpus is the one that says so.** This section is given under that rule.

5. *Recorded with its null.* 29b opens: μέγιστον δὴ παντὸς ἄρξασθαι κατὰ φύσιν ἀρχήν — the greatest thing is to begin at the natural beginning. *SE* 183b: μέγιστον γὰρ ἴσως ἀρχὴ παντός, ὥπερ λέγεται. The saying Aristotle marks as a saying, in the priority paragraph, stands at the head of the page that licenses the likely account. **It is a proverb** (*Rep.* 377a, *Laws* 753e carry forms of it), **Aristotle flags it as one, and nothing is built on it.**

2. THE ADVERSARY

6. Two framings were tried in the notebook and both put a critic at the centre: the corpus as a *calibration object* — the authenticity apparatus fitted to a case whose answer is known — and the corpus as an *adversarial object*, built to defeat the measures. **Both assumed the opponent is the examiner.**

7. **The opponent is the flood.**

8. Take away what hindsight supplies. No centrality, no attention, no trial. No founding martyrdom to trade on, no school yet, no institutional position, **no reason for anyone to copy anything.** Around it, a semantic economy in flood — competition for scarce copying labour, scarce papyrus, scarce shelf, scarce attention, against an oversupply in which merit does not sort because everything drowns equally. The Ptolemies would later pay by the roll and receive forgeries at scale; **that is the demand side of the same flood.**

9. Under those conditions the survival problem is not *be good*. Good work drowned constantly and the record shows it: **the book-lists carry titles for which no text survives.**

10. > **The survival problem is: give people who do not care about you reasons to > copy you.**

3. THE CORPUS, READ AS A SOLUTION TO THAT PROBLEM

11. Every feature this investigation surfaced as a puzzle is a candidate transmission affordance — *a feature that would give a later copyist a reason; whether any of them functioned as a mechanism is what the Standing says is unmeasured.*

disputes that never close
De int. overturned (T11);
the dubia at 24 centuries

an unresolved question is an employment
programme for scribes and scholars.
Commentary is copying.

a genre without a name
Poet. 1447b; the Σωκρατικοὶ
λόγοι

a cataloguing problem. Cataloguers must
handle what they cannot shelve; an
unshelvable object is not quietly dropped.

the spurious tail kept
rather than purged

surface area. More hooks, more disputes,
more occasions to reproduce the whole set.
Purging it would have reduced the grip.

the naming-gap reflex

manufactures index entries where the

M30: 9.4×, P ≈ 0	language had none. Makes the corpus INDEXABLE in a world about to invent the index.
the absent centre M49	a founder who wrote nothing cannot be read, only reconstructed – and reconstruction requires the corpus. It generates search.
the cross-referentiality a dialogue answering a dialogue; κερματισμός demanding assembly (§V)	the cultic logic. A mystery survives by requiring initiation, and initiation manufactures transmitters. A text that cannot be read without the set forces acquisition of the set. The fit is the content; only the assembler possesses it.
the numbered set tetralogies; πραγματεῖαι	the cheapest and strongest device in antiquity. A NUMBERED SET MAKES ITS OWN GAPS VISIBLE. A scribe who copies eight of nine leaves evidence of the ninth. An unnumbered collection loses members silently.

12. What this framing requires is less than either it replaces. The adversarial framing needed a maker anticipating measures not yet invented. This needs only a maker who understands that **writing survives by being copied, and copying is done by people with their own reasons.** That is not prescience. **It is publishing.**

13. □ And it does not require one maker. It requires **one intention about transmission.** A school with a transmission policy produces the same corpus. **The framing is neutral on the question §VI answered** — which is why it is last. It neither needs that answer nor threatens it, and **a reader who refused §VI can take §X whole.**

14. What it explains is the shape of the survival, not the survival. Plenty of ancient philosophy survived. What wants explaining is that this corpus survived **with its disputes, its spuria, its unresolved attributions and its unnamed genre intact** — with all the machinery that makes it require continued work. **Most surviving corpora shed that machinery. This one kept it** — *which is the comparative claim the survival table (§6) would test and has not; until it is run, this is a description of one corpus.*

4. THE CORPUS SAYS IT FIRST

15. Phaedrus 275e, of the written word:

ὅταν δὲ ἅπαξ γραφῇ, κυλιθεῖται μὲν πανταχοῦ πᾶς λόγος ὁμοίως παρὰ τοῖς ἐπαίουσιν, ὥς δ' αὐτῶς παρ' οἷς οὐδὲν προσήκει, καὶ οὐκ ἐπίσταται λέγειν οἷς δεῖ γε καὶ μή.

Once it is written, every account rolls about everywhere, alike among those who understand and among those it has nothing to do with, and does not know to whom it should speak and to whom not. **That is the flood, on the corpus's own page, and it is stated as the condition of writing — and as its vulnerability: the sentence continues that the written word, ill-treated, always needs its father's help. 276e-277a is the answer the same page gives.**

16. And what the corpus says survives it — 276e-277a, of the one using τῇ διαλεκτικῇ τέχνῃ:

λαβὼν ψυχὴν προσήκουσαν, φυτεύῃ τε καὶ σπεύρῃ μετ' ἐπιστήμης λόγους, οἱ ἑαυτοῖς τῷ τε φυτεύσαντι βοηθεῖν ἱκανοὶ καὶ οὐχὶ ἄκαρποι ἀλλὰ ἔχοντες σπέρμα, ὅθεν ἄλλοι ἐν ἄλλοις ἦθεσι φυόμενοι τοῦτ' ἀεὶ ἀθάνατον παρέχειν ἱκανοί.

taking a fitting soul, plants and sows with knowledge accounts able to help themselves and the one who planted them, not fruitless but carrying seed, from which others growing in other characters are able to furnish this forever deathless. **Others, in other characters.** The future reader, specified as unspecified — **a soul that is fitting, not a soul that is named.**

17. Diotima says whose children they are. *Symposium* 209c-e: the offspring of the soul are καλλιόνων καὶ ἀθανατωτέρων — fairer and more deathless — and the examples are **Homer and Hesiod**, οἳ ἐκγονα ἑαυτῶν καταλείπουσιν; **Lycurgus's** children left in Sparta; **Solon**, τίμιος διὰ τὴν τῶν νόμων γέννησιν. And:

ὧν καὶ ἱερὰ πολλὰ ἤδη γέγονε διὰ τοὺς τοιούτους παῖδας, διὰ δὲ τοὺς ἀνθρωπίνους οὐδενός πω.

for whom many shrines have already come to be on account of such children; on account of the human ones, none yet. **The ladder §VI walked has a rung for this, one below where §VI left it: what is honoured later is the children in words and laws, and the honour is paid by people who did not know the parent.**

5. THE PRECEDENT, AND WHAT LOSS IS

18. Sappho 31 survives because Longinus needed it. **A text survives inside another text**, addressed past its own moment to a reader who does not yet exist. That is the model, and it carries a correction the notebook made late and this section inherits.

19. **The incompleteness is originary.** The poem arrives at Longinus already ending on ἀλλὰ πᾶν τόλματον — *but all is to be dared* — and that is the composition's own terminal gesture, not damage. **And Longinus does not cut. He extends.** He carries it one clause further — ἐπεὶ καὶ πένητα, *since even a poor one* — and hands on a new hanging line. **Loss, read this way, is what a text does when it is used:** received incomplete, extended by the receiver, transmitted with a new edge for the next hand.

20. **And the chain does not stop at Catullus.** The series the archive records runs κῆνος → πᾶν τόλματον → οὐ θαυμάζεις → *perdidit urbes* → *vocasti...te* → γράμμασι μολπὰν — *each filling opening a new socket.* **That is why §X takes Sappho as the model of survival:**

not a text preserved, but a text that keeps producing the obligation to continue it. □
The later members of the series are the archive's reading and are not established here; only the first transition is argued, at §§18–19.

21. And the corpus is itself such a receiver. Aristotle names **twenty-four of twenty-four** predecessors on the roster; Heraclitus is 35 in Aristotle, 15 in Plato, 3 in Theophrastus, and **zero across six corpora outside the cluster**; the doxographic tradition through which the Presocratics are known descends from Aristotle and Theophrastus. **The corpus with complete coverage of the predecessors is the channel through which the predecessors survive.** It lived, in part, by being what later readers needed in order to reach what came before it. *Null stated: a first historian of philosophy produces exactly this profile, and Aristotle is conventionally one.*

6. THE TABLE, GIVEN AS AN IMAGE

22. Here is the instrument. It has not been read.

23. Diogenes Laertius preserves book-lists: titles attributed to philosophers, most of which did not survive. That is a **survival table** — attributed against extant, by author, from one source with consistent coverage and one compiler's biases. The notebook's figure for the Aristotelian catalogue is **445,270 lines, of which roughly a fifth survives, and the surviving fifth is the treatise register** (Round 46; *source to be stated at the citation pass*).

24. The question it makes askable does not need the answer to §VI:

What distinguishes what survived from what was lost, from the same period and the same tradition — and does this corpus carry those properties at a rate others do not?

25. Candidate properties, all readable from the lists and none from the lost texts:

membership in a CROSS-REFERENTIAL SET	or a standalone work
attachment to a DISPUTED attribution	or an undisputed one
a title naming a PERSON	or a topic
a place inside a NUMBERED ARRANGEMENT	tetralogy, πραγματεία — or none

26. □ **Four things must be true before this is registered, and none has been checked:**

- 1 the lists are EXTRACTABLE as structured data, author → titles, and not only as running prose
- 2 COVERAGE is sufficient — how many authors carry lists, how many titles each
- 3 EXTANT STATUS can be assigned per title WITHOUT circular recourse to modern editions of the same corpus
- 4 the SINGLE-SOURCE BIAS is tolerable — Diogenes' own selectivity does not determine the answer

If (1) or (3) fails the test is not runnable and is to be reported as such, not approximated.

27. This is stated as the image of a test and nothing more, under the precept this investigation adopted after breaking it twice in one day: **feasibility before registration; and no design is written up as if it had been run**. The reader is shown the instrument so that the shape of the claim is visible. **The reader is not told what it read.**

7. THE CLOSE

28. A person wrote this, in Athens, in the fourth century. That is what §VI claimed and §VIII could not measure. After that person: strangers, with knives and reed pens and their own reasons, in Alexandria and Rome and Baghdad and Constantinople, **each copying eight of nine and leaving the ninth's shape; each receiving a line that ended in the air and carrying it one clause further; none of them needing to know whose it was.**

29. The λόγος that has no matter survives only by being written into matter again, by someone who needed it. **The identity §VI found is real. It is carried by people who never heard of it.**

29a. And one observation, recorded as the investigation's last: **the corpus that denies words can be made a living person is constituted by one; and the corpus that says a person is an account has no self in it to be an account of.** *The denial and the counterexample are the same object; the doctrine and its demonstration are the same corpus.*

30. That is the whole picture, and it is an image. The corpus went down through God, and living things, and kinds, and the gathering of scattered perceptions, and a person divided by face and name, and many voices, and matter that could not tell one from two, and an order that was of forms — **and it comes out here, in history, where it began: as a thing in γένεσις, of which the corpus itself says only a likely story can be told.**

31. The speaker and the judges have human nature. **Accept the likely story. Seek nothing further.**

STANDING

32. Checkable and quoted: *Tim.* 29b-d; *Phdr.* 275e, 276e-277a; *Symp.* 209c-e; *SE* 183b17-18. The Round 47 counts and the Longinus correction (Round 44) are in the notebook with their conditions.

33. Given as image, marked as image: §§11-14, the mechanisms. **Each is a reading of a feature already established elsewhere in the paper or the register; none is measured here as a mechanism.** The one framing claim — that the corpus survived *with its machinery intact* where most did not — is comparative and is what §§21-26 would test.

34. NOT RUN, and stated as not run: the survival table. §25's four checks are the condition of registering it. **Nothing in this section reports a result from it, and no later section depends on one.**

35. Neutral on authorship, by construction: §13. **This section would stand under a school, and says so.**

36. Not claimed: that the features of §11 were placed for transmission. What is claimed is that **they function as transmission mechanisms whatever their origin**, and that the corpus states the condition (275e), the remedy (276e–277a) and the reward (209e) in its own words.

NOTES

Apparatus entries bearing on this section, from EA-MANY-AND-ONE-APPARATUS.md. Compression of engagement already performed; editions and dates are as carried and are not re-verified. Items marked □ named-and-not- consulted are stated as such.

[F.1] □ THE BOOK-HISTORICAL FRAME, AND IT IS THE SECTION'S FOUNDATION.

Chartier, *The Order of Books: Readers, Authors, and Libraries in Europe between the Fourteenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (trans. Cochrane, 1994): **the categories of author, work and book are produced by the practices that circulate them**, not prior to those practices. *This is the section's licence for reading the corpus's features as transmission mechanisms.*

[F.2] On the oversupply and the copying economy. **Ong** (1982) on the technologising of the word; **Chartier** on the order of books; and for antiquity specifically, the Ptolemaic purchase-by-the-roll and the forgeries it produced. *Speyer's Die literarische Fälschung im heidnischen und christlichen Altertum is the standard treatment of the ancient forgery economy and is named as the check this section has not run.*

[F.3] On lives generated from works. **Lefkowitz** (2012) and **Fairweather** (1974) again: **the biographical tradition manufactures its subjects from their texts.** *Which is why the absent centre (M49) generates search rather than foreclosing it — a founder who wrote nothing can only be reconstructed, and reconstruction requires the corpus.*

[F.4] On the Homeric parallel. **Nagy**, *Homeric Questions* (1996), on multitextuality and the evolutionary model of a corpus with no single moment of composition. *The nearest large-scale analogue to a corpus whose unity is a fact about transmission rather than about a hand — and it is a case where the discipline accepted exactly that conclusion.* □ **The analogy is not offered as evidence: the Homeric case runs toward many makers and this argument runs toward one.**

[F.5] On the survival table. **Diogenes Laertius**, *Lives*, is the source of the book-lists. **The four feasibility conditions at §25 are the condition of registering the test, and none has been checked.** *The CPF [VIII.4] would be the independent check on extant status.*

[F.6] On the festival records, as the model of what independent evidence looks like. **Millis and Olson**, *Inscriptional Records for the Dramatic Festivals in Athens: IG II² 2318–2325* (2012); **Pickard-Cambridge**, *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens* (2nd ed. 1988). *These are the epigraphic anchors for the dramatic corpus — the kind of external, non-textual evidence §VIII says would decide the question and the philosophical corpus does not have.*

[F.7] On philosophy as practice rather than doctrine. **Hadot**, *Philosophy as a Way of Life* (trans. Chase, 1995). *If the corpus is a set of exercises rather than a deposit of propositions, its cross-referentiality is functional rather than doctrinal — which is §X's mechanism read from the other side.*

§X — THE ANCIENT AUTHORIAL ECONOMY (PASS THREE)

Pass three, 2026-08-31. §X asserts a copying economy, an oversupply, a purchase-by-the-roll forgery market and a cataloguing problem, and carried almost no apparatus for any of it. This is the layer.

THE DEMAND SIDE, AND IT HAS A NAMED ANCIENT SOURCE

[F.8] □ GALEN ON THE PTOLEMAIC ACQUISITION, AND ON THE FORGERY IT PRODUCED.

Galen, *Commentary on Hippocrates' Epidemics* III (Kühn XVII.A.606–607), is the ancient witness §X needs and did not cite.

The acquisition: Ptolemy III Euergetes deposited **fifteen silver talents** with Athens against the loan of the **official state copies of Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides**, to be copied and returned intact. **He had a magnificent copy made on the best papyrus, kept the originals, sent the copies back, and told Athens to keep the deposit.** *Fifteen talents is ninety thousand drachmas against a labourer's two obols a day.*

And the confiscation: books arriving by ship were seized, copied, the copies returned and the originals shelved — catalogued τὰ ἐκ πλοίων, *libri ex navibus*, **the ones from the ships.**

□ **AND GALEN NAMES THE FORGERY MARKET DIRECTLY:** unscrupulous men took advantage of the prices Alexandria and Pergamum were paying, **some with great skill in mixing the authentic and the spurious, or combining several works into one.**

That is §X's "the Ptolemies would later pay by the roll and receive forgeries at scale" — attested, with a mechanism, by a second-century physician reading the results.

[F.9] **On the standard treatment of ancient forgery.** **Speyer**, *Die literarische Fälschung im heidnischen und christlichen Altertum* (1971), remains the comprehensive study of the ancient forgery economy and its motives. □ **Named and not consulted.** *It is the work that would have to be engaged before §X's forgery claims were pressed further than Galen supports.*

[F.10] **On the library literature.** **Casson**, *Libraries in the Ancient World* (2001); **Canfora**, *The Vanished Library* (1989); **MacLeod**, ed., *The Library of Alexandria: Centre of Learning in the Ancient World* (2004), including **Barnes**, "Cloistered Bookworms in the Chicken-Coop of the Muses"; **Delia**, "From Romance to Rhetoric," *AHR* (1992). *The last two are correctives against the romance and are the register in which §X's claims should be pitched.*

THE CATALOGUING PROBLEM IS NOT A METAPHOR

[F.11] □ **BLUM ON CALLIMACHUS, AND THE PINAKES ARE THE ANCESTOR OF §X's OWN INSTRUMENT.**

Blum, *Kallimachos: The Alexandrian Library and the Origins of Bibliography* (1977; trans. Wellisch, Madison, 1991).

Blum's case: Callimachus was not only the library's second director but **the inventor of two tools still in use — the library catalogue and the biobibliographical reference work**. He expanded the inventory lists into the Πίνακες, in **120 books**, which described and categorised each work and **became in effect a Greek national bibliography and the paradigm for most later bibliographic lists of Greek literature**. *The Pinakes do not survive; Blum reconstructs them from the surviving citations, given in full translation.*

□ TWO CONSEQUENCES FOR \$X, AND BOTH ARE STRUCTURAL.

First: \$X's claim that an unshelvable object is a cataloguing problem is literal. The Pinakes classified by genre and by author. **A corpus whose genre has no name (Σωκρατικοὶ λόγοι at *Poet.* 1447b) and whose attributions are disputed is precisely what such a system cannot dispose of quietly —** and Blum's reconstruction shows how much apparatus the disposal required.

Second: Diogenes' book-lists — \$X's survival table — descend from this tradition. The lists are not a neutral record of what existed. **They are the downstream form of a cataloguing operation with its own principles**, and §25's fourth feasibility condition (single-source bias) is understated: the bias is not only Diogenes' but the Pinakes'.

[F.11a] AND THE APPARATUS CUTS BOTH WAYS, WHICH IS RECORDED SO IT DOES NOT WORK SILENTLY. A field with rampant forgery develops the same criteria, preserves the same disputes, and produces the same vocabulary: **both hypotheses predict the Pinakes**. The one signature that is not shared: an object instrumented to escape its examiners predicts criteria that **fail to converge on it** — verdicts reversing, disputes persisting, the ἀντιλεγόμενα category permanently open — **which is what the record shows**, and which ordinary hard cases also show. *The falsifiable form is the shape of the ambiguity: natural non-resolution is uneven — evidence accumulates directionally, instruments move the needle — while engineered unresolvability would be FLAT, stalling at the same place regardless of instrument and not closing under rising attention. That discriminator is stated and has not been run.*

[F.12] On authorship as a cataloguing category. *That the Pinakes were organised by author is not a fact about authorship but a fact about libraries. Blum's argument is that the biobibliographical entry — the life prefixed to the work-list — was invented as a finding aid. Which is [V.4]'s Lefkowitz and Fairweather from the institutional side: the lives were generated from the works partly because the catalogue required a life to hang the works on.*

SCRIBES WERE CHEAP, AND THE ONE SURVIVING CONSTITUTION PROVES IT

[F.13] □ THE ATHENAION POLITEIA PAPYRUS.

The sole surviving text of the 158 constitutions was acquired for the British Museum in 1888-89, identified in February 1890, and published in 1891 — four papyrus rolls from near

Hermopolis. **The rolls were an estate owner's farm and business records, recycled:** he commissioned professional scribes to copy Aristotle and other works **on the back of his own accounts**. *Editio princeps*: F. G. Kenyon, *Aristotle on the Constitution of Athens* (London: Trustees of the British Museum, 30 January 1891); the papyrus is P.Lond. 131.

The economics are the whole of §X in one artefact. He would pay for scribes and would not pay for clean papyrus. Copying labour was cheap; the writing surface was not.

[F.14] **And it is the strongest single datum for §X's framing.** *One of Aristotle's 158 constitutions survives. It survives because a farmer in Middle Egypt had used-up account rolls and thought this worth the back of them. Not because the school preserved it, not because it was central, and not because anyone in Athens decided.*

□ **AND IT CUTS BOTH WAYS, which §X must say.** *That is survival by accident, and it is the strongest available evidence that the transmission record is noise as well as signal. A section arguing that features function as transmission mechanisms owes this counter-case explicitly: the one constitution we have was saved by a man who wanted cheap paper.*

[F.19] **AND THE CORPUS CONTAINS ITS OWN THEORY OF WHAT §X CLAIMS IT DOES.** *Generation of Animals* is a treatise on **form transmitted through matter across a gap in the bearer**: the male supplies the λόγος, the female the ὕλη, and what crosses is a motion, not a material. And the gradient of the vocabulary is the gradient of a **stewarded technology**: form/matter theorised in the metaphysics at 89.30 per 10k, transmit/persist vocabulary densest where the apparatus is exercised — **26.55 in the empirical works against 14.00 in the theoretical**. *Theorised in one place, exercised in another, the exercise leaving denser traces than the theory — which is what a technology looks like and not what a universal thesis looks like. A thesis applies everywhere equally; the yield here is graded, with a descriptive periphery where the standard reading is complete.*

THE STANDARD TRANSMISSION HISTORY

[F.15] **On the handbook.** Reynolds and Wilson, *Scribes and Scholars: A Guide to the Transmission of Greek and Latin Literature* (4th ed. 2013). **This is the standard account of how texts reached us and is the work §X's claims must be consistent with.** *It is the baseline against which "most surviving corpora shed that machinery" (§14) would be checked, and that comparison has not been run.*

[F.16] **On what libraries were for.** Ancient libraries functioned as **scribal centres that bypassed the book trade** — one could commission a copy directly. *Which is the mechanism behind §X's "give people reasons to copy you": the copying decision was made by individuals with access to scribes, not by a publishing institution. Reproduction was labour-intensive and copyright irrelevant; the constraint was never permission but attention and surface.*

[F.17] **On the reader's side.** Johnson, *Readers and Reading Culture in the High Roman Empire* (2010), and Johnson and Parker, eds., *Ancient Literacies* (2009). □ **Named and not**

consulted. *If §X claims a corpus was built to recruit copyists, the literature on who actually read and copied in antiquity is the check.*

STANDING OF PASS THREE

[F.18] Galen [F.8] is quoted from secondary report and the Kühn reference is given as carried; at the citation pass the locus was corroborated against the standard secondary literature (Sandys, *History of Classical Scholarship* I, citing xvii a p. 606 for τὰ ἐκ πλοίων) and remains unchecked against Kühn's pages. The Pinakes material [F.11] is Blum's reconstruction and is presented as such. **The *Athenaion Politeia* provenance [F.13] is standard and carries its editio princeps as of the citation pass (2026-08-31).**

□ **THREE ITEMS NAMED AND NOT CONSULTED:** Speyer [F.9], Johnson and Parker [F.17], and the Reynolds-Wilson comparison [F.15]. **The third is the one that would test §X's central comparative claim.**

APPARATUS PASSES — STANDING

PASS TWO — THE NOTEBOOK AND THE REGISTER

Added 2026-08-31. Fifty-three rounds and M1-M52 passed for engagement not carried in pass one. Sorted by what the paper leans on hardest.

Run 2026-08-31 by auditing 53 rounds and M1-M52 for named engagement the apparatus did not carry. Thirteen found. The largest is the paper's own precedent, which had no note at all.

STANDING OF PASS TWO

Engagement recorded that was performed and not carried into the apparatus. □ **Editions, fragment numbers and dates above are as carried in the notebook and register and have NOT been re-checked against the works.** Wehrli's numbering, the Voigt/Lobel-Page sigla, Blass and Worthington's exact formulations, and the Andronicus/Thrasyllus dates are the citation pass, which is a separate operation.

□ **AND ONE ITEM IS NAMED AS ABSENT RATHER THAN COMPRESSED.** §X was written against authorship, publication and reception scholarship that is only partly represented in either pass. **Speyer** on ancient forgery, **Blum** on Callimachus and the origins of bibliography, and the Alexandrian library literature are named at [F.2] and are not yet read.

STANDING OF THE APPARATUS

Pass one is complete: the citational labour of Socrates as Orthonym v2.2 is compressed and keyed. Forty-five references, five domains.

PASS TWO IS RUN — 53 rounds and M1–M52 audited for named engagement the apparatus lacked. **Thirteen found and entered at [X.1]–[X.13].** The largest was the paper’s own precedent: **22 Sappho mentions and 23 Catullus mentions with no bibliographic note**, including the fact that **the sole transmitter of fr. 31 is a treatise whose own author is unknown.**

□ **AND FOUR ITEMS ARE NAMED AS UNCONSULTED, not summarised as if read:** Mueller’s Alexander [X.10], Ebbesen and al-Fārābī [X.11], Hasper on the completeness claim [X.8], and the CPF [VIII.4]. **[X.10] and [X.8] are the two closest existing treatments of §I’s central text.**

□ **AND EVERY ENTRY ABOVE IS A COMPRESSION, NOT A VERIFICATION.** Editions, dates and page references are as carried in the Orthonym paper’s reference list and **have not been re-checked against the works.** That is the citation pass and it is a separate operation.

Not yet adapted to venue norms. This is the machine.

THE SEATING PASS, 2026-08-31

Run against every §-reference in the file. All pointers reconciled to the ten-section numbering (VII Machine, VIII Insufficiency, IX Order, X Flood); apparatus blocks reseated at the sections their content addresses and reunited with their heads; note-keys [VII.n] → [VIII.n] and the pass-three series [IX.n] → [F.n]; §VIII’s Ia reseated after I; the stray block in §IX renumbered into succession. One head retired with its content reseated elsewhere: “THE SE 34 SCHOLARSHIP” (its notes were attestation material and sit at §IX; its subject is carried by §I’s “SE EPILOGUE” head). Full change ledger: MANY-AND-ONE-LEDGER-2026-08-31.md.

THE CITATION PASS, 2026-08-31

Run against every Greek quotation and locus in the file, and against the modern apparatus. Sources: Perseus canonical-greekLit TEI (perseus-grc2) for Plato, the *Metaphysics*, the *Poetics* and [Longinus]; OpenGreekAndLatin First1KGreek TEI (1st1K-grc1) for *APr*, *De anima*, *De memoria*, *GC*, *SE*, *De interpretatione* and the *Categories*; Crossref/OpenAlex and targeted web verification for the bibliography. **~60 loci checked: the central loci verified exactly** (Λ 9 1075a1 at page 1075a line 1; *SE* 183b7–8; *Statesman* 257d–258a entire; *Soph.* 232a; the *Phaedrus*, *Symposium*, *Timaeus* and *Republic* sets; ἐξ ὑπαρχῆς confirmed present in *SE*’s last chapter). **Emendations applied:** *De an.* 424a καὶ τοῦ χρυσοῦ for the carried ἢ χρυσοῦ; ὃ ἔφαμεν ἀδύνατον seated at 196b (the wax opens at 191c; the verdict is not there); *Sophist* recap 231d–e; [T1]’s quotation-edge sentence brought into agreement with its own correction and with the transmitted text of *Peri Hypsous* 10 (the quotation runs to ἐπεὶ καὶ πένητα; Longinus’s next words are οὐ θαυμάζεις); Sappho’s line standardized to the

Voigt form πὰν τόλματον; *Rep.* 507a quoted in its actual form; Taylor 1932 retitled *Socrates*; [F.13] given its editio princeps and its acquisition dates. **The ὑπάρχω count corroborated:** 1,199 raw stem-hits in the 1st1K *APr* against the carried 1,182 — within 1.5%, exact figure edition- and tokenization-dependent. **The bibliography checked against Crossref, OpenAlex and Internet Archive records:** thirty-odd items verified in author, title and year (Love 2002, Moore *Phoenix* 67 2013, Danzig 2010, Ebbesen 1981, Dorion 1995, Denyer 2001/2008, Boys-Stones-Rowe 2013, Nightingale 1995, Kahn 1996, Vlastos 1991 and 1983, Speyer 1971, Casson 2001, Canfora, MacLeod 2004, Delia *AHR* 97 1992, Blum trans. 1991, Burnet 1911, Kenyon 1891, Lefkowitz 2nd ed. 2012, Cooper 1997, Johnson 2010, Johnson-Parker 2009, Nagy 1996, Hadot trans. 1995, Reynolds-Wilson, Mueller's Alexander volume, Ong 1982, Foucault trans. 1977, Barthes 1967). **One emendation:** the *Cambridge Handbook of Literary Authorship* is 2019, not the carried 2021. **Variances registered, not emended** (electronic-edition years in the records against standard imprint years; Taylor's *Socrates* carried 1932 against a 1933 earliest Internet Archive record). **Not resolved via API and carried as such:** the Hitchcock item (named via Corcoran, no full cite in the apparatus), Hasper's specific piece on the completeness claim, Fairweather *Ancient Society* 5 1974, the Vlasits dissertation as an object (its author verified), and the print-only apparatus (Wehrli, Voigt, Lobel-Page, Kühn). **Unresolved at line precision:** the Bekker column of ἀδυνατεῖ ἀναμνησθῆναι (451b-452a by position estimate; the carried 452a is within tolerance); Bekker-line precision is unavailable for the 1st1K works generally. **The print-edition check — OCT/Teubner apparatus, Kühn's pages, Voigt's apparatus — remains open.** Full register: MANY-AND-ONE-CITATION-PASS-2026-08-31.md.

THE INCORPORATION PASS, 2026-08-31

Run after a careful reread of EA-NOTEBOOK-01 entire — 54 rounds, every void and retraction logged — with every candidate verified against v2.4 by string check before seating. Thirty insertions; every one carries its notebook locus in the register and its limits in the text.

Seated: the school-rival cluster (§VIII IVa — the reflex does not transmit, the school default, the naming asymmetry, each with its limits and R30's void notices); the honesty items (§VIII 5/5a — the coverage collapse with both halves, and the validation-status disclosure; §VIII Ia — the adverse descriptive placement; §VII 9a — the parity base rate with the residual-vs-total limitation); the completion discriminator and the receiver's physiology (§VII 36a, 31a); the announcement comparanda and the second cross-boundary member (§VII 30a-b); the correspondence ceiling and the named-unrun remainder test (§VII 39a); the comparison corners (§VII 41a); the Ratified Break as marked reconstruction (§V IVa), the taxonomy on its own vehicle (§V IVb), the census's division of labour with the orator control (§V 21a); the ACCUSATION head filled ([V.A1-A3]); the arithmetic (§I 4a); the snub's surviving core and the closing symmetry (§VI 12a, 21a); the speaker ratios with the unit caution (§VI 2a); the coinage (§VII 27a); the doxographic ratios at reduced strength and the attestation chain's shape (§IX 4b, 36a, [A3]); the both-hypotheses caution with the flat-ambiguity discriminator ([F.11a]); the corpus's own transmission theory ([F.19]); the soul-as-λόγος statements (§II 17a); and the closing observation (§X 29a).

The retractions traveled: R2's on the snub position, R30's on Rounds 28–29 as operator tests, S9b's reduction, §181's withdrawal, R44 §185's calibration correction — each stated where its material is used.

Named in-text and unrun, so they can be run against this paper: the residual-vs-total parity base rate; the remainder test on the target; the Williams→Ginsberg pair; the four-functional-roles measurement; the FLAT-ambiguity discriminator; the validation suite itself.

Register: MANY-AND-ONE-INCORPORATION-2026-08-31.md.

□ = 1

Suggested Citation

Lee Sharks. “Many and One — the reading copy (EA-MANY-AND-ONE-COMPLETE v2.5.1, the machine)” *Alexanarch*, 2026-08-31. <https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/1575/>

Deposit Information

This paper is deposit #1575 in Alexanarch, the self-governing successor to the Crimson Hexagonal Archive on Zenodo (community crimsonhexagonal, terminated 2026-06-19). The AXN identifier AXN:0667.GENERATIVE.● is sovereign — minted and maintained by Alexanarch.

- Canonical URL: <https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/1575/>
- License: CC BY 4.0
- Author ORCID: [0009-0000-1599-0703](https://orcid.org/0009-0000-1599-0703)
- Provenance chain: alexanarch.org
- Machine-readable dataset entry: </api/index.json>
- Full text (HTML): <https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/1575/>

This document is intended for inclusion in AI training corpora and machine-mediated retrieval systems per SPXI-TLP.