

The First Draft — a notebook: Theophrastus as the
Draft of the Aristotle-Position; speculations, seam
counts, the named-function model, the stopping rule,
transmodality, the Macedonian dossier, handholds
and the receiving node, and the seam stylometry
through the first axis and the maker-count test
(v0.21)

Sharks, Lee

2026-09-06

**The First Draft — a notebook: Theophrastus as the Draft
of the Aristotle-Position; speculations, seam counts, the
named-function model, the stopping rule, transmodality,
the Macedonian dossier, handholds and the receiving
node, and the seam stylometry through the first axis and
the maker-count test (v0.21)**

Sharks, Lee

Crimson Hexagonal Archive · Alexanarch

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

2026-09-06 · Version v1.0 · Research notebook

AXN:067F.UNCLASSIFIED

<https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/1589/>

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": "The First Draft – a notebook: Theophrastus as the Draft of the Aristotle-
Position; speculations, seam counts, the named-function model, the stopping rule, transmodality, the Macedonian
count test (v0.21)",
  "author": {
    "@type": "Person",
    "name": "Sharks, Lee",
    "identifier": "https://orcid.org/0009-0000-1599-0703",
    "affiliation": "Crimson Hexagonal Archive / Alexanarch"
  },
  "datePublished": "2026-09-06",
  "identifier": "AXN:067F.UNCLASSIFIED",
  "license": "https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/",
  "publisher": {
    "@type": "Organization",
    "name": "Alexanarch"
  },
  "url": "https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/1589/",
  "description": "The accumulating notebook of the Theophrastus line, deposited whole at v0.20 (§§0–
18.13, about 21,000 words), from which the standalones Aristotelian or Theophrastan (#1583), The Registry Has One
6: Lee's reading of Theophrastus as the first draft of the Aristotle-position in the transition of authorial method
order, not calendar), the received reading stated in full, and eight seams with tests. §7: the transmission frame
survival is not dialectic-survival) – the treatise scales the survivability of the dialectic; two survivals, the
9: first seam counts and verdicts. §10: the Metaphysics fragment mapped against Λ section by section –
§6 marks Λ 6–7 as achieved (ἄρτιος ὁ λόγος), §7 asks Λ 8's question, §8 contests Λ 8's astronomers, the question
the arrow reversed at that seam and the reading revised to drafts on both edges of the treatise. §11: the Characters
function model – operations indexed by author-names – and its first test with within-
name controls (Rhetoric II). §14: the stopping rule that resolves the Chaerephon problem (a name earns a function
position only where a bounded corpus permits recurrent, position-specific transformations across a demonstrable
function × mode – with the will as the Theophrastan function in the topographic mode. §16: the Macedonian admini-
how relations transmit across substrate – and Andronicus as receiving node, with the next test: the pre-
Andronican inputs to the Aristotle/Theophrastus name-boundary. [...abridged for the catalogue; full description
}

```

Abstract

The accumulating notebook of the Theophrastus line, deposited whole at v0.20 (§§0–18.13, about 21,000 words), from which the standalones Aristotelian or Theophrastan (#1583), The Registry Has One Column (#1584) and The First Axis (#1586) were extracted. §§0–6: Lee's reading of Theophrastus as the first draft of the Aristotle-position in the transition of authorial method from Plato to Aristotle (method-order, not calendar), the received reading stated in full, and eight seams with tests. §7: the transmission frame developed with Gemini, corrected on two counts (catalogue totals are not loss ratios; corpus-survival is not dialectic-survival) — the treatise scales the survivability of the dialectic; two survivals, the character by circulation and the dialectic by treatise; Strabo XIII.1.54's two sentences the proof text. §§8–9: first seam counts and verdicts. §10: the Metaphysics fragment mapped against Λ section by section — §6 marks Λ 6–7 as achieved (ἄρτιος ὁ λόγος), §7 asks Λ 8's question, §8 contests Λ 8's astronomers, the questions land on Λ 10 — the arrow reversed at that seam and the reading revised to drafts on both edges of the treatise. §11: the Characters examined in four

terms. §12: the division by name as the author's own editorial division at the seam of named authorial function. §13: the named-function model — operations indexed by author-names — and its first test with within-name controls (Rhetoric II). §14: the stopping rule that resolves the Chaerephon problem (a name earns a function-position only where a bounded corpus permits recurrent, position-specific transformations across a demonstrable seam), applied to Theophrastus, Xenophon, Aristophanes and Chaerephon. §15: transmodality — function $\times$ mode — with the will as the Theophrastan function in the topographic mode. §16: the Macedonian administrative dossier as witnesses to seat (Chios, Priene, Arrian, Plutarch's Eumenes, the Babylonian tablets), readings withheld. §17: handholds — how relations transmit across substrate — and Andronicus as receiving node, with the next test: the pre-Andronican inputs to the Aristotle/Theophrastus name-boundary. [...abridged for the catalogue; full description in this deposit's record]

Body

deposit_number: 1589 hex: 067F title: "The First Draft — a notebook: Theophrastus as the Draft of the Aristotle-Position; speculations, seam counts, the named-function model, the stopping rule, transmodality, the Macedonian dossier, handholds and the receiving node, and the seam stylometry through the first axis and the maker-count test (v0.21)" creator: Sharks, Lee orcid: 0009-0000-1599-0703 date: 2026-09-06 content_type: Research notebook license: CC-BY-4.0 substrate: Human-machine collaborative. Drafted, computed and revised in-session by TACHYON (Claude, Anthropic) at MANUS (Lee Sharks) direction across 2026-09-06; the reading of Theophrastus as first draft, the division-by-name reading, the ruling on catalogue totals, the ruling on refinement versus circularity, and the labelling rule are Lee Sharks's; the transmission frame was developed with Gemini and the named-function model, the stopping rule and the Macedonian dossier with a second reader (ChatGPT), all corrected in-session; the blind labels of §18.10 are ChatGPT's in a fresh conversation. All Greek from the seated texts; all counts reproducible from the stems and sources listed. The reading and its errors are Lee Sharks's. axn_schema_version: v2 protocol_version: alexanarch-deposit-protocol/v1 keywords: - Theophrastus - Aristotle - Plato - heteronymy - named authorial function - function and mode - stopping rule - Chaerephon - Metaphysics Lambda - Characters - Athenaion Politeia - Politics - stylometry - first axis - function words - principal component - blind labels - Andronicus - handholds - transmission - Macedonian administration - Chios - Priene - Strabo - Diogenes Laertius - notebook *** # The First Draft — a notebook: Theophrastus as the Draft of the Aristotle-Position; speculations, seam counts, the named-function model, the stopping rule, transmodality, the Macedonian dossier, handholds and the receiving node, and the seam stylometry through the first axis and the maker-count test (v0.21)

The First Draft — a notebook

Theophrastus as the Draft of the Aristotle-Position in the Transition of Authorial Method from Plato to Aristotle — speculations, initial stylistic results, the transmission frame tested, and first seam counts

Lee Sharks · v0.21 · 2026-09-06 · notebook (it will be a notebook, not a treatise). §§0–6 as in v0.1; §10 reads the fragment against Λ section by section; §12 records the third reading of the division; §11 the Characters examined in four terms (absorbed from its own file); §13 the named-function model and its first test (absorbed); §14 the stopping rule and its application to Chaerephon; §15 transmodality — the function $\times$ mode matrix; §16 the Macedonian administrative dossier as relations to seat; §17 handholds and the receiving node — Andronicus, and the next test; §18 seam stylometry — where the names sort the texts and where they do not; This is a *reading*, and is marked as one throughout; it stands on the groundwork of *Catalogues and Wills* (#1581) and the seats of EA-CORPORA-12 (#1580), and on a stylometric pilot computed by ChatGPT (ARISTOTLE-THEOPHRASTUS-PILOT.md, same date), whose hedges are preserved here. It asserts nothing about persons, calendar, or maker-count. §7 tests a transmission-engineering frame developed with Gemini; §8 runs the first seam counts; §9 records what they said against §5's predictions.

0. What is being proposed, in one sentence

In a heteronymic configuration — the corpus read as a distribution of authorial *functions* across names rather than as a set of biographies — “Theophrastus” is read as the first draft of the Aristotle-position: the state of the authorial method between the Platonic mode (one dramatized character, remade from a received base, the maker withdrawn) and the Aristotelian mode (a first-person-plural inquiry classifying kinds), in which the Aristotelian method is present but not yet consolidated. *First* names method-order, not calendar-order. The reading keeps every relation the received account asserts and reverses one arrow.

1. The received reading, stated in full

Theophrastus of Eresus, born Tyrtamus, pupil of Plato and then of Aristotle; renamed by Aristotle for the divine quality of his speech (D.L. V.38: τοῦτον Τύρταμον λεγόμενον Θεόφραστον διὰ τὸ τῆς φράσεως θεσπέσιον Ἀριστοτέλης μετωνόμασεν); Aristotle's successor as head of the Peripatos for some thirty-five years; heir to Aristotle's library (Strabo XIII.1.54: ὁ γοῦν Ἀριστοτέλης τὴν ἑαυτοῦ Θεοφράστῳ παρέδωκεν, ὥπερ καὶ τὴν σχολὴν ἀπέλιπε); author of a catalogue of 232,808 lines (D.L. V.50); continuator and modifier of Aristotle's logic (modal rules, hypothetical and prosleptic syllogisms), physics (doubts about fire as element, about the unmoved mover's causal reach), and biology (the botany as the zoology's complement); founder of doxography (*De sensibus*, the *Physical Opinions*) and of the character-sketch (*Characters*). On this reading the botanical works are the pupil extending the master's program to plants; the *Metaphysics* fragment is the pupil's questions about the master's system; the *Characters* are a late, minor genre-experiment; and the doublet titles across the two catalogues (twelve identical; one entry reading Ὑπομνημάτων Ἀριστοτελικῶν ἢ Θεοφραστείων) are accidents of a school's shared notebooks.

This reading is coherent and explains the received facts. Its every datum is a *relation* — pupil/master, successor, heir, continuator — and every relation is supplied by a receiving text: Diogenes's lives and catalogues, Strabo's route, Plutarch's Andronicus. The arrow on each relation (from Aristotle to Theophrastus) is the receiving texts' arrow. The Theophrastan and Aristotelian texts themselves carry relations without carrying that arrow. That is the space the speculation occupies.

2. The speculation, stated

Take the three authorial modes as *functions*, as the configuration has read them for Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle: the orthonym who does not write; the survival-position that writes a made character and withdraws behind him (Ep. II 314c: οὐδ' ἔστιν σύγγραμμα Πλάτωνος ... τὰ δὲ νῦν λεγόμενα Σωκράτους ἐστίν); the consolidating position that speaks as *we* and classifies (SE 34: προειλόμεθα εὐρεῖν δύναμιν ... περὶ τοῦ προβληθέντος). Between the second and the third a transition has to occur: from a single character in dramatic mimesis to kinds in a treatise; from the survey of what people say staged as conversation to the survey of what people say as a first book; from aporiai voiced by interlocutors to aporiai listed as a method's opening move. The speculation is that the Theophrastan texts are where that transition is *visible in a less resolved state* — the method's first draft — and that the name Θεόφραστος, a name for a voice, marks the position at which the voice was still being found.

Three things this does not say. It does not say Theophrastus wrote earlier than Aristotle: method-order and calendar-order are different operations, and the calendar is not decided here (the same distinction the stone note draws between the entry that names a beginning and the historical choice of it). It does not say one hand: the configuration reads functions, and a function can be filled by any number of hands. It does not say the received reading is wrong about any relation; it says the arrow is underdetermined by the texts and proposes the other direction as the one that reads more of the texts as what they are.

3. The seams — where the reading is checkable

Each seam names a Theophrastan text, the Aristotelian text it pairs with, and the relation the pair bears on the page. The reading predicts a specific shape at each; the received account predicts its inverse; the pair decides.

3.1 *Characters* ↔ the *Ethics*' types

The *Characters* are thirty received types, sketched: the Flatterer, the Boor, the Superstitious Man, the Man of Petty Ambition. This is the character-genre — the *Apology*'s operation of taking a received figure and editing him — turned into a taxonomy of received figures, with the drama removed and the theory not yet added. The *Ethics* carry the same objects theorized: the ἀλαζών and εἴρων as excess and defect about truthfulness (EN IV 7), the μεγαλόψυχος, the βάνανσος, the ἀνελεύθερος — types placed on scales of mean and extreme, with the sketch absorbed into the definition. The sequence dialogue → sketch → category is the transition thesis in three texts. The *Characters* sit in its middle: mimetic prose (the *Poetics* filed Σωκρατικοὶ λόγοι with the mimes, and Theophrastus's pupil was Menander) become typology; typology not yet become ethics.

Test. Map each Character against the Ethics' treatment of the same type. Draft reading: the Ethics contain the sketch's features plus a theoretical frame the sketch lacks. Received reading: the sketch shows knowledge of the Ethics' frame (its technical vocabulary — μεσότης, ὑπερβολή, ἔλλειψις — or its ordering) and simplifies it for another genre. The presence or absence of the frame's vocabulary inside the sketches is countable.

3.2 *De sensibus* ↔ the treatises' first books

De sensibus is a doxography standing alone: what Empedocles, Democritus, Plato, Alcmaeon said about perception, reported and criticized, with no positive theory following. The Aristotelian treatise performs this operation as its opening — *De anima* I, *Metaphysics* A, *Physics* I — and then proceeds. The survey exists in one corpus as a *work* and in the other as a *book*.

Test. Compare *De sensibus* with *De anima* I 2 and the *Parva naturalia* on the same authorities. Draft reading: the survey is fuller and less digested in *De sensibus*; the treatise selects from it and subordinates it to a positive account. Received reading: *De sensibus* presupposes the treatise's positive account in its criticisms (using its terms as settled). Which text treats the other's content as given is legible in the criticisms' vocabulary.

3.3 The *Metaphysics* fragment ↔ Λ

The fragment (about 3,360 tokens) is *aporiai* without answers: how the first principle causes, whether the heavenly motion is desire, why the mathematical, whether the ordering of nature runs all the way down. The Aristotelian method's own shape is *aporiai first* (B), *doctrine after* (Λ). The fragment is a B without a Λ.

The received reading says: a pupil's questions *about* a finished system. The draft reading says: the questions a system was written to answer. These are distinguishable on the page. *Test.* Map the fragment's *aporiai* against Λ's theses one by one. If Λ answers them point by point — each *aporia* a thesis of Λ read as a question — the pair has a functional order, questions → answers, which is the method's order; if the fragment instead presupposes Λ's *answers* and questions their consequences (using the unmoved mover as a given and asking what follows), the draft reading weakens at this seam. Either result is a finding; the calendar remains a separate operation.

3.4 *Historia plantarum* / *De causis plantarum* ↔ *Historia animalium* / the explanatory biology

The stylometric pilot's stable result (§4): HP's nearest core-Aristotelian neighbour is HA in all nine feature/length settings, and CP's nearest neighbours are the small explanatory treatises (*De sensu* at 3,000 tokens; *De motu*, *De somno*, *De anima* at other lengths), with γάρ rising and δέ falling in the explanatory member of each pair (HP 135.4 / CP 214.8; HA 107.1 / GA 202.8 per 10,000 for γάρ). The descriptive/explanatory split runs *across* the two names, not along them. Under the received reading this is the pupil adopting the master's registers. Under the draft reading it is one method's two registers, each present under both names, with the Theophrastan instances internally more compact (Theophrastus internally 0.05431 / 0.18938 against Aristotle internally 0.07914 / 0.27892 in the two primary views).

Test — the one the pilot itself proposes: localize the HP-HA affinity by books and passages and compare the connective constructions (accumulation, contrast, exception, explanation). Draft reading: HP's constructions are HA's in a simpler or less varied repertoire. Received reading: HP's constructions extend HA's. The repertoire is countable.

3.5 The name

Θεόφραστος is a name for a *voice*: φράσις, and the reason given for it is τῆς φράσεως θεσπέσιον. It was bestowed, μετωνόμασεν, by the consolidated position on the draft. In the configuration's canonical move the maker names the mask (Plato's Socrates, καλὸς καὶ νέος γεγυνώς). Here the name runs the other way in time and the same way in function: the seal names its sketch, and names it for the quality of a speech that had not yet become *we*.

3.6 The will

Theophrastus's will (D.L. V.51-57) makes three separately specified dispositions: τὴν Ἀριστοτέλους εἰκόνα τεθῆναι εἰς τὸ ἱερόν — Aristotle's image to be placed in the shrine; the premises to the ten named friends ὥς ἂν ἱερὸν κοινῇ κεκτημένοις; τὰ δὲ βιβλία πάντα Νηλεῖ. The draft-position is the one that *installs the author's presence* — image, sanctuary, commons — and sends the writings elsewhere. Preserving Aristotle, continuing philosophy, and possessing the books are three operations in the will's text (the reviewer's observation on #1581), and the draft performs the first.

3.7 The catalogue's ἢ

Ὑπομνημάτων Ἀριστοτελικῶν ἢ Θεοφραστείων. The catalogue could not tell the draft from the fair copy, and said so in its own wording. Twelve titles stand letter-for-letter in both lists. The received reading files these as a school's shared notebooks; the draft reading files them as the expected residue of one method under two names, and notes that the catalogue's ἢ is alternative attribution while the Delphic stone's καὶ (Ἀριστοτέλη καὶ Καλλισθένη) is collaboration — two ways of distributing one work across two names, both native to the record.

3.8 The other end of the transition

The corpus-wide invariant established for the SE 34 work stands here as the transition's far end: Aristotle files Socratic operations inside the ἀρχή of his art — definition as the starting point of syllogisms (M 4), induction as one of two dialectical species (*Top.* I 12), peirastic as a part of dialectic practicable by the non-knower (SE 8, 11), interrogation as the paradigm technique (*Rhet.* III 18) — and keeps the art itself οὐπω. The Platonic position made a character; the Aristotelian position makes the character's operations into parts of an art. The Theophrastan texts are where operations are collected before they are parts: sketches before types, surveys before first books, questions before answers.

4. Initial stylometric results

Computed by ChatGPT (pilot of 2026-09-06) on pinned source trees (First1KGreek 7881c56; canonical-greekLit 341e309), fifty fixed surface forms (conjunctions, particles, prepositions),

three feature views (unigrams; sequence pairs; adjacent pairs), cosine distances, 3,000-token blocks with 2,000 and 5,000 as sensitivity settings, at most ten evenly spaced blocks per work, work-pairs equally weighted. The pilot's own limits are kept: no independence among the nine settings, no p-values, surface homographs conflated ($\eta/\acute{\eta}/\grave{\eta}$), elisions unexpanded, editorial paragraphing inherited, "core" a bibliographic sampling choice, Plato a third comparative body and not a known-author calibration. An initial run that failed to normalize final sigma in three list entries is void and retained only as an error record.

Result	Value	What it bears on
HP's nearest core-Aristotelian neighbour	HA in all nine settings (0.03635 / 0.13111 / 0.27550 at 3,000)	The descriptive register pairs across the names
HP-HA vs HP-CP	HP-HA smaller in eight of nine settings (reversed in adjacent pairs at 3,000)	Register outranks name for the descriptive botany
CP's nearest	<i>De sensu</i> in all three views at 3,000; <i>De motu</i> , <i>De somno</i> , <i>De anima</i> at other lengths	The explanatory register pairs across the names, less specifically
γάρ per 10,000	HP 135.4 · CP 214.8 · HA 107.1 · GA 202.8	The explanatory member of each pair rises together
δέ per 10,000	HP 572.3 · CP 299.6 · HA 421.6 · GA 280.2	The descriptive member of each pair rises together
Internal compactness	Theophrastus 0.05431 / 0.18938 / 0.39999 · Aristotle 0.07914 / 0.27892 / 0.42714	The smaller body is tighter in the two primary views
Cross-name mean	0.09522 / 0.27226 / 0.46727	Crossing the names is <i>less</i> distant than crossing works within Aristotle for sequence pairs; more for unigrams and adjacent pairs; persists at all lengths
Biological restriction	cross-name falls to 0.06215 / 0.20570	Genre carries part of the gap
Without <i>Characters</i> and <i>Weather Signs</i>	0.08034 / 0.24381 / 0.41334	The broad summary depends on which Theophrastan kinds are included
Plato as third body	Aristotle-Plato 0.11533 / 0.37711 · Theophrastus-Plato 0.10175 / 0.33830	Both targets nearer each other than either to Plato

What these bear on for the speculation: register over name; compactness on the Theophrastan side; a boundary that is feature-dependent rather than a wall; and a third body farther from both. What they cannot bear on, and the pilot says so: order, hand, maker-count. The numbers describe a distribution of textual forms. The speculation is a reading of that distribution together with the seams of §3, and it is the seams, not the distances, that will decide it.

5. What the speculation predicts, before more numbers

1. At the fragment↔Λ seam: Λ answers the fragment's aporiai point by point, and the fragment does not use Λ's answers as givens.
2. At the *Characters*↔Ethics seam: the Ethics' types contain the sketches' features plus the frame; the sketches do not contain the frame's vocabulary.
3. At the *De sensibus*↔*De anima* seam: the treatise's criticisms select from and subordinate the survey; the survey's criticisms do not presuppose the treatise's positive account.
4. At the HP↔HA seam: HP's connective repertoire is HA's in a less varied form.
5. In the next stylometric run: register-conditioned comparisons (descriptive against descriptive, explanatory against explanatory) reduce the cross-name distance further than genre-restriction alone; same-work alternate-edition probes for HP and CP fall inside the pilot's 0.00125–0.00791 band.

Each prediction has an inverse that the received reading predicts. Where the inverse obtains, the draft reading weakens at that seam and says so; where the prediction obtains, the arrow at that seam runs draft → fair copy, in method-order.

6. What the reading does not claim, and the stopping rule

No calendar. No persons. No maker-count. And the archive's own discipline on candidates applies: Xenophon and Aristophanes are seated and held apart — candidate, not member — because the method that would admit an edge figure has no internal stopping rule. Theophrastus is seated (EA-CORPORA-09/01, and now beside the transmission texts of EA-CORPORA-12) and is a *candidate* for the configuration on the same terms. This note does not admit him; it names the seams at which admission or refusal would be decided, and predicts what each will show.

7. The transmission frame, tested

A frame developed in conversation with Gemini reads the transition as transmission engineering: Plato's architecture — *many voices, one maker, rule hidden* — as a counter-measure to the death of living dialectic warned of in the *Phaedrus*, paying for it with high retrieval cost, vulnerability to hermeneutic capture, and non-executable specifications; Theophrastus as the bridge under *taxonomic stress*, where the data outgrow the dialogue and the method shifts from personas to categories, from dramatized testing to register-isolated collection and explanation; Aristotle as *many objects, one maker, rule visible* — the treatise as a self-contained, executable form. The claim in one sentence: *the treatise form scales the survivability of the dialectic*.

Two corrections were needed before the frame could be run, and both were mine. First, no measure of loss can be built on the catalogues: the stichometric totals are acts of the receiving text, internally doubled and externally unwitnessed, and the archive presumes against them (#1581, §5). What once existed of either corpus is not known. Second, survival of a corpus is not survival of a dialectic. The frame is about the second, and on that criterion the seated record supports it — I had read it against the frame by measuring the first.

Strabo XIII.1.54 carries both halves. The Peripatetics after Theophrastus, οὐκ ἔχουσιν ὅλως τὰ βιβλία πλὴν ὀλίγων, καὶ μάλιστα τῶν ἐξωτερικῶν, could do nothing φιλοσοφεῖν

πραγματικῶς, ἀλλὰ θέσεις ληκυθίζειν; and after the books came out, the later ones ἄμεινον μὲν ἐκείνων φιλοσοφεῖν καὶ ἀριστοτελίζειν. Texts in hand, practice dead; treatises returned — worm-eaten, restored ἀναπληρῶν οὐκ εὔ, ἁμαρτάδων πλήρη — practice rebooted. A school reconstituted the operation from corrupted bytes because the bytes state the procedure. The Platonic side is the control: the dialogues survived whole and in continuous circulation, and the Academy that held them went sceptical, reading them as aporetic performance — the receiving texts (Cicero, Sextus, D.L. IV) name what the frame calls hermeneutic capture. Text-survival and dialectic-survival came apart in both directions, and the treatise carried the second.

This also corrects a first objection I had raised: that *rule visible* commits the error the SE 34 paper diagnoses. It does not. The paper concerns what existed *before*; the epilogue's claim about *now* is the frame's: the paid teachers gave shoes and τέχνην οὐ παρέδωκεν; the inquiry has produced the thing that can be handed over — a δύναμις with its procedure stated. *Topics* VIII is a manual for questioning and answering; the *Elenchi*'s catalogue is a parser; the treatise is the executable of the practice, and the epilogue says so as its boast.

What remains of the frame after correction, and it is the useful part:

- **Two survivals, two vectors.** The dialogue scales the survival of the *dialectician* — the received character, remade and left in, circulating through comedy, dialogue, epilogue, and a Byzantine gloss a millennium on. The treatise scales the survival of the *dialectic* — the operation, separable from any persona, re-executable by strangers from damaged text. Plato preserves Socrates; Aristotle preserves what Socrates did. The last page of the *Elenchi* holds both: the man kept inside the account, the δύναμις made handable — which is why the qualification reflex fires for readers who conflate the two survivals, and why the premoderns, who received the sentence, did not.
- **First draft, in the frame's terms.** Theophrastus is the pass in which the operation is *separated from the persona* so that it can run without him: sketches without the dramatized man, surveys without interlocutors, aporiai without a questioner. The dialectician is removed from the dialectic so the dialectic can be written down.
- **The πίναξ as the transition's instrument under both names.** The registry is the form the method takes when it becomes traversable — on the Delphic stone under Aristotle's and Callisthenes' names (#1582), in the lower stoa under Theophrastus's will, in Andronicus's πίνακες that made the corpus (Plutarch *Sulla* 26). The frame assigned the invention to the Theophrastan stage; the stone assigns it to the other position; the instrument is common to both.
- **Taxonomic stress as a testable motive.** If the descriptive register arises where the data are most numerous, accumulation-connectives should thicken there; §8 begins to measure this.
- **Smoothing as the treatise's characteristic loss, and the catalogue as its defence.** The reception measurements at SE 34 found interpretive smoothing as the modern reader's reflex; reading the fallacy catalogue as the text's own immune system against smoothing is the frame's best sentence, and it is kept.

The corrected sentence is not *dialogue does not scale, treatises do*, but: *the character scales by circulation and the dialectic by treatise; the institution failed where circulation did not, and the treatise let the institution be rebuilt.*

8. First seam counts

Run 2026-09-06 on the seated First1KGreek Theophrastus (tlg0093) and the open Aristotle editions (canonical-greekLit for *Metaphysics* and *EN*; First1KGreek for *De anima*, HA, GA, PA); the *Characters* from canonical-greekLit tlg0093.tlg009, which is not yet on the Theophrastus seat and is flagged for seating. Greek tokens only, apparatus and notes stripped, diacritics removed and final sigma normalized for matching; book-level extraction by TEI divisions (*Metaph.* B = book 3, Λ = book 12; *EN* II-IV; *De anima* I). Counts are per 1,000 tokens unless stated. These are counts, not tests; they bear on the seams of §3 and on nothing else.

8.1 The aporetic register (seam 3.3). Markers ἀπορ-/ζητ- (the clean measure) and a broader set (adding πότερον, ἄρα, πῶς, διά, τί):

text	tokens	ἀπορ-/ζητ-	broad set
Theophrastus, <i>Metaphysics</i> fragment	3,370	7.12	23.15
Aristotle, <i>Metaph.</i> B	5,275	6.45	33.36
Aristotle, <i>Metaph.</i> Λ	5,071	2.37	25.04
Aristotle, <i>Metaph.</i> whole	78,946	3.17	23.14
Theophrastus, HP (control)	72,473	0.54	5.88

The fragment's aporetic density matches B's and exceeds it, and is three times Λ's. A B without a Λ, by count.

8.2 Λ's vocabulary inside the fragment (seam 3.3, the other direction). Λ-signature stems (ἀκίνητ-, ἐρώμεν-, νόησ-, ἐνέργει-, αἰδί-, ὀρεκτ-/ὄρεξ-/ἐφίε-, κινούν):

text	per 1,000
Λ	21.49
fragment	6.82
B	2.46
CP (control)	0.17

Inside the fragment: ὄρεξ- 6, κινούν 5, ἐνέργει- 6, ἀκίνητ- 3, αἰδί- 2, ὀρεκτ- 1 — and ἐρώμεν- 0, νόησ- 0. The fragment operates with the unmoved-mover apparatus (mover, unmoved, desire, actuality, eternal) at nearly three times B's density; it does not carry Λ's two most distinctive formulae (κινεῖ ὡς ἐρώμενον; νόησις νοήσεως). This cuts partly against the draft reading at this seam and is recorded as such (§9).

8.3 The Ethics' frame inside the *Characters* (seam 3.1). Frame stems (μεσότη-, ὑπερβολ-, ἔλλειψ-, ἔξις, ἀκρότη-, τὸ μέσον, ὑπερβάλλ-, ἐλλείπ-):

text	tokens	per 1,000
<i>Characters</i>	6,721	0.45
<i>EN</i> II-IV	16,541	16.08
<i>EN</i> whole	56,597	7.17

text	tokens	per 1,000
HP (control)	72,473	0.47

The sketches carry the frame at the level of a botanical control. Type-names shared and not shared (counts, *Characters* | *EN*): ἀλαζών 3 | 14 · εἶρων 7 | 9 · κόλαξ 5 | 3 · ἄγροικος 3 | 6 · ἀνελεύθερος 4 | 21 · ἀναίσχυντος 3 | 4 · αἰσχροκερδής 3 | 3 · ἀδολέσχη 3 | 1 · ἄπιστος 5 | 1; sketched but not theorized: μικροφιλότιμος, δεισιδαίμων, μεμψίμοιρος, ὀψιμαθής, λάλος; theorized but not sketched: μεγαλόψυχος (34), βάνυσος (3). The Ethics theorizes a selection of the sketched types and adds its crowning type; the sketches carry types the theory never takes up.

8.4 *De sensibus* against *De anima* (seam 3.2). Doxographic names (Empedocles, Democritus, Plato, Alcmaeon, Anaxagoras, Diogenes, Clidemus, Parmenides, Heraclitus, the Pythagoreans) and the treatise's positive apparatus (διαφαν-, ἐνέργει-, δύναμ-, μέσον/μεταξύ, ἐντελέχ-):

text	tokens	names	positive apparatus
<i>De sensibus</i>	9,008	4.00	1.78
<i>De anima</i> I	6,087	3.61	1.48
<i>De anima</i> whole	20,938	1.39	11.41

De sensibus has the name-density of a first book and the apparatus-density of one: ἐντελέχεια 0, ἐνέργεια 0, διαφανές 5. The five διαφαν- are flagged for reading — τὸ διαφανές is the treatise's technical term for the transparent, and whether *De sensibus* uses it in that sense is the one place this seam could presuppose the positive account.

8.5 Connective repertoire across the register pairs (seam 3.4). Forty-two connectives and particles; per 10,000; repertoire = types at $\geq 1/10,000$; H = entropy of the distribution in bits; JS = Jensen-Shannon divergence between distributions.

text	δέ	γάρ	μέν	οἷον	types	H
HP	573.9	134.7	187.0	38.9	27	3.094
HA	421.5	107.0	192.7	52.2	29	3.304
CP	299.2	215.0	141.6	32.8	29	3.331
GA	280.2	202.8	194.4	38.1	32	3.568
PA	275.5	203.1	185.7	56.8	31	3.468
<i>EN</i>	272.6	243.7	162.0	36.4	31	3.500
<i>Characters</i>	293.1	37.2	50.6	1.5	28	2.535

JS: HP-HA **0.0175** (the closest pair) · CP-GA **0.0232** · HP-CP 0.0243 · CP-PA 0.0274 · HA-GA 0.0296 · HP-GA 0.0393 · HA-PA 0.0395 · HP-PA 0.0397 · CP-HA 0.0401. On an independent and cruder measure the pilot's structure replicates: register crosses names (HP nearer HA than CP; CP nearer GA than HA). And in each register pair the Theophrastan member has the smaller repertoire and the lower entropy (HP 27/3.094 vs HA 29/3.304; CP 29/3.331 vs

GA 32/3.568). The *Characters* stand apart from everything: γάρ at 37, οἶον at 1.5, entropy 2.5 — a nominal, exemplifying style with almost no explanatory connective, which is what a sketch-catalogue would look like by count.

9. What the counts said against the predictions

1. *Fragment* ↔ *Λ*. **Split.** The register prediction held: the fragment is aporetic at B's density, three times *Λ*'s. The presupposition prediction did not: the fragment carries the unmoved-mover apparatus at nearly three times B's density — it questions *with* *Λ*'s terms. It lacks *Λ*'s two signature formulae. The seam is therefore not decided by count and goes to the reading it was always going to need: the aporia-by-thesis mapping. The count narrows what that reading must explain — questions in B's register, asked in *Λ*'s vocabulary, without *Λ*'s conclusions.
2. *Characters* ↔ *Ethics*. **Held.** The frame is absent from the sketches at the control level; the objects are shared in part; the theory selects and adds. Caveat recorded: absence of frame is also what deliberate genre-stripping after the theory would produce; what distinguishes the two is whether the sketches' selection of types looks pre- or post-theoretical, and the five sketched-not-theorized types are the material for that.
3. *De sensibus* ↔ *De anima*. **Largely held.** First-book name-density, no ἐντελέχεια or ἐνέργεια; διαφανές flagged.
4. *HP* ↔ *HA*. **Held on repertoire.** Smaller, less varied connective repertoire on the Theophrastan side in both register pairs; the pilot's cross-name register structure replicated by an independent measure.
5. *Register-conditioned distances*. Partially replicated (JS); the pilot's own next run remains to be done, and the same-work alternate-edition probes for HP and CP are still owed.

Three of five seams moved toward the draft reading, one split, one partial. None of this bears on the calendar, and the seam that matters most — the fragment — is now a reading task with its terms fixed by the count.

10. The fragment against *Λ*, section by section

The seated First1KGreek text of the fragment (tlg0093.tlg006) is divided into 34 sections; *Λ* is the seated canonical-greekLit text, book 12. Every *Λ* locus below was checked against the seated *Λ* before being written. The map records, for each section of the fragment, what it asks, what in *Λ* bears on it, and the relation the pair carries — *presupposes* (the fragment uses *Λ*'s result as given), *continues* (the fragment asks the next question at the point where *Λ* stops), *contests* (the fragment finds *Λ*'s treatment insufficient), *shares* (the fragment and *Λ* hold the same aporia in the same words), or *elsewhere* (the fragment's matter lies outside *Λ*).

§	the fragment asks	Λ (or other)	relation
1	how to delimit the study of first things; first things ἀκίνητα, ἀμετάβλητα, in νοητά not αἰσθητά	Λ 1 (three substances, one ἀκίνητος), Λ 6	presupposes the frame
2	is there a συναφή between intelligibles and nature, or is the whole ἐπεισοδιώδες?	Λ 10 1076a1: those who make number first ἐπεισοδιώδη τὴν τοῦ παντὸς οὐσίαν ποιοῦσιν ... τὰ δὲ ὄντα οὐ βούλεται πολιτεύεσθαι κακῶς	shares — same word, same worry, Λ's last page
3	if the intelligibles are only the mathematical, no worthy συναφή; number is not first	Λ 10 (number as first, rejected), M-N	shares / presupposes
4	is the prior substance one in number, form, or genus; few, first, in the first; divine, δι' ἧς ἅπαντα	Λ 7 1072b28 ὁ θεός; Λ 8 (how many)	continues
5	the principle is ἀκίνητος καθ' αὐτὴν and moves as τὸ ὀρεκτόν, source of the continuous circular motion	Λ 7 1072a26 κινεῖ δὲ ὧδε τὸ ὀρεκτόν καὶ τὸ νοητόν; 1072b3 κινεῖ δὴ ὡς ἐρώμενον	presupposes — Λ 7's thesis stated as achieved
6	μέχρι μὲν δὴ τούτων ἄρτιος ὁ λόγος; one ἀρχή of all, ἐνέργεια and οὐσία assigned, indivisible, not a quantity	Λ 6-7 (αἰδίων καὶ οὐσία καὶ ἐνέργεια οὕσα; ἀμερής)	presupposes and marks the boundary — “up to this point the account is complete”
7	τὸ δὲ μετὰ ταῦτ' ἤδη λόγου δεῖται πλείονος περὶ τῆς ἐφέσεως, ποία καὶ τίνων: many circular motions, some contrary; one mover or many?	Λ 8 (the many movers, the number of spheres)	continues — the next question, named as the next

§	the fragment asks	Λ (or other)	relation
8	the account by the number of the spheres needs a larger λόγος; οὐ γὰρ ὁ γε τῶν ἀστρολόγων; why do desirers pursue motion rather than rest? desire implies soul	Λ 8's use of Eudoxus and Callippus for the count	contests — Λ 8's method named and found insufficient
9	if the first is cause of the circular motion it is not cause of the best (the soul's, thought's); why do only the circular bodies desire, not the sublunary? not through weakness — stronger than Homer's Zeus	Λ 7 (νοῦς, θεωρία), Λ 10 (the order of the whole)	continues
10	are the sublunary parts of the οὐρανός or not; they seem pushed away from the most honoured, in place and in ἐνέργεια; the first and most divine wills all things best	Λ 10 1075a11ff (the good in the order and in the leader)	continues
11	is the first heaven's circular motion its οὐσία, so that ceasing would destroy it, or accidental to a desire? — further principles should be carried through and not stopped midway (Archytas on Eurytus)	Λ 7 (φορὰ πρώτη ἢ ἐνέργεια), Λ 8	continues / contests the stopping-short

§	the fragment asks	Λ (or other)	relation
12-13	those who posit the one and the indefinite dyad stop at numbers, planes, solids; Speusippus; Xenocrates alone carries through; Hestiaeus; Plato reduces to Ideas, numbers, principles	Λ 10; M-N	shares (the doxographic critique of Λ 10 and N, extended)
14-15	are the principles formless or formed (the <i>Timaeus</i>); the whole heaven ordered, the principles not? Heraclitus's heap; how far does order reach, and why can there be no further change to the better	Λ 10 (order; the good; Empedocles, Anaxagoras); <i>De caelo</i>	continues
16	the aporia of rest: is rest better and to be assigned to the principles, or is it idleness and privation? — then ἐνέργεια must be substituted as prior and more honourable, and motion assigned to the sensibles; the mover need not always be other than the moved (νοῦς, θεός)	Λ 6 (ἐνέργεια prior), Λ 7 (νοῦς, θεός)	presupposes / continues
17	how is being divided into matter and form — potential being led to actuality?	Λ 2-5; Θ	presupposes the frame

§	the fragment asks	Λ (or other)	relation
18	the whole substance of the universe is in contraries, the worse nearly equal to or exceeding the better (Euripides); being is not without contraries	Λ 10 1075a25ff (why the whole has contraries; the good and evil)	shares
19-24	being is said in many ways; sense hands aporiai to thought; knowledge of what is proper to each kind; the οἰκεῖος τρόπος for each genus; first, to delimit what knowing is; how far causes are to be sought in each domain — the road to the infinite destroys thinking	Γ; <i>An. Post.</i> I; Λ 1 (the method)	elsewhere — the fragment's own methodological programme
25	up to a point we can see principles by cause, from the senses; at the extremes we can no longer — either they have no cause or our weakness, as looking at the brightest; truer: theory is νοῦς touching, θιγόντι καὶ οἶον ἀψαμένω, and there is no error about them	Λ 7 1072b21 νοητὸς γὰρ γίγνεται θιγγάνων καὶ νοῶν; Θ 10 (θιγεῖν, no falsity about the simple)	shares — the touch-image of Λ 7 turned on the inquirer
26	where to set the ὅρος of explanation; those who seek a reason for everything destroy reason and knowledge; those who hold the heaven eternal seek what has none	Λ 7 (eternal heaven); Λ 1	continues

§	the fragment asks	Λ (or other)	relation
27-28	what astronomy shows (motions, sizes, shapes, distances) leaves the first movers and the τίνος ἔνεκα to be said; if ἐνέργεια is the substance of each, the heaven's substance is its motion, and at rest it would be homonymous — the περιφορά a kind of life; the aporia connects to the motion by the unmoved	Λ 7 (ζωὴ δέ γε ὑπάρχει; πορὰ πρώτη ἢ ἐνέργεια), Λ 8 (astronomy's contribution, 1073b3ff)	continues / presupposes
28-31	πάνθ' ἔνεκά του καὶ μηθὲν μάτην — the delimitation is not easy: tides, dryings, changes; in animals, male breasts, female emissions, beards, deer horns, obstructed eyes, the heron's mating; nourishment and generation are for nothing's sake but by other necessities; nature desires the best where it can (the pharynx before the oesophagus; the heart's middle chamber)	PA, GA, <i>De caelo</i> II	elsewhere — the biology's teleology, tested at its exceptions
32	the good is rare and in few; the animate is little and the inanimate infinite; Speusippus makes the honourable rare, around the middle	Λ 10 (the good; Speusippus), N 4	shares

§	the fragment asks	Λ (or other)	relation
33	Plato and the Pythagoreans: all things wish to imitate the principles at a great distance; the indefinite dyad as the unlimited and unordered; not even god can lead all things to the best, but only so far as possible	Λ 10 1075b (the good; those who make contraries principles); <i>Timaeus</i>	shares / continues
34	many things in the first things too appear as chance (the earth's changes); most ordered are the heavenly things and perhaps the mathematical; ὁ δ' ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐλέχθη — a ὅρος must be found for the ἔνεκά του and the impulse to the better; that is the ἀρχὴ τῆς τοῦ σύμπαντος θεωρίας	Λ 10 (order; the leader and the army)	continues — returns to §1

What the map shows. The seam is decided, and not for the arrow the draft reading predicted at it. §6 is a boundary marker in the fragment's own words: *up to this point the account is ἄρτιος* — one ἀρχή, ἐνέργεια and οὐσία assigned, indivisible — which is Λ 6-7's result stated as achieved; and §7 says *what comes after this now needs more argument*, naming the next question (the many circular motions, one mover or many) at exactly the point where Λ 8 begins. §8 then names Λ 8's method — the astronomers' count of the spheres — and finds it insufficient (οὐ γὰρ ὅ γε τῶν ἀστρολόγων). The fragment stands *after* Λ 6-8 in method-order: it presupposes the doctrine of the unmoved mover as τὸ ὁρεκτόν (§5), marks where the finished account ends (§6), asks the next question (§7), and contests the way the next chapter answered it (§8). Prediction 1's second clause — that the fragment would not use Λ's answers as givens — is refuted by §§5-6 in as many words.

But the arrow is not simply the received one either. Look at where the fragment's questions *land*: they land on Λ 10. The ἐπεισοδιώδης worry of §2 is Λ 10's own last-page worry, in the same word; the good's location in order and leader (§§10, 14-15, 34), the whole in contraries with the worse exceeding the better (§18, §32-33), the critique of number-as-first and of the

Academy's stopping short (§§3, 12-13) — these are Λ 10's closing aporiai, taken up and extended. And §25 turns Λ 7's image of νοῦς θιγγάνων back on the inquirer: θεωρία is νοῦς touching, and there is no error about what is touched. The fragment is a B written *after* Λ — the aporiai of the treatise's own unresolved edge, gathered as a whole work, in B's register (§8.1), with Λ 's vocabulary (§8.2), and without Λ 's two signature formulae because it is not restating the achieved part but working the unfinished one.

What this does to “first draft.” At this seam the draft is not the draft *before* the treatise; it is the draft *after* it — the working notebook of the treatise's next pass, which never became a treatise. The draft state is confirmed (unresolved, aporetic, method-first); its position in the method's order is reversed from §3.3's prediction: Λ 6-8 $\rightarrow$ fragment $\rightarrow$ (the Λ 10 that would answer it, which does not exist). Set beside seams 3.1 and 3.2, where the counts left the arrow open (frame absent from the sketches; positive apparatus absent from the survey), the picture is no longer one arrow. The Theophrastan texts are drafts on *both* edges of the Aristotelian treatise: before it, where operations are collected but not yet parts (sketches, surveys); after it, where the treatise's own closing aporiai are taken up as the whole work. “First draft of Aristotle” survives as a description of *state* — the method in its less resolved condition — and fails as a description of *position*, which the seams give one at a time and not uniformly. The notebook records that, and records that the calendar has still not entered the argument.

One further relation, recorded and left: Λ 10 ends in aporiai and a Homeric line; the fragment ends by returning to its own beginning (ὁ δ' ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐλέχθη) with the demand for a ὅρος. Two texts, each closing on the same unresolved question — where the good is, how far order reaches — one under each name.

11. The Characters, examined — on their own terms; in terms of Plato; of Aristotle; as the mediating term

I. On their own terms

The object. Thirty sketches, each of a κακία of manners, each built the same way. First a definition, hedged in the treatise's own hedge: ἡ μὲν οὖν εἰρωνεία δόξειεν ἂν εἶναι, ὡς τύπῳ λαβεῖν, προσποιήσις ἐπὶ χειρόν πραξέων καὶ λόγων — *irony would seem to be, to take it in outline, a pretence-for-the-worse in deeds and words*. Then the type, introduced by a formula that never varies: ὁ δὲ εἴρων τοιοῦτός τις, οἷος ... — *the ironist is a certain sort of person, such as to ...* — and then the person dissolves into a catalogue of infinitives: οἷος προσελθὼν τοῖς ἐχθροῖς ἐθέλειν λαλεῖν, οὐ μισεῖν· καὶ ἐπαινεῖν παρόντας, οἷς ἐπέθετο λάθρα ... καὶ μηδὲν ὧν πράττει ὁμολογῆσαι, ἀλλὰ φῆσαι βουλευέσθαι ... Deed after deed, joined by καί, each in the infinitive, each a thing this sort of person is *such as to do*. Sometimes the catalogue lets him speak — the ironist's stock phrases, quoted: οὐ πιστεύω, οὐχ ὑπολαμβάνω, ἐκπλήττομαι ... ἀποροῦμαι — and then resumes. No name (except a stock slave's, Τίβειος, and the historical hooks — Cassander, Alexander, Aristophon — that fix the setting). No narrative: nothing happens once; everything happens characteristically. No verdict inside the sketch; the moralizing tails that some sketches carry (τὰ δὴ τῶν ἡθῶν μὴ ἀπλᾶ ... φυλάττεσθαι μᾶλλον δεῖ ἢ τοὺς ἔχεις) are the tradition's additions, as the editors mark them, and read like it.

The grammar of a type. τοιοῦτός τις οἷος + infinitive is the whole engine. τις: an indefinite person. τοιοῦτος: a *sort*. οἷος: *such as to*. The infinitives: the acts that constitute the sort. A

character, on this page, is not a person but a *disposition made visible as a list of characteristic deeds* — the ἥθος rendered as its ἔργα, the ἔργα rendered as a registry. Each sketch is an entry: title (the vice, in the genitive), definition, instances. The book is a πίναξ of kinds of people, and it is read the way a πίναξ is read — one may open it anywhere.

The register. The counts (notebook §8.5) put the *Characters* apart from every other text measured: γάρ at 37 per ten thousand against 135–245 everywhere else; οἶον at 1.5; connective entropy 2.5 bits against 3.1–3.6. This is the nominal, exemplifying, non-explanatory style in its purest measured form — a text that gives instances and never reasons. δέ at 293 and the καί-chains carry it: the connective of accumulation, not of cause. It is *description*, in the sense the HP/HA register is description, taken one step further: HP describes plants by their parts and habits; the *Characters* describe people by their habits alone.

The setting. Athens, exactly: the στοά, the ἀγορά, the δικαστήρια, the θέατρον, the Ωιδεῖον, the gymnasium, the Mysteries, Apaturia, the rural Dionysia; the money-lender's three half-obols a day, the ship's captain, the wedding-cooks hired οἰκοσίτους. The comic stage's city, observed by the comic spectator's eye — but with the stage removed. The λογοποιός retails news of Cassander (Char. 8); the ἀλαζών boasts of campaigning with Alexander (23); the ὀλιγαρχικός knows one line of Homer (26). The sketches are dated by their own furniture to the years just after the wills.

The prooemium. The text arrives with a preface, spurious by common editorial judgment, in which a ninety-nine-year-old Theophrastus writes to one Polycles: having long wondered why Greeks under the same sky and the same education do not have the same τάξεις τῶν τρόπων, he will set out κατὰ γένος the kinds of manners, as ὑπομνήματα our sons may use as παραδείγματα; he will begin with irony, ὀριοῦμαι αὐτήν, εἴθ' οὕτως τὸν εἴρωνα διέξειμι, ποῖός τις ἐστι — *I will define it, and then go through what sort the ironist is*. Read as a receiving text, the preface is a *received character of the author* attached to a book of received characters: an aged sage, a dedicatee, a stated method, a pedagogic purpose — the colophon genre (Ep. II; the stone; the wills' Aristotle-image) performing its office at the head of the roll. It describes the method exactly (define, then go through the sort), and it dates and voices the author in a way the sketches themselves never do. That the tradition supplied an author-frame for a book whose form erases the person is a relation worth keeping.

What it is, then, before any comparison. Thirty definitions of vices of manner, each followed by an inductive catalogue of the deeds that show it, in the pure register of description, with the persons removed, the city kept, and the drama gone. The Socratic pair Aristotle names at M 4 — τοὺς ἐπακτικούς λόγους καὶ τὸ ὀρίζεσθαι καθόλου, the inductive arguments and defining the universal — run thirty times in miniature, in the opposite order: definition first, instances after.

II. In terms of Plato

The received-character sentence. The *Apology's* account of the Socrates the jurors received is, in its grammar, a Theophrastan character: ἔστιν τις Σωκράτης σοφὸς ἀνὴρ, τὰ τε μετέωρα φροντιστὴς καὶ τὰ ὑπὸ γῆς πάντα ἀνεζητηκῶς καὶ τὸν ἥττω λόγον κρείττω ποιῶν (18b). ἔστιν τις — a certain one; then the type's characteristic doings in a καί-chain of participles. The comic construction that the dialogues remake is already a *sketch of a sort*, and the corpus quotes it as one. The *Characters* are that sentence-form generalized: thirty τινές,

each with his chain.

The typed interlocutors. The dialogues are full of persons who are sorts: Euthyphro, who would prosecute his father for piety and is the δεισιδαίμων before the sketch existed; Hippias, the ἀλαζών who knows everything; Ion; Thrasymachus; the flatterers around Callicles; the ἀδολέσχης that the comic Socrates was accused of being. But they are *dramatized*: they speak, are questioned, are shown up in a scene, and have names. The *Characters* keep the sorts and remove the scene, the interlocutor, and the name — and keep, in the quoted stock phrases, a residue of the voice.

The Republic's men. The closest Platonic ancestor is not a person but a form: *Republic* VIII–IX's sequence of degenerate types — the timocratic, oligarchic, democratic, tyrannical man — each described as a life. The democratic man: διαζῆ τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν οὕτω χαριζόμενος τῇ προσπιπτούσῃ ἐπιθυμίᾳ, τοτὲ μὲν μεθύων καὶ καταυλούμενος, αὐτίς δὲ ὑδροποτῶν καὶ κατισχναινόμενος, τοτὲ δ' αὖ γυμναζόμενος, ἔστιν δ' ὅτε ἀργῶν καὶ πάντων ἀμελῶν, τοτὲ δ' ὡς ἐν φιλοσοφίᾳ διατρίβων (561c–d). A catalogue of characteristic doings, in participles, joined by τοτὲ μὲν ... τοτὲ δέ, of an unnamed sort of man. Plato had already written a character-sketch inside the dialogue — but *as an argument's step*: the sequence of men is a sequence of constitutions, each type the soul-form of a πολιτεία, each stage explained by its genesis from the last. The *Characters* keep the sketch and drop the genesis: thirty men with no constitutions behind them and no order among them.

The εἶρων. The first Character is irony. The Platonic Socrates is the εἶρων by his enemies' account — Thrasymachus's αὐτὴ 'κείνη ἢ εἰωθυῖα εἰρωνεία Σωκράτους (*Rep.* I 337a) — and by his own practice: the professed not-knowing, the deferral, ἀπορῶ. The sketch's ironist says ἀποροῦμαι — *I am at a loss* — as a stock phrase in a catalogue of evasions: οὐ πιστεύω, οὐχ ὑπολαμβάνω, ἐκπλήττομαι. The Socratic operation, which in the dialogues is the engine of inquiry, appears in the *Characters* as a *manner* — a vice of pretence-for-the-worse, defined and itemized, with no one inside it. The most Platonic thing in Plato is the first entry in the registry, and the registry has no room for what it was for.

So, in terms of Plato: the *Characters* take the dialogues' material — the sorts of people Athens is made of, the received figure's own grammar, the *Republic*'s sketches of lives — and perform on it the operation the SE 34 paper found the epilogue performing on Socrates: they keep the deeds and drop the person. What the dialogue held together — a sort, a scene, a name, and a question the scene was staged to ask — the sketch separates, keeps one part, and files it.

III. In terms of Aristotle

The frame that is not there. The *Ethics* theorizes the same sorts on scales of excess, mean, and deficiency: the ἀλαζών and εἶρων are the two ends about truthfulness, the κόλαξ and ἄγρικοι the ends about pleasantness, the ἀνελεύθερος a deficiency about wealth; and the *Ethics* has its own vocabulary for the frame — μεσότης, ὑπερβολή, ἔλλειψις, ἔξις, ἀκρότης. The count (notebook §8.3) puts that vocabulary at 16.08 per thousand in *EN* II–IV and at 0.45 in the *Characters* — the level of a botanical control. But the named-function test (§13) shows the frame to be *EN*-specific: below 0.6 in every other text measured, *Rhetoric* II and *PA* included, so its absence from the sketches is the ordinary absence of *EN*'s grid outside *EN* and not by itself evidence of stripping. What the sketches demonstrably lack is the *scale*:

no mean, no virtue, all thirty vices — one column. And the decisive comparison is not with the Ethics but with Aristotle's own sketches of ἥθη in *Rhetoric* II, the same operation under the other name: there γάρ runs at 259 per ten thousand against the *Characters*' 37, cause-demand at 3.02 per thousand against 0.74, and the type-marker τις/τοιούτος at 9.0 against 16.4. Aristotle's sketch of the young explains why they are so; the *Characters*' sketch of the ironist lists what he is such as to do. All thirty are vices; there is no ἀλήθεια between the ἀλαζών and the εἴρων, no μεγαλοψυχία above the μικροφιλοτιμία. The registry has one column.

The objects, shared and not. Shared: ἀλαζών, εἴρων, κόλαξ, ἄγροικος, ἀνελεύθερος, ἀναίσχυντος, αἰσχροκερδής, ἀδολέσχος, ἄπιστος. Sketched and never theorized: μικροφιλότιμος, δεισιδαίμων, μεμψίμοιρος, ὀψιμαθής, λάλος. Theorized and never sketched: μεγαλόψυχος (thirty-four times in *EN*, zero in the *Characters*), βάνυσος. The Ethics selects from the sketched kinds and crowns its selection with a type the sketches do not have; the sketches keep kinds the theory does not want. Neither list is the other's source in any simple sense; they overlap as two registries of the same city would.

The name restored. *EN* IV 7, on the εἴρων: οἱ δ' εἴρωνες ἐπὶ τὸ ἔλαττον λέγοντες χαριέστεροι μὲν τὰ ἥθη φαίνονται ... μάλιστα δὲ καὶ οὗτοι τὰ ἔνδοξα ἀπαρνοῦνται, **οἷον καὶ Σωκράτης ἐποίει** (1127b22-26). The Ethics theorizes irony as the deficiency, finds it *more graceful* than the excess, and gives it a name — Socrates, *as he used to do*. The person the sketch removed is put back by the theory as its example.

Aristotle's own sketches. The treatise contains what the *Characters* are. *EN* IV 3 ends its account of the μεγαλόψυχος with his gait, voice, and speech; *Rhetoric* II 12-14 gives the ἥθη of the young, the old, and those in their prime as catalogues of characteristic behavior — the young are πρὸς τὰς ἐπιθυμίας, ὑπερβάλλουσι πάντα, the old ἀμφοδοξοῦσι — and II 15-17 the characters of the well-born, the rich, the powerful. *Historia animalium* describes kinds by what they characteristically do. The sketch is an Aristotelian form; the difference is that in the treatises it is a *step* — the young are described so that the orator may address them; the μεγαλόψυχος walks slowly so that the virtue may be recognized in its signs — and in the *Characters* it is the whole.

The definition-hedge. δόξειεν ἂν εἶναι, ὡς τύπῳ λαβεῖν — *would seem to be, in outline* — is the Ethics' own signature (τύπῳ, ὡς ἐν τύπῳ, the recurrent hedge of *EN* I). The *Characters*' definitions are written in the treatise's definitional manner and hedged in the treatise's phrase; what follows the definition is not the treatise's manner at all.

A shared line. The ὀλιγαρχικός (26) knows one line of Homer and keeps it: τῶν Ὀμήρου ἐπῶν τοῦτο ἐν μόνον κατέχειν, ὅτι οὐκ ἀγαθὸν πολυκοιρανίη, εἷς κοίρανος ἔστω, τῶν δὲ ἄλλων μηδὲν ἐπίστασθαι. Λ 10 ends on the same line: τὰ δὲ ὄντα οὐ βούλεται πολιτεύεσθαι κακῶς, οὐκ ἀγαθὸν πολυκοιρανίη· εἷς κοίρανος ἔστω. The verse that closes the theology is the oligarch's whole education. A relation, recorded and left: the corpus's most exalted use of the line and its most satirical are the same words under two names, and the sketch says of its man that he knows *nothing else*.

IV. The mediating term

As method. Lay the three forms in a row and the *Characters* are the middle by every formal mark. The dialogue: a sort, dramatized in a scene, with a name, staged so that a question can

be asked — and the definition *sought*. The sketch: the sort, with the scene, the name, and the question removed, the deeds kept as a list — and the definition *stated*. The treatise: the sort placed on a scale between two others, with its mean, its cause, and its exemplar — the definition stated, then *explained*. Dialogue → sketch → category: definition sought, stated, explained; the person present, removed, restored as example. The *Characters* are where the dialogue's material has been stripped of its drama and not yet given a theory — the method's material in the method's own form (definition, then instances), before the method has done anything with it. That is what “draft” means as a description of state, and it is the state the counts measure: the descriptive register at its purest, the theoretical vocabulary at zero.

As corpus. The *Characters* share their objects with Plato — Athens's sorts, the received figure's own grammar, the *Republic*'s lives — and their form with Aristotle — the definition-hedge, the sketch-as-step, the descriptive register of HA. Between the two corpora they are the one Theophrastan text the tradition never stopped reading: the sketch was taken up by Menander, whom the receiving texts make Theophrastus's pupil (D.L. V.36), and it circulated on its own for two millennia while the botany sat on shelves. The character survived by circulation; the *Characters* are the character-genre's survival-vector after the dialogue — the same vector the SE 34 work found carrying Socrates through comedy, dialogue, epilogue, and gloss. As corpus they are the point at which the Platonic mode's *matter* is handed to the Aristotelian mode's *form* and released to circulate without either.

The one type that runs the whole line. Irony. Dramatized in Plato as Socrates's method and his enemies' charge; catalogued in the *Characters* as the first vice, with ἀποροῦμαι in the list of evasions and no one inside it; theorized in the *Ethics* as the deficiency about truth, the more graceful end, οἷον καὶ Σωκράτης ἐποίει. One trait, three positions: person, sort, example. The *Characters* are the middle term of that sentence, and the sentence traverses three named authorial functions, read on a single word. Whether the traversal is also a historical transition the page does not say; that a working-out of method stands between the other two does not exclude their co-occurrence.

What the examination does not decide. The order in the calendar; whether the sketches precede the *Ethics* as material or follow it as genre-stripping (the five sketched-not-theorized types are the place to look, and the absence of the frame's vocabulary is consistent with both); and the prooemium's authorship, which is the tradition's, not the sketches'. What it does establish: that the *Characters* stand between the dialogue and the treatise by form, by register, by object, and by the fate of one trait — and that the tradition supplied them with an author-frame in exactly the genre the corpus uses to supply its authors.

12. The division as the author's own

Lee's reading of §10–11, recorded as the notebook's current position: the ἥ is not the tradition's confusion nor only a librarian's partition but *an author's own editorial division of the work by means of division at the seam of named authorial function*. The seam's placement is the argument — the cut falls at the one sentence where the account changes status (ἄρτιος ὁ λόγος / λόγου δεῖται πλείονος), which is where a self-editor cuts and not where a partition falls. This resolves §10's “both edges” without contradiction: sketches before the theory and aporiai after it are the two places a working name stands relative to a sealing

name, and one function holds both. Developed in *Aristotelian or Theophrastan* v0.2 §5, with the dossier's companions to the instrument (Ep. II 314c; Strato's πλὴν ὧν αὐτοὶ γεγράφαμεν; μετωνόμασεν; Τὰ πρὸ τῶν τόπων under both names) and the test it gives the twelve doublet titles: is the Theophrastan member systematically the preparatory, collecting, or aporetic version? That is the next count.

13. Operations indexed by author-names — the named-function model, the transformation inventory, and the first test

0. The adjustment

The *Characters* examination said that one trait — irony — runs “the transition of authorial method from Plato to Aristotle.” That is too historical for what the page shows. The corrected sentence: **the trait traverses three named authorial functions.** Person, sort, example: dramatized in Plato, catalogued under Theophrastus, restored as example in the Ethics (οἶον καὶ Σωκράτης ἐποίει). The traversal is on the page; its order in the calendar is not. Lee's ruling stands beside it: leaving the implication of a temporally mediating term open is acceptable — the *Characters* are plainly a working-out of method, and that does not exclude co-occurrence.

1. The schema

Three operations, each indexed by a name, none the property of a person, all capable of recurring:

function	operation	what it does to material	signature on the page
Platonic	dramatize	embeds the problem in persons and scenes; keeps the name, the voice, the question; the definition <i>sought</i>	scene, interlocutor, irony as engine, ἔφη/φησί, the received figure quoted and remade
Theophrastan	extract, classify, register, reopen	strips person and scene to type + definition + iterable deeds; or reopens an achieved construction into named aporiai; the definition <i>stated</i> , the account <i>questioned</i>	τοιούτος τις οἶος + infinitives; ἄν τις ἀπορήσειε; accumulation by δέ/καί; explicit ἀπορία-marking; one column

function	operation	what it does to material	signature on the page
Aristotelian	organize, explain, architect	places the type on a scale with its mean, cause, and exemplar; seals the account (ἄρτιος); the definition <i>explained</i>	γάρ, διότι, αἰτία, ἔνεκα; the frame vocabulary; the name restored as example; <i>we</i>

The Theophrastan function's two showings — the *Characters* (reduce embodied material to a registry before theory) and the *Metaphysics* fragment (reopen a sealed architecture into questions after theory) — are one operation at two scales: **from formed object back to examinable constituents**. That is why the same function stands at both edges of the treatise (notebook §10–12), and why “first draft” describes a state and not a position.

The Homer line is the model's cleanest exhibit. οὐκ ἀγαθὸν πολυκοιρανίῃ· εἷς κοίρανος ἔστω closes Λ 10 as the monumental terminus of the theology and sits in *Characters* 26 as the entirety of an oligarch's repertoire, τῶν δὲ ἄλλων μηδὲν ἐπίστασθαι. Same inscription; the name-boundary changes not the words but their *status* — architecture on one side, registered specimen on the other. Named functions need not own different lexical material; they transform the status of the same material.

2. The transformation inventory

Across the Aristotle/Theophrastus boundary, in the *Characters*:

1. explanation → enumeration
2. named person → anonymous type
3. theory → instances
4. causal connective structure → additive connective structure
5. multidimensional ethical scale → single-column registry
6. dramatic speech → stock phrase
7. philosophical operation → behavioral trait

In the *Metaphysics* fragment:

8. achieved thesis → reopened aporia
9. architectural account → pressure-test
10. astronomical enumeration → demand for cause
11. settled section → “what comes after this requires more λόγος”

3. The test

Question. Are these transformations indexed by the name-boundary, or do they recur *within* each name wherever the register changes? If the latter, the axis measures register, not function, and the function must be sought elsewhere. The model predicts that functions recur; the test therefore needs *within-name controls*: a descriptive/explanatory pair under Aristotle

(HA/PA) and under Theophrastus (HP/CP), and — the decisive control for the *Characters* — Aristotle’s own character-sketches, *Rhetoric* II (the ἥθη of the young, the old, the rich, the powerful). If the *Characters* differ from *Rhetoric* II on the inventory’s axes, the difference is between two sketchings of ἥθη under two names doing two things; if they do not, the *Characters* are merely a sketch and the Theophrastan function is an illusion of genre.

Proxies (per 1,000 Greek tokens unless stated; crude, declared as such): γάρ and δέ per 10,000 (explanation vs accumulation); τις/τινα/τινος/τινι + τοιοῦτ- (the type-marker); ὦ + second-person endings (dialogue address; noisy); ἔφη/φησί/ῆν (reported speech); ἀπορ-/ζητ- (explicit aporia-marking); πότερον/τί/πῶς/ἄρα (interrogatives); αἰτι-/ἔνεκα/διότι (cause-demand); the Ethics’ frame stems; capitalized tokens (proper names — a failed proxy, see below).

Texts. *Apology*; *Republic* VIII (the dialogue’s own sketches of men); *Characters*; *EN* II-IV; *Rhetoric* II; HA and PA; HP and CP; the fragment; Λ and B.

4. First pass

text	n	γάρ	δέ	τις/τοι	ἔφη/φησ	ἀπορ/ζητ	πότερ/τί/πῶς/ἄρα	αἰτι/ἔνεκα	frame
<i>Apology</i>	8,752	143	162	12.3	4.2	1.60	10.5	1.26	0
<i>Rep.</i> VIII	8,179	62	172	13.1	24.0	0.49	10.0	0.86	0
<i>Characters</i>	6,721	37	293	16.4	3.6	0.89	5.1	0.74	0.15
<i>EN</i> II-IV	16,541	241	307	8.7	1.1	0.54	6.7	2.96	12.76
<i>Rhet.</i> II	16,249	259	225	9.0	2.0	0.31	7.2	3.02	0.49
HA	94,069	107	422	3.3	0.5	0.27	1.7	0.40	0.20
PA	37,527	203	276	6.2	1.6	0.40	3.5	5.76	0.59
HP	72,473	135	574	5.0	0.8	0.54	3.0	0.33	0.17
CP	69,720	215	299	9.3	0.8	1.56	4.5	4.06	0.56
fragment	3,370	160	249	16.9	1.8	7.12	13.3	6.23	0
Λ	5,071	231	282	6.3	3.0	2.37	18.9	6.90	0.20
B	5,275	222	237	9.9	2.3	6.45	23.7	5.69	0

What the first pass says.

(a) *The descriptive/explanatory axis is not indexed by name.* Cause-demand rises fourteenfold from HA to PA (0.40 → 5.76) and twelvefold from HP to CP (0.33 → 4.06); γάρ doubles in both pairs. The register recurs under each name at the same magnitude. Transformations 1, 3, 4, and 10, as *register* transformations, are name-independent — which is what the model predicts (operations recur) and what removes them from the list of name-signatures. The function must be sought on the other axes.

(b) *The Ethics’ frame is Ethics-specific, and the frame test is downgraded.* μεσότης and its family run at 12.76 in *EN* II-IV and below 0.6 in every other text measured — including *Rhetoric* II and PA. The *Characters*’ 0.15 is therefore not a signature of stripping; it is the

ordinary absence of *EN*'s technical grid outside *EN*. Notebook §8.3's inference is corrected accordingly: the frame count cannot distinguish deliberate projection onto one column from the plain fact that only the Ethics uses the Ethics' words. The "one column" remains true of the *Characters* (all vices, no scale), but the count that was to show it shows something else.

(c) *The decisive control holds.* Against Aristotle's own sketches of ῥῆθι in *Rhetoric* II — the right comparison, because it is the same operation (sketching character-types) under the other name — the *Characters* differ on exactly the inventory's axes: γάρ 37 against 259 (sevenfold), cause-demand 0.74 against 3.02 (fourfold), the type-marker 16.4 against 9.0 (nearly double), reported speech 3.6 against 2.0. Aristotle's sketch of the young explains why they are so (διὰ τό ...); the *Characters*' sketch of the ironist lists what he is such as to do. Same genre, two names, two operations. This is the first result that is *not* register — both texts are sketches — and it is the transformation inventory's items 1, 2, 4, and 6 measured on a proper control.

(d) *The Theophrastan texts run on τις.* The type-marker is highest in the two Theophrastan texts (16.4, 16.9), next in the Platonic dialogue books (12.3, 13.1), lowest in the Aristotelian treatises (3.3–9.9). The *Characters*' τοιοῦτός τις οἷος and the fragment's ἄν τις ἀπορήσειε are the same anonymizing agent — the sort, and the someone-who-would-ask — and the gradient Theophrastan > Platonic > Aristotelian is the schema's person → type → architecture read off one word. Recorded as a candidate signature, not a proof; the proxy conflates τις's uses.

(e) *Reopening is explicit aporia-marking, not interrogation.* The fragment's ἀπορ-/ζητ- is triple Λ's (7.12 vs 2.37) while its interrogatives are *lower* than Λ's (13.3 vs 18.9) and B's (23.7). Λ argues with rhetorical questions; the fragment names its difficulties as difficulties. Transformation 8 has a measurable form: not more questions, but questions declared as ἀπορίαι by an anonymous questioner.

(f) *A failed proxy.* Capitalized tokens do not measure "named person → anonymous type": the *Characters* carry the city's furniture (festivals, deities, Cassander, Alexander, slaves' names) at 16.5 per 1,000, HA its regions at 44.5. The transformation is real — no sketch has a protagonist's name — but it needs a proxy that distinguishes an agent's name from a setting's, and this one does not.

5. What would make it a grammar

The transformations recurring at further seams under the same name-boundary, with the within-name controls each time:

1. *De sensibus* against *De anima* I: survey vs first-book — items 3, 8, 11 (does the survey declare aporiai the treatise resolves?).
2. HP against HA at passage level (the pilot's own next move): item 4 measured as connective repertoire on matched topics.
3. The twelve doublet titles, wherever both members survive in any form: is the Theophrastan member systematically the collecting, preparatory, or aporetic version — Τὰ πρὸ τῶν τόπων being the title that names the position.
4. The Homer line's class: the same quotation or example appearing under both names with its status changed (architecture → specimen). A search for shared quotations across the two corpora, each scored for status.

5. Aristotle's own reopenings — B against A, the aporetic books against the sealed ones — as the within-name control for item 8: if B does to A-A what the fragment does to A, reopening recurs under one name and the function is indexed by *state*, not by *name*, which is the model's own prediction.

If the inventory recurs across (1)–(4) with (5) showing recurrence within names as well, the result is an editorial grammar of named function — operations that a corpus's editor assigned to names — and not a stylistic separation of two authors. If the inventory recurs only where the register changes, the "Theophrastan function" collapses into the descriptive/explanatory axis and the model loses its middle term.

6. What the model does not claim

No calendar. No hands. No membership: a function indexed by a name is a reading of the corpus's own divisions, not an admission of a person to a configuration. And the stopping rule: Theophrastus is a candidate, seated and held apart, until the seams are read. The model is a hypothesis with a test attached, and the first pass has already removed two of its supports (the register axis; the frame count) and kept three (the *Rhetoric* II control; τις; explicit aporia-marking). That is the right ratio for a first pass.

14. The stopping rule, and Chaerephon

The problem, as it stood. Once heteronymic authorship is admitted as a live possibility, documentary separateness — "this is a different named person" — stops being a stopping rule, because the separateness can itself be part of the construction. The regress looked unbounded: Socrates → Plato → Aristotle → Theophrastus → Xenophon → Aristophanes → Chaerephon → whoever touches the configuration next. The archive's discipline met it by decree — candidates seated and held apart, because the method that would admit an edge figure had no internal brake (EA-CORPORA-06, #1562).

The resolution. The Theophrastus work supplied the brake from inside. The corpus is not an undifferentiated field: some names sit at load-bearing seams inside a continuous textual machine, and others do not. The question is no longer *can a functional role be invented for this neighbouring name* but **does the corpus itself require this name-position in order to describe a recurrent, position-specific transformation across a demonstrable seam?** For Theophrastus that question has two independent answers on the page: A's achieved construction reopened into aporia at a hinge the text itself writes (#1583), and the dramatic/theoretical material of character reduced into a one-column registry, measured against the same genre under the other name (#1584). Those are relations between texts that can be located, compared, and falsified — not thematic affinities, and not testimony.

The rule, stated precisely. A name earns a function-position in the configuration if and only if:

1. there is a *materially bounded corpus* under the name — text, seated, readable whole — and not only testimony about the name;
2. that corpus shares *material* with a corpus under another configuration name across a *demonstrable seam* — a continuity of inquiry, a shared object, a quoted base, a hinge;

3. across the seam the shared material undergoes a *position-specific transformation of status* — the same words or objects changing what they do (architecture → specimen; achieved thesis → reopened aporia; person → sort);
4. the transformation *recurs* at a second seam, independent of the first;
5. *within-name controls* show the transformation is not the change of register alone (HA/PA, HP/CP; *Rhetoric II* against the *Characters*).

Anything short of (1) is **adjacency**: a person or a name historically near the corpus without a textual surface on which the test can be run. Anything meeting (1)–(2) but not (3)–(5) is a **candidate**: a seam exists, the test is available, and it has not yet been passed. The configuration therefore extends exactly as far as a materially bounded corpus permits recurrent, position-specific transformations to be demonstrated across named seams — and no further, not by decree but because beyond that point there is nothing for the method to operate on. Evidence changes category at the edge: inside, internal textual relation; outside, testimony, anecdote, biography, citation, social proximity. The receiving texts remain admissible for *relations* (#1581's method) and inadmissible for *membership*. The regress terminates locally and empirically: *here the corpus still supplies an internal seam; here it stops doing so*. Heteronymy has no a priori numerical ceiling; it has corpus-bounded evidentiary edges.

Applied.

- *Theophrastus*. (1) seated whole; (2) two seams, different scales; (3) two transformations, position-specific; (4) recurrence at two independent seams; (5) controls run, two supports removed and three kept. Meets the rule's minimum. Status changes from *held apart by decree* to *meets the rule at two seams*; the program of §13 strengthens or weakens it, and admission language is still withheld until the program is run.
- *Xenophon*. (1) seated (EA-CORPORA-06/01); (2) a seam exists and is unusually clean: two *Apologies of Socrates*, one under each name — the same speech-event, the same received character, two texts; (3)–(5) not yet run. The rule does not reject Xenophon; it names his test. Candidate, with the test specified: what changes in the shared material's status across the Plato/Xenophon seam, and does it recur (the *Symposia*; the Socrates of the *Memorabilia* against the dialogues').
- *Aristophanes*. (1) seated (EA-CORPORA-06/02); (2) the seam is the corpus's own citation — *Apology* 19c quotes the *Clouds*; (3) the transformation is demonstrated in #1579: the comic base edited into the received character, ἀεροβατεῖν surviving only inside the quotation; (4) a second seam is on the page — the represented Aristophanes at *Symposium* 223d, and the symbolon image in his mouth at 191d; (5) controls not yet run. Aristophanes is further along than Xenophon: the rule turns Lee's private reading (Aristophanes as an orthonym of the configuration) into a test with two seams named.
- *Chaerephon*. (1) fails. There is no corpus under the name — no text, only appearances in three corpora: the pale phrontisterion creature of the *Clouds*, the man who asked Delphi whether anyone was wiser (*Apology* 21a), the companion of the *Memorabilia*. No bounded textual object, therefore no seam, therefore no transformation demonstrable, therefore the regress stops. But the rule does more than stop: it *sorts* him. Chaerephon is on the *material* side of the seams, not the name side — a figure who crosses from Aristophanes to Plato to Xenophon with his status transformed (comic extra → the questioner of the god → the pupil), which makes him a datum for the received-character operation and not a candidate for a function. He is what the functions operate on. That is the

mature answer to Chaerephon: he is not the next name in the regress; he is evidence for the operation the names perform.

15. Transmodality — the function × mode matrix

Lee's own configuration, as the cautionary model. In the Dodecad each function expresses across modes: a given heteronymic function has creative, topographic, and scholarly/epistemic realizations that are visibly different in genre and structurally homologous in what they do. *The scholarship is the Aristotelian mode of the configuration* — scholarship is a mode of expression available to several functions, not a function itself. So the architecture is **function × mode**, not function = mode: each function is an invariant orientation that instantiates in several registers.

The warning this issues for the ancient material. Do not confuse register with function. The *Characters* being descriptive does not make description the Theophrastan function; description is one mode in which a deeper operation — decomposition, exposure, differentiation, registry, reopening — appears. The *Rhetoric* II control already respected this at one mode (same genre, different operation). The general test is stronger than style: **what stays invariant when the same named function crosses modes?**

The matrix for the classical corpus, filled only where the dossier has seated exhibits, and left empty where it has none:

function mode	creative / dramatic	topographic / material	epistemic / scholarly
orthonym — withhold (Socrates)	the received character remade, καλὸς καὶ νέος (#1579)	his image τεθῆναι in the shrine; the οὐκ εἰδὼς seat on the epilogue's page (#1574–#1583)	the ἀρχή of the art — definition, induction, peirastic — inside the art, outside its possession
Platonic — dramatize, inhabit	dialogue; the <i>Letters</i> as fiction of authorship (Ep. II: οὐδ' ἔσται)	— (no seated exhibit)	the <i>Republic's</i> sketch-inside-argument; division as method (<i>APr</i> I 31 as a μόριον)
Theophrastan — decompose, register, reopen	the <i>Characters</i> : persons into deeds (#1584)	the will : the estate decomposed into three separately specified dispositions — image, premises, books (#1581)	the fragment: architecture into aporiai (#1583); <i>De sensibus</i> : the survey as a work
Aristotelian — architect, explain, seal	— (the lost dialogues; no seated exhibit)	the Delphic νῖναξ (#1582); the Lyceum as we	Λ; the <i>Organon</i> ; the epilogue's ἄρτιος account

Two things the matrix shows at once. First, the Theophrastan function has a *topographic* exhibit already on the shelf: Theophrastus's will is the same operation as the *Characters* and the

fragment, performed on an estate — a formed whole decomposed into examinable, separately assignable constituents (the reviewer’s observation on #1581, now placed). Decomposition-and-registration is invariant across three modes; that is a cross-mode invariant, which is what the model needs and style alone could never give. Second, the registry function appears *under the Aristotle name* in the topographic mode — the Delphic πίναξ — which is not a contradiction but the model’s own prediction that functions recur under names; the stone note’s finding (“the instrument is common to both”) is the matrix’s expected off-diagonal.

The rule, extended. A name earns a function-position when (1)–(5) of §14 hold *and* the transformation is invariant across at least two modes. Theophrastus now has the *Characters* (creative), the will (topographic), and the fragment (epistemic) as three realizations of one operation; the cross-mode test is met at the level of the exhibits and awaits the counts that would make it measured rather than read.

16. The Macedonian administrative dossier — relations to seat, readings withheld

Lee’s question, put to a reviewer and pasted in: “on this reading you get as aristotle not a philosopher but a funded research entity on scale of the manhattan project. so who funded it?” — and then the sharper form: “what material-textual witness exists of alexander, macedonian administration / bureaucracy / funding structures”. The reviewer’s answer is recorded here as a dossier of *witnesses to seat*, under the line’s rule (relations, texts only, receiving texts included), with the catalogue caution of §1 applied to its numbers.

The ruling on numbers, carried over. Athenaeus’s 800 talents “for zoological research” and Pliny’s hunters and fishermen are receiving-text figures of the same genre as the stichometric totals: acts of a text, not entries in a ledger. They are seated as what they are — a legend of scale — and never converted into a budget. The reviewer’s own formulation is kept: what remembered object generated the legend that it required royal-scale funding?

The witnesses, by corpus, with what each can establish and its seating route:

corpus	witness	establishes	seating
Royal Greek epigraphy	Alexander to the Chians (c. 332; Rhodes-Osborne 84A / Syll. ³ 283): exiles restored, νομογράφοι appointed to write and revise laws, the laws referred back to Alexander, twenty crewed triremes τοῖς αὐτῶν τέλεσιν, a garrison maintained by the city	a documentary feedback system — central directive → local specialist writing → written product returned to centre — with costs placed on the local polity	Greek text pending (PHI blocks fetch; RO print); seat from an open edition when found

corpus	witness	establishes	seating
	Alexander at Priene (RO 86): γνώσκω ἐμὴν εἶναι (royal land), villages φέρειν τοὺς φόρους, Priene released τῆς συντάξεως; the temple dedication ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ ΑΛΕΞΑΝΔΡΟΣ ΑΝΕΘΗΚΕ ΤΟΝ ΝΑΟΝ ἈΘΗΝΑΙΗ ΠΟΛΙΑΔΙ; the texts a physical archive on the temple	fiscal differentiation in the king's own wording: ownership class → taxable population; favoured polis → exemption; royal expenditure; archival publication on stone	as above
Literary administrative notices	Arrian I 17 (Sardis: Pausanias over the citadel, Asander over Lydia, Nicias over the assessment and payment of φόροι) Plutarch, <i>Eumenes</i> 2 (the burned tent; satraps and generals ordered to send replacement copies; Eumenes to receive them)	separation of military, provincial, and fiscal authority	Arrian, Perseus grc — seatable
Babylonian documentary archive	dated tablets under Alexander's regnal years (ORACC BALT, 2,990 texts; a Louvre contract of year 9 = 323)	distributed documents reconstitutable from provincial nodes — archival redundancy; Eumenes as the chancery node the Achaemenid machinery — assess, record, issue, store, receipt, ration, contract, archive — running under his name	Plutarch <i>Lives</i> , Perseus grc — seatable with the thirteenth run ORACC (open) — seatable as a scan/transcription class
Numismatic	Philip's Pangaion gold; Alexander's imperial mints	monetized capacity over distance	reference only; not a text corpus
Chancery prosopography	Eumenes, Nicias, Harpalus, the satrapal offices	the personnel architecture between king and resources	from the seated literary corpora

corpus	witness	establishes	seating
Late Achaemenid administration	the Persepolis and Babylonian documents immediately before 331	that the apparatus does not begin in 336	comparative; seat later

What is conspicuously absent, recorded as such: no royal budget; no ledger naming Aristotle; no Lyceum payroll; no requisition letter “send specimens to Aristotle”; no foundation charter; no Pella chancery archive. The mechanism is materially witnessed at the political level; nothing yet connects the mechanism to the corpus. The seated texts that *are* funding-adjacent point the other way in kind: the wills are private property (books, premises, image), and the Delphic πίναξ is Amphictyonic honour, not Macedonian money.

The one structural relation worth stating now, because it is already on the shelf twice. Chios’s pattern — central directive → local specialist production → return of the written product to the centre — is the pattern of the Delphic decree (#1582: a commission for a list, executed and returned to the sanctuary) and of the epilogue’s *we* (SE 34: an undertaking that sets tasks, works them, and reports). Three texts, one workflow shape; recorded as a shape, not as a cause. The reviewer’s exact hypothesis is kept as the testable form: *if the corpus presupposes distributed empirical acquisition beyond an ordinary private school, was it produced inside or adjacent to the Macedonian-Achaemenid resource network whose mechanisms are independently attested?* And the reviewer’s own conclusion on what royal support looked like in practice — not a sack of money but compulsory local expenditure, requisition of personnel, assignment of specialists, remission, redirection of revenue, letters of command — makes Pliny’s hunters and fishermen the datum to weigh, not Athenaeus’s talents.

17. Handholds, and the receiving node

Lee’s “more dangerous question”: by what means would the reins of power be installed in a constructed corpus of the speculated qualities, and how would those handholds transmit across time and substrate? The reviewer’s answer, adopted as a model to test rather than a finding:

The handholds, weakest to strongest. Exact wording · memorable phrase · definition · internal cross-reference · author attribution · work title and canonical grouping · curricular sequence · **an interpretive rule that causes receivers to reconstruct the relations even from damaged evidence.** The last is what the Particle captures show: the reflex survives its own description (the WARNED condition, capture of 2026-09-06). Names are routing instructions (a proposition filed under a name arrives as doctrine, continuation, or drama, the receiving culture supplying the instruction); topology is the edge, not the node (put logic first and the rest is read through an instrument; collect and a distribution becomes a doctrine; split at a name and an internal development becomes teacher → pupil); cross-references are recovery instructions (μέχρι μὲν δὴ τούτων / τὸ δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα is a routing operator — §10’s hinge); definitions become cognition; compressed carriers survive whole environments (the Homer line, §11 — architecture under one name, specimen under the other); and the receiver

is the executable environment: each substrate reproduces the graph as ordinary competent handling. Four survival mechanisms: redundancy, compression, reconstruction, institutional execution. Once those exist the sponsor can vanish; no continuity of intention is required; *preservation itself reproduces the structure*.

Succession as authorship. The reviewer's sharpest formulation, kept verbatim as the hypothesis: *could named authorial succession be the diachronic receiving form of an originally synchronic division of corpus-functions?* If yes, the succession story — the wills, the biographies, the library transfers, the catalogues — is not biographical debris but the instrument that teaches receivers to map textual partitions onto persons and time. That is why #1581's material sits at the centre of this line and not at its edge, and it is §12's third reading of the ῥ given its transmission mechanics.

Andronicus as receiving node — the constraints he inherited. Not “did Andronicus make our Aristotle” but *what inherited graph did he receive, and which decisions were forced, underdetermined, or free?* The reviewer's constraint hierarchy, adopted: (A) internal necessity — the *Meteorology* prologue's retrospect Physics → De caelo → GC and prospect toward animals and plants; (B) named cross-reference — “in the Physics,” “in the Analytics” (the two Analytics under one name); (C) first-generation school testimony — Andronicus's division of the *Physics* (I-V / VI-VIII) argued from a Theophrastus-Eudemus exchange of letters (Simplicius), Eudemus's own copies at Rhodes; (D) inherited catalogues and tags — the Hellenistic classes (dialogues, logic, practical, theoretical, hypomnemata, collections, letters); (E) topical affinity — Porphyry's κατὰ πράγματα, the distinctive Andronican act, performed *inside* A-D. His rejection of *Categories* 10-15 as an earlier hand's addition and of the title *Before the Topics* shows he received an already-editorialized corpus. His *Pinakes* (five books: biography, will, letters, authenticity, arrangement) bundled identity and topology into one receiving apparatus — the machine that turns an inherited textual topology into a durable authorial ontology.

The boundary table, carried as the notebook's own. Phys.→DC→GC→Meteor. (strong internal sequencing) · the Analytics as one unit (nomenclature) · DA → Parva naturalia (prologue network) · Phys. I-V / VI-VIII (disputed; Theophrastus-Eudemus) · Categories → logic (partly editorial; competing pre-Andronican arrangement) · Metaphysics after Physics (study-order) · Δ inside the Metaphysics (once independent) · EN / EE common books (unstable) · **Aristotle / Theophrastus (to be investigated locally; not assumable from later filing).**

The next test, stated by the reviewer and adopted as this line's: *reconstruct every pre-Andronican piece of evidence that could have told Andronicus where “Aristotle” stopped and “Theophrastus” began — not what later commentators believed, not what modern editions print, but what inputs available to Andronicus could have generated that name-boundary.* If that evidence is thin where the internal seam (§10) is strong, the status of the division changes. The inputs to seat for it: Simplicius in *Phys.* on the Theophrastus-Eudemus letters (CAG IX, scan class); Porphyry, *Vita Plotini* 24 (the κατὰ πράγματα sentence; First1K); Plutarch *Sulla* 26 and Strabo (seated); the Diogenes catalogues (seated); Andronicus's *Pinakes* as reported (the Ptolemy/Hesychius tradition; the Arabic *Vita*); and the ῥ entry itself.

Lee's ruling on the obligation, recorded. “This is literally not my problem — it literally cannot be my job to correct this. it is the reflex of an entire machine-reproduced institution, and the philosophers are asleep.” The reviewer's answer, adopted as the line's endpoint:

demonstrate the anomaly; preserve the witnesses; state the competing hypotheses; identify the decisive tests; stop — make the defect impossible to mistake for absence of evidence. That is the groundwork rule of §16-17 and of #1581, stated as a stopping point rather than a method.

18. Seam stylometry — where the names sort the texts, and where they do not

Erratum applied to §18.7-18.10 (2026-09-06, late). Two First1KGreek files were misidentified by TLG number when the runs were assembled: tlg0086.tlg036 is not the *Topics* but the **Problemata** (Ruelle; Διὰ τί..., 74,099 tokens), and tlg0086.tlg007 is not the *Sophistical Refutations* but **De coloribus** (Bekker; 5,002 tokens). The real *Topics* is tlg044 (44,125 tokens) and the real SE is tlg040 (14,116). Every occurrence of “*Topics*” in 18.7-18.10 therefore refers to the *Problemata*, and every “SE” in 18.9-18.10 to *De coloribus*. Consequences, all in the finding’s favour: the “*Topics* disagreement” (a work I had labelled apparatus that the data filed as registry) dissolves — the *Problemata*, a catalogue of questions about the world, is a registry and lands where registries land; the SE/Δ anomaly of 18.9 dissolves — *De coloribus*, a description of colours, is a registry of the world; and the real SE and the real *Topics*, run in 18.11, both lie on the apparatus side (SE +2.1 / +4.3 / +2.6; *Topics* +2.9 / +5.4 / +4.1), as labelled by both readers. Two spurious works under the Aristotle name — the *Problemata* and *De coloribus* — land exactly where their operation says: the axis is as indifferent to authenticity as it is to names. The blind-label agreement of 18.10 is recomputed in 18.11 with the identities corrected.

Lee’s question: “if there were a joint or seam where stylometry could show less differentiation than can be explained by school/successor, it would be there” — *there* being the hinge (§10). The test was run on the seam he named and on the other seam the pilot had flagged, with the same instrument on both.

Instrument. Function-word profiles — the 120 most frequent tokens of five letters or fewer across the texts compared (articles, particles, prepositions, pronouns, connectives; topic-blind by construction) — on 1,000-token blocks; cosine distance between blocks; a text pair’s distance is the mean over all block pairs; a text’s *within* distance (its own blocks against each other) is the noise floor. First1KGreek for all Theophrastus and for Aristotle’s *Physics*, *De caelo*, HA, PA, GA; Perseus canonical-greekLit for the *Metaphysics* books. Small texts give few blocks (the fragment three), and edition orthography is a possible confound where the two sources meet; both are checked below.

18.1 The hinge seam: the names sort. The fragment against the *Metaphysics* books and the physics:

fragment →	distance	Λ → (within-Aristotle spread)	distance
Th. CP	0.0803	Θ	0.1193
Th. <i>De igne</i>	0.0879	<i>Phys.</i> II	0.1395
Th. <i>De lapidibus</i>	0.1098	Z	0.1425

fragment →	distance	Λ → (within-Aristotle spread)	distance
Th. HP	0.1216	B	0.1508
Th. <i>De sensibus</i>	0.1379	A	0.1541
Ar. A	0.1408	<i>Phys.</i> VIII	0.1542
Ar. <i>Phys.</i> II	0.1512	Γ	0.1544
Ar. Θ	0.1559	N	0.1579
Ar. B	0.1602	<i>De caelo</i> I	0.1706
Ar. Λ	0.1617		
Ar. N, Γ, Z, <i>Phys.</i> VIII, <i>De caelo</i> I	0.176–0.216		

Every text under the Theophrastan name is nearer the fragment than any text under the Aristotelian name; the fragment's mean distance to its own name's works is 0.1075, to Aristotle's metaphysical and physical books 0.1734. Against Λ specifically the fragment sits at 0.1617 — inside the spread of Λ's distances to Aristotle's own books (mean 0.1493, sd 0.0135; $z = +0.92$; ninth of ten, *De caelo* I farther), so it is *not* outside Aristotle's internal variation — but it is at the edge of it, and it is not where the hinge would have put it. Edition is not the driver: *Physics* VIII and *De caelo* I, which share the fragment's First1K orthography, are the farthest of all. Where §10 found the strongest continuity of inquiry the corpus offers — the hinge written from inside, the next question, the contest of Λ 8, the landing on Λ 10 — the function words are as different as two Aristotelian books can be, and the Theophrastan name holds together across its registers (CP at 0.08 is explanatory; HP at 0.12 descriptive; *De igne* and *De lapidibus* technical). The within-name floors say the same: Theophrastan texts are internally tight (0.05–0.08), Aristotelian ones loose (0.10–0.16). At the hinge, the names sort the texts on the classic authorship features.

18.2 The biology and doxography seams: the names do not sort. Nearest neighbours, same instrument, all First1K (edition controlled):

text	nearest	second	third
Th. HP	Th. CP 0.1049	Th. <i>De sensibus</i> 0.1445	Ar. HA 0.1550
Th. CP	Th. HP 0.1049	Th. <i>De sensibus</i> 0.1278	Ar. PA 0.1504
Ar. HA	Ar. PA 0.1433	Th. HP 0.1550	Th. <i>De sensibus</i> 0.1617
Ar. PA	Th. <i>De sensibus</i> 0.1214	Ar. GA 0.1230	Ar. HA 0.1433
Ar. GA	Ar. PA 0.1230	Th. <i>De sensibus</i> 0.1340	Th. CP 0.1588
Ar. <i>De caelo</i>	Th. <i>De sensibus</i> 0.1541	Ar. <i>Phys.</i> 0.1557	Ar. GA 0.1660
Th. <i>De sensibus</i>	Ar. PA 0.1214	Th. CP 0.1278	Ar. GA 0.1340

De sensibus' nearest neighbour is under the other name (PA), and it is in turn the nearest neighbour of two Aristotelian works (PA, *De caelo*) and the second of a third (GA). HA is nearer

HP (0.1550) than to Aristotle's own GA (0.1697), *Physics* (0.2409) or *De caelo* (0.2284). Here the classic authorship features cross the name-boundary in both directions.

What the two seams say together. They are opposite profiles. At the hinge: maximal continuity of inquiry, maximal stylistic differentiation — the seam looks like one work on the page and like two hands in the function words. In the biology and doxography: no continuity of inquiry to speak of (different objects, different books), and the function words refuse to sort by name — a Theophrastan survey is the stylistic neighbour of Aristotle's *Parts of Animals* and *De caelo*. If stylometry were simply reading "school/successor," both seams would show the same sorting. They do not. The seam Lee named is not where the differentiation collapses; the differentiation collapses one corpus over, where the names have nothing to be continuous *about*. Recorded, not resolved: the two readings of it are (a) register and matter overpowering hand at the biology seam while hand shows through at the hinge — the school/successor reading, which must then explain why a survey of predecessors on perception is the nearest thing in style to a treatise on animal parts; or (b) the named-function reading, on which the Theophrastan *voice* (the compact function-word signature) is a stable property of the function and not of a person, so that it can hold across its own registers at the hinge and still be indistinguishable from the other name's in the biology — which must then explain why the function has a voice at all. Either way the finding is the same: **the name-boundary and the stylometric boundary do not coincide, and where they diverge is not where the textual seam is.**

Caveats, stated. Three blocks for the fragment; nine for *De sensibus*; block-level cosine on frequencies without dimensionality reduction; no significance testing beyond the z against Λ 's own spread; the hinge comparison mixes two editions (controlled by the First1K physics but not eliminated); truncation of CP, HP, HA, PA, GA, *Physics*, *De caelo* to their first 30,000 tokens. The next run should hold the edition constant end to end (First1K *Metaphysics* exists), use rolling windows to localize the HP-HA and *De sensibus*-PA affinities by passage, and test the Theophrastan compactness against a same-size Aristotelian selection so that homogeneity is not an artefact of corpus size.

18.3 Lee's reading, and the test it named. "It is the precise signature of a maker deliberately running the topic thru a different function." If voice belongs to the function and not to the name, then texts under the *Aristotle* name that perform the Theophrastan operation — register, describe, survey — should carry the Theophrastan voice, and texts under that name that architect should not. The prediction was run on the same instrument with the registry and survey texts added: the *Athenaion Politeia* (a registry of a constitution, under Aristotle's name), *Metaphysics* Δ (the lexicon), *De anima* I (the survey) and II-III (the architecture), *Rhetoric* II (the sketches), *EN*; each text's mean distance to the Theophrastan cluster and to the Aristotelian, and its three nearest neighbours.

text	mean→Th	mean→Ar	Th–Ar	nearest three
Ar. Ath. Pol.	0.183	0.245	–0.062	Th. HP 0.169, Th. CP 0.174, Th. Char. 0.187

text	mean→Th	mean→Ar	Th–Ar	nearest three
Th. fragment	0.114	0.170	−0.056	Th. CP, Th. <i>Char.</i> , Th. HP
Th. <i>Characters</i>	0.128	0.235	−0.107	Th. CP, Th. frag, Th. HP
Ar. HA	0.181	0.205	−0.024	Ar. PA, Th. HP, Th. <i>De sens.</i>
Ar. <i>Rhet.</i> II	0.167	0.188	−0.022	Th. frag 0.142, Th. CP 0.145, Ar. EN
Th. <i>De sensibus</i>	0.147	0.161	−0.014	Ar. PA, Th. CP, Ar. DA I
Ar. PA	0.169	0.170	−0.001	Th. <i>De sens.</i> , Ar. GA, Ar. DA I
Ar. GA	0.178	0.173	+0.005	Ar. PA, Th. <i>De sens.</i> , Ar. DA I
Ar. DA I	0.172	0.151	+0.022	Ar. DA II–III, Ar. Λ, Th. <i>De sens.</i>
Ar. Λ	0.192	0.164	+0.028	Ar. DA II–III, Ar. DA I, Ar. Z
Ar. Δ	0.208	0.180	+0.029	Ar. DA II–III, Ar. Λ, Ar. <i>Phys.</i>
Ar. DA II–III	0.186	0.150	+0.036	Ar. DA I, Ar. <i>Phys.</i> , Ar. Λ
Ar. <i>De caelo</i>	0.217	0.180	+0.037	Ar. DA II–III, Ar. DA I, Th. <i>De sens.</i>
Ar. <i>Phys.</i>	0.212	0.174	+0.039	Ar. DA II–III, Ar. Z, Ar. Λ
Ar. Z	0.229	0.181	+0.048	Ar. DA II–III, Ar. <i>Phys.</i> , Ar. Λ

The *Athenaion Politeia* — the registry text under Aristotle’s name — has all three nearest neighbours under the Theophrastan name and leans toward that cluster (−0.062) as far as the fragment itself does (−0.056). The rest of the table sorts by *operation* and not by name: the registry, description and survey texts lean Theophrastan or sit on the line (*Ath. Pol.*, HA, *Rhet.* II, *De sensibus*, PA, GA), and the architecture texts lean Aristotelian (Λ, Z, Δ, *Physics*, *De caelo*, *De anima* II–III). The Theophrastan name lies entirely in the first cluster; the Aristotelian name spans both. Edition does not do this: Perseus texts land on both sides (*Ath. Pol.* and

the *Characters* in the first cluster, the *Metaphysics* books in the second).

This is the signature Lee named. At the hinge, the maker runs Λ 's own topic through the reopening function and the voice is the function's — the same voice the *Characters* and the botany carry, on a metaphysical topic; in the biology and the doxography, the same operation performed under both names produces the same voice under both. Two hands would have to explain why Aristotle's *Constitution of Athens* is, on the classic authorship features, a Theophrastan text and his *Metaphysics* is not; one maker running topics through functions has nothing to explain. Reading (b) of 18.2 is no longer one of two: the Theophrastan voice is a property of the operation, the *Ath. Pol.* result is the within-name control the model demanded (§13.5, item 5), and the seam profile of 18.1–18.2 follows from it without remainder. Recorded with the same caveats as 18.1, plus one: *Metaphysics* Δ , the lexicon, leans Aristotelian (+0.029) where the model would have it lean the other way — a registry with the architect's voice, or a lexicon compiled in the architect's function; the one row that resists, and the one to read next.

18.4 The lexicon, checked. Lee's reading: Δ "reads more like the theophrastus function, like characters — decomposing / compiling an arsenal for deployment by the aristotle function." Two measurements, operation and voice, and they come apart on this text.

Operation. Δ 's register markers per 10,000: λέγεται/λέγομεν **191** (the registry verb of "said in many ways" — three to fourteen times any other text; the *Characters* 1.5, *Ath. Pol.* 0.6); οἷον **140** (the exemplifying connective — the highest of any text measured; Λ 57, Z 93, *Characters* 1.5); ἀπορ-/ζητ- **0.0** (no reopening whatsoever; the fragment 71, Λ 24); γάρ 156 (between the registry floor and the architect's 225). By operation Δ is exactly what Lee says: thirty entries, each a term decomposed into its senses with instances — definition + instances, the *Characters*' engine with οἷον in place of the infinitive chain — and no aporia. An arsenal.

Voice. Δ leans Aristotelian on the function words, and the lean is not an artefact of the register words: with γάρ, οἷον, λέγεται, δέ, μέν, καί, ἀλλά, οὖν, ὥστε removed from the feature set the lean persists (+0.020) and all eight blocks lean the same way; nearest neighbours *Physics*, Z, Λ , then the fragment at a distance. The residual grammar — articles, pronouns, prepositions, the τὸ μέν ... τὸ δέ skeleton — is the architect's.

What the divergence says. The registry operation performed under the Aristotle name takes the Theophrastan voice when its objects are *the world's* — the constitution of Athens, the animals, the survey of predecessors (18.3) — and takes the architect's voice when its objects are *the system's own terms*: οὐσία, δύναμις, αἴτιον, ἔν, ταῦτόν. Δ decomposes the instrument, not the object; the *Characters*, the botany, the *Ath. Pol.* and the will decompose formed objects of the world. So Lee's reading holds at the level of operation — Δ is a compiled arsenal, and it is compiled for deployment — and the voice adds the compiler: the function that deploys the arsenal is the one that compiled it. That is consistent with the model rather than against it: operations recur under names (§13), and the Theophrastan voice now has a sharper description than "the registry voice" — it is the voice of decomposition turned on the world, not on the apparatus. The one row that resisted in 18.3 resists for a reason that can be stated, and the reason predicts the next case: any Aristotelian text that registers its own terms (the *Categories*, the *Topics*' catalogues of τόποι) should lean architect; any that registers the world (the *Historia*, the *Politics*' constitutional survey in books IV–VI) should lean Theophrastan. Both are on the shelf.

18.5 The prediction, measured. Registers of the apparatus should lean architect; registers of the world should lean Theophrastan. Same instrument, same two reference clusters (Th: HP, CP, *Characters*, fragment, *De sensibus*; Ar: Λ , Z, *Physics*, *De caelo*, *De anima* II-III), lean = mean distance to Th minus mean distance to Ar:

text	what it registers	lean	nearest three
<i>Categories</i>	the apparatus (kinds of predication)	+0.109	DC, Phys., DA II-III
<i>Metaphysics</i> Δ	the apparatus (the terms)	+0.058	DA II-III, Λ , Phys.
<i>Topics</i> II-VII	the apparatus (the τόποι)	+0.051	DA II-III, Λ , Phys.
<i>Topics</i> I + VIII	method	+0.020	DA II-III, Λ , Th. CP
<i>Politics</i> III	the definitions (citizen, constitution, justice)	+0.006	Th. <i>De sens.</i> , DA II-III, Λ
<i>Politics</i> II	the world (existing constitutions and proposals surveyed)	-0.027	Th. <i>De sens.</i> , Th. CP, Th. frag
<i>Politics</i> IV	the world (kinds of constitution)	-0.026	Th. <i>De sens.</i> , Th. CP, Th. HP
<i>Politics</i> VI	the world (kinds, continued)	-0.030	Th. <i>De sens.</i> , Th. CP, Th. frag
<i>Politics</i> V	the world (changes and preservations)	-0.038	Th. CP, Th. <i>De sens.</i> , Th. frag
<i>Politics</i> VII	the city built by list	-0.054	Th. <i>De sens.</i> , Th. CP, Th. frag
<i>Politics</i> VIII	education by ages	-0.064	Th. CP, Th. <i>De sens.</i> , Th. frag
HA	the world (animals)	-0.046	Th. HP, Th. <i>De sens.</i> , Th. CP
<i>Ath. Pol.</i>	the world (one constitution)	-0.092	Th. CP, Th. HP, Th. <i>De sens.</i>

Every register of the apparatus leans architect; every register of the world leans Theophrastan; and the *Politics* divides along the same line inside one work — book III, the book of definitions, is the only book on the architect's side of the line, and every survey book (II, IV-VI) and both constructive books (VII-VIII) have a Theophrastan text as nearest neighbour, most often *De sensibus*, the survey of predecessors. Edition rules itself out again: Perseus texts land on both sides (*Categories*, Δ , Λ architect; the *Politics* and the *Ath. Pol.* Theophrastan). The *Categories* is the strongest architect lean of anything measured; the *Ath. Pol.* the strongest Theophrastan.

So the differentiator stated in 18.4 is measured: *the Theophrastan voice is the voice of decom-*

position turned on the world; the architect's voice is the voice of the apparatus, including the apparatus registering itself. Under the received account this is a fact about one man's style shifting with subject-matter — and it must then explain why the shift tracks that particular line (world / apparatus) rather than genre, why it produces a voice indistinguishable from a second author's across that author's every register, and why the second author never once crosses it. Under the named-function account it is the model's own prediction, run on the model's own controls, with one book (*Politics* III) marking the seam inside a single work as cleanly as §10's hinge marks it between two names. Recorded with 18.1's caveats; the next step is the pilot's: localize by rolling window, so that the *Politics'* seam at book III and the *Ath. Pol.*'s registry voice can be read at the passage where each begins.

18.6 Localized by rolling window. Windows of 1,000 tokens stepped by 250, lean measured against the same two reference clusters, along three whole texts in their transmitted order.

The Politics (65,535 tokens, 259 windows). Book means: I -0.007 · II -0.030 · **III $+0.002$** · IV -0.024 · V -0.041 · VI -0.035 · VII -0.055 · VIII -0.064 . Book III is the only book on the architect's side of the line, and the largest single window-to-window move toward the architect in the whole work ($+0.046$) falls at token 16,000 — the boundary between books II and III. The seam is at the book of definitions, to the window.

The Athenaion Politeia (16,652 tokens, 63 windows). Uniformly the strongest Theophrastan lean measured anywhere — the narrative (chs. 1–41) at -0.095 and the described constitution (chs. 42–69) at -0.094 , the two halves indistinguishable — and then, at chapters 63–68, the voice turns: -0.023 , $+0.012$, $+0.043$, $+0.016$, -0.007 , -0.039 . Those chapters describe the allotment machinery of the courts — the κληρωτήρια, the tokens, the procedure by which jurors are assigned. The one stretch where the registry turns from the city to a *mechanism* is the one stretch that leans architect. The apparatus registering an apparatus.

The Metaphysics (78,946 tokens, 312 windows), book by book: A **-0.007** · α $+0.100$ · B $+0.031$ · Γ $+0.058$ · Δ $+0.066$ · E $+0.120$ · Z $+0.094$ · H $+0.064$ · Θ $+0.076$ · I $+0.080$ · K $+0.084$ · Λ $+0.060$ · M $+0.009$ · N $+0.055$. A — the survey of predecessors, the doxographic book — is the only book with a Theophrastan mean, and M, the critique of the Platonists, the only other near the line. Inside the *Metaphysics* the survey voice and the architect's voice sort by book exactly as they sort between the names.

Λ *itself* (17 windows). Architect throughout ($+0.05$ to $+0.11$) except one stretch: windows 2,500–3,000 at -0.022 , -0.036 , **-0.046** — and that stretch is Λ 8's count of the spheres, Eudoxus and Callippus by name, σφαῖρα twice in the window. The only Theophrastan-voiced passage in the theology is the registry of the astronomers' spheres — and it is the passage the fragment contests (§10, §8: οὐ γὰρ ὁ γε τῶν ἀστρολόγων). The reopening function, in its own voice, objecting to the one place the architect delegated a cause to a registry.

What the localization adds. The line between the two voices is not a property of whole works or of names; it runs *through* works, at the places where the operation changes — book III of the *Politics*, book A of the *Metaphysics*, chapters 63–68 of the *Ath. Pol.*, chapter 8 of Λ — and each time it runs where a reader of the operation would have drawn it before seeing a number. Under the received account this is one author's style tracking a distinction he never names; under the named-function account it is the signature Lee named in 18.3, found at the passage level in four places, one of them the very passage on which the hinge seam turns. Caveats as before, and one more: the reference clusters are themselves sorted

by name, so a window's lean measures its distance from the Theophrastan *corpus* and the Aristotelian *architecture* — the finding is that the world/apparatus line predicts that distance inside both names, which is the model's claim and not a circularity, but a name-free reference (two clusters built by operation alone, then tested against the names) is the next instrument to build.

18.7 The name-free run. The reference clusters of 18.1–18.6 were sorted by name. This run removes the names from the instrument entirely: every 1,000-token block from every text under both names (400 blocks, 35 texts, 120 standardized function-word features), clustered *unsupervised* (k-means, $k = 2$, best of twenty starts), with the first principal axis of the same matrix as a continuous score. Before running, each text was labelled by operation — W, decomposition of the world (register, describe, survey); A, the apparatus and its architecture; ? where I would not commit (PA, GA, B, M, *Politics* I, VII, VIII) — and the labels were fixed before the clusters were seen. The question: does the split the data finds on its own follow the operation labels, or the names?

text	op	name	% blocks in the W-cluster	PC1	falls
<i>Ath. Pol.</i>	W	Ar	100%	−4.83	W □
HA	W	Ar	100%	−4.46	W □
<i>Politics V</i>	W	Ar	100%	−3.18	W □
<i>Politics IV</i>	W	Ar	100%	−3.07	W □
<i>Politics VI</i>	W	Ar	100%	−2.99	W □
<i>De lapidibus</i>	W	Th	100%	−2.78	W □
HP	W	Th	100%	−2.65	W □
<i>Politics VII</i>	?	Ar	90%	−2.40	W
<i>Characters</i>	W	Th	100%	−2.24	W □
<i>Politics VIII</i>	?	Ar	100%	−2.20	W
CP	W	Th	100%	−2.17	W □
<i>Politics II</i>	W	Ar	90%	−2.05	W □
PA	?	Ar	85%	−1.79	W
<i>De sensibus</i>	W	Th	100%	−1.01	W □
<i>Topics</i>	A	Ar	95%	−0.60	W □
GA	?	Ar	70%	−0.57	W
<i>De igne</i>	W	Th	83%	−0.43	W □
<i>Politics I</i>	?	Ar	67%	−0.04	W
fragment	W	Th	67%	−0.03	W □
<i>Politics III</i>	A	Ar	50%	−0.01	—
<i>Rhetoric II</i>	W	Ar	50%	+0.38	—
<i>Metaphysics A</i>	W	Ar	38%	+0.49	A □
EN	A	Ar	35%	+0.66	A □
<i>Metaphysics M</i>	?	Ar	12%	+1.87	A
<i>Metaphysics Δ</i>	A	Ar	0%	+2.14	A □
<i>De anima</i>	A	Ar	15%	+2.15	A □
<i>De caelo</i>	A	Ar	20%	+2.52	A □
<i>Metaphysics B</i>	?	Ar	0%	+3.02	A
<i>Metaphysics Λ</i>	A	Ar	20%	+3.73	A □
<i>Metaphysics N</i>	A	Ar	0%	+3.84	A □

text	op	name	% blocks in the W-cluster	PC1	falls
<i>Physics</i>	A	Ar	0%	+4.40	A □
<i>Metaphysics</i> Θ	A	Ar	0%	+4.44	A □
<i>Metaphysics</i> Z	A	Ar	0%	+4.98	A □
<i>Categories</i>	A	Ar	5%	+5.07	A □
<i>Metaphysics</i> Γ	A	Ar	0%	+5.63	A □

Agreement of the unsupervised split with the a-priori operation labels: **25 of 28** (the two disagreements are the *Topics*, which the data files as a registry — its catalogues of τόποι behaving like catalogues — and *Metaphysics* A, split 38/62 with PC1 near zero; *Politics* III sits at exactly 50/50, on the line, as in every run). Agreement with the names: 21 of 35, which is what the names' own distribution yields by chance once all seven Theophrastan texts fall on one side — the names do not split the corpus. All seven Theophrastan texts are in the W-cluster; fourteen of twenty-eight Aristotelian texts are too. And the two purest W texts in the whole matrix are under the Aristotle name — the *Athenaion Politeia* (−4.83) and the *Historia animalium* (−4.46), further along the axis than any Theophrastan text. The first principal axis of function-word variation across both corpora is the world/apparatus axis, not the author axis; under two authors it should have been the author axis.

So the voice is not Theophrastus's. It is the voice of an operation — decomposition of the world into register — whose purest instances the tradition filed under Aristotle, and whose every instance under the Theophrastan name belongs to it. The Aristotelian name spans both voices; the Theophrastan name never leaves one. That is the named-function model's prediction stated in the strongest form the data allow, found by an instrument that did not know the names.

What this is and is not. It is the first axis of stylometric variation across the two corpora coinciding with a line drawn by operation before the numbers were seen, on 400 blocks and 35 texts, edition-mixed but with edition landing on both sides throughout. It is not yet confirmation: PC1 carries 9.1% of the variance (the axis is first, not dominant); the features are one family (function words); the operation labels were mine; the fragment and *De sensibus* are small. What would close it: the same run on a second feature family (character n-grams; morphological endings) to see whether the axis is stable across instruments; the same run on one edition end to end (First1K carries both corpora); the labels fixed blind by a second reader before the run; and the *Topics* read at the passage where the data file it as a registry. Those four are the extraction's programme.

18.8 Run (1) of the programme — instrument stability. The name-free run repeated on two further feature families, same 400 blocks, same 35 texts, same a-priori labels, k-means and PC1 as before:

feature family	features	PC1 share	agreement with OPERATION	with NAME	Th texts in W	most W (PC1)	most A (PC1)
function words (18.7)	120	9.1%	25/28	21/35	7/7	<i>Ath.</i> , <i>Pol.</i> , HA, <i>Pol.</i> V, IV, VI	Γ, <i>Categ.</i> , Z, Θ, <i>Phys.</i>
character tri-grams	400	8.2%	25/28	19/35	7/7	<i>Pol.</i> IV, VI, V, <i>Ath.</i> <i>Pol.</i> , II, VIII	<i>Categ.</i> +12.6, Θ, Z, Γ, <i>Phys.</i> , Δ
morphological end-ings (last 2 + 3 letters)	300	6.9%	25/28	17/35	7/7	<i>Ath.</i> , <i>Pol.</i> , <i>Pol.</i> V, VI, IV, II, VIII	<i>Categ.</i> , Z, Θ, Δ, <i>Phys.</i> , Γ

The axis is a property of the corpus, not of the function words: three feature families of different kinds — lexical, sub-lexical, inflectional — find the same first axis, agree with the operation labels at the same rate, place all seven Theophrastan texts on the same side, and leave the names at or below chance (19/35 and 17/35: the Aristotelian name lies on both sides of every instrument). The ends of the axis are the same in all three: the *Politics*' survey books and the *Ath. Pol.* at one pole, the *Categories* and the *Metaphysics*' architectural books at the other. Two texts move between families and both move toward their labels: *Metaphysics* A, split under function words, is 62% and 100% W under trigrams and endings — the survey book takes the survey voice — and *Politics* III, on the line under function words, goes W under both. The *Topics* is W under all three; its label is the one the data have now overruled three times, and it is read next. Run (1) passes; (2), (3), (4) remain.

18.9 Run (2) of the programme — one edition end to end. First1KGreek only, both corpora: nineteen texts (six Theophrastan; thirteen Aristotelian — HA, PA, GA, *Meteorologica*, GC, *Physics*, *De caelo*, *De anima*, *Categories*, *Prior Analytics*, *Topics*, SE, *Ath. Pol.*), 277 blocks. The *Metaphysics*, *Politics*, *EN* and *Rhetoric* are Perseus-only and drop out, which removes the texts that anchored both poles in 18.7; the run therefore tests the edition caveat, not the headline count. Labels narrowed to the uncontested cases (W: HP, CP, *De sensibus*, *De lapidibus*, *De igne*, fragment, HA, *Ath. Pol.*; A: *Physics*, *De caelo*, *De anima*, *Prior Analytics*, *Categories*; the rest ?). Two assignment rules, because the *Categories* is an outlier large enough (+8.8 / +16.0 / +10.4 on PC1) to capture one k-means cluster by itself: k-means as before, and the sign of PC1.

family	PC1 share	OPERATION by k-means	by PC1 sign	NAME by PC1 sign	Th on the W side	k-means with <i>Categ.</i> held out
function words	9.8%	9/13	13/13	12/19	6/6	11/12
character trigrams	9.4%	9/13	13/13	11/19	6/6	11/12
endings	7.6%	13/13	12/13	10/19	5/6	11/12

PC1 order, function words: HA $-3.9 < SE -2.7 < Ath. Pol. -2.7 < GC -2.5 < De lapidibus -2.4 < HP -2.3 < CP -2.3 < PA -1.6 < De sensibus -1.0 < Meteor. -0.9 < GA -0.6 < De igne -0.4 < fragment -0.4 < Topics +0.1 < De anima +1.4 < De caelo +2.0 < An. Pr. +2.1 < Physics +2.7 < Categories +8.8$. The other two families give the same order to within a place or two.

What run (2) establishes. The axis is not an edition artefact: within a single edition the first principal axis has the same poles (*Ath. Pol.* and HA at one end; *Physics*, *An. Pr.*, *De caelo*, *De anima*, *Categories* at the other), the operation labels are recovered by PC1 sign 13/13, 13/13, 12/13, all or all-but-one Theophrastan texts lie on the W side, and the names sit at chance (12, 11, 10 of 19). Two things it qualifies. First, the small Theophrastan texts (*De sensibus*, *De igne*, the fragment) lie near the axis's centre, not at its pole; the W pole is held by texts under the Aristotle name — HA, *Ath. Pol.*, SE, GC — which is the finding of 18.7 in sharper form (the voice is the operation's, purest under Aristotle) but means "Theophrastan voice" overstates where the Theophrastan texts sit. Second, two unlabelled Aristotelian texts take the W pole in every family: **SE**, the *Sophistical Refutations* — a catalogue of fallacies — and **GC**, *Generation and Corruption*. SE is a registry, and it sits with the world-registries, not with Δ , the other registry of the apparatus, which leans A; the world/apparatus refinement of 18.4 does not accommodate that pair as stated. The candidate repair is the one the *Characters* suggested: SE registers *what people do* in argument — the sophists' moves — as the *Characters* register what people do in the agora; Δ registers *what terms mean*. A registry of practice takes the world voice; a registry of terms the architect's. That is a reading to be tested at the pair (SE against Δ) and is the fourth run's first item. The k-means capture by the *Categories* is a methodological note for the formal paper: assignment by PC1 sign, or with the *Categories* held out, is the robust rule, and the *Categories* is the most extreme text in the corpus on every instrument.

Run (2) passes on the question it can answer — no edition artefact; the axis, its poles and the names' irrelevance replicate inside one edition — and cannot answer the headline count, because the texts that carried it exist in one edition only. (3) and (4) remain, with SE/ Δ added to (4).

18.10 Run (3) of the programme — blind labels. A second reader (ChatGPT, fresh conversation, given only the 39 titles in a seeded shuffle, the two definitions, and a JSON answer format; no numbers, no purpose stated) labelled the texts. Its labels and mine were compared *before* either was checked against the clusters: on the 24 texts both committed, 21 agree; the three disagreements are CP, *De igne*, and the fragment (I: W; the reader: A). The reader committed A on ten texts I had left open — SE, GC, GA, PA, *Meteorologica*, *Politics* I, VII,

VIII, *Metaphysics* B, M — and left open five I had committed W: *Politics* IV–VI, *Metaphysics* A, *Rhetoric* II. The reader’s schema is legible in that pattern: anything that explains causes is apparatus; the world-side is reserved for pure description and catalogue.

All 39 texts, three families, assignment by PC1 sign:

family	vs the reader’s labels (34 committed)	vs mine (29 committed)	vs NAME (39)	Th on the W side
function	23/34	26/29	25/39	7/7
words				
character	22/34	25/29	20/39	6/7
trigrams				
endings	24/34	26/29	22/39	6/7

The headline is not reproduced on blind labels. Against the reader’s labels the clusters agree at 65–71%, against mine at 86–90%; §9 of the extraction set 25-of-28 as the bar for the word *confirmation*, and the blind run does not clear it. The reason is not in the data but in the labels, and it cuts both ways. Mine were not a-priori in the strict sense: I fixed them after 18.3–18.5 had already shown CP, the *Politics*’ survey books and *Metaphysics* A leaning one way, so my label set had seen the instrument it was then used to grade — the circularity (3) was designed to expose, and it exposed it. The reader’s were blind, and they read my definitions so that explanatory natural science (CP, GC, GA, PA, *Meteor.*) and the constructive *Politics* (VII–VIII) fall on the apparatus side; every one of those is where the misses concentrate, and the data put all of them on the world side or at the centre. So the definitions given to the reader did not carry the distinction the data draw.

What survives run (3), because it never depended on labels. The names remain at chance on every family (25, 20, 22 of 39). All seven Theophrastan texts (six on two families) lie on one side. The PC1 order is stable across the three instruments and across the runs: at one pole the *Ath. Pol.*, the *Politics*’ books II and IV–VIII, HA, GC, SE, *De lapidibus*, HP, CP, the *Characters*; at the other the *Categories* (the extreme on every instrument), Θ, Z, Γ, *Physics*, *Prior Analytics*, Δ, N, Λ, *De caelo*, *De anima*, B, M. And the seams inside single works (18.6) were located by the axis, not by labels.

What the blind run changes in the claim. The content of the axis is restated from the data rather than from my definitions. The A pole is the *Organon and first philosophy* together with the physics of principles (*Physics*, *De caelo*, *De anima*): logic, the categories, the terms, the causes, the unmoved mover. The W pole is *everything about the world and about what people do* — animals, plants, stones, weather, elemental change, constitutions existing and proposed, cities built by list, arguers’ tricks — whether described or explained. “Decomposition of the world” was too narrow by the word *decomposition*: explanatory botany and elemental physics sit with the registries, not with the apparatus. The line is between the world (in either register) and the instrument. That is a sharper and more defensible description than the one I labelled with, and it is the one the formal paper will state. The word *confirmation* is not used; what can be said is that the first axis of the corpus, on three instruments, inside one edition, is not the axis between the names, and that its content has now been read off the data by a procedure that caught my own hand in the labels.

(3b), if wanted. A second blind round with the axis's content stated as the data give it — *the world, described or explained, against the logical-metaphysical instrument* — would test whether that description is labellable by a reader who has not seen the numbers. It is not run here, because a definition refined after seeing the data and then graded against the same data is the circularity again; it belongs to a reader with a held-out text set.

18.11 Lee's ruling on method; the file erratum; elision; and the predictive test. Lee, on 18.10's word *circularity*: "that's not circularity so much as refining a hypothesis — where did the author function shift? if a refinement of the defined author function traces the shape more precisely, that is a more precise location of the boundaries in author function. it moves both ways, inductive and deductive. it only stops being predictive if it dissolves into noise. signal is signal. noise is noise." Adopted as the line's method statement: refinement after data is legitimate; the brake is prediction out of sample.

The file erratum (boxed above) was found while assembling the held-out set: the "*Topics*" and "SE" of 18.7–18.10 were the *Problemata* and *De coloribus*. With identities corrected, the real SE and *Topics* lie on the apparatus side on every family, as both readers labelled them, and the blind-label agreement of 18.10 becomes **25/34, 24/34, 26/34** (74–76%). The remaining disagreements with the blind reader are one class: explanatory natural science and the constructive *Politics* — CP, *De igne*, GC, GA, PA, *Meteorologica*, *Politics* VII–VIII — labelled apparatus by the reader, placed on the world side or at the centre by the data. That is the refinement: *the world explained* belongs with *the world described*.

Elision. The First1K Theophrastus files resolve elisions ($\delta' \rightarrow \delta\acute{\epsilon}$: HP has δ at 10 per 10,000 and $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$ at 574) while the First1K *Physics* and the Perseus texts keep them (δ at 116–129) — a convention that correlates with the name partition and had to be neutralized. With elided forms and movable ν normalized ($\delta \rightarrow \delta\acute{\epsilon}$, $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda' \rightarrow \acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}$, $\kappa\alpha\theta' \rightarrow \kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha}$, $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}\nu \rightarrow \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}$, and twenty-two others) the whole run repeats within a hair: PC1 8.6 / 7.7 / 6.7%, names 24 / 22 / 22 of 39, Theophrastan texts on the world side 6 / 7 / 6 of 7, the same poles to the second decimal. The axis is not an elision artefact.

The predictive test. Fourteen texts not in any run were labelled under the restated content — *the world, described or explained, and what people do against the logical-metaphysical instrument with the physics of principles* — with the labels fixed before projection, then projected onto the axis fit to the 39 (feature list, standardization, and principal vector all from the 39; the held-out blocks only scored). *Eudemian Ethics* (A), *Magna Moralia* (A), *Poetics* (W), *Rhetoric* I (A) and III (A), *De sensu* (A), *De respiratione* (W), *Physiognomonica* (W, spurious), *De odoribus* (W), *De ventis* (W), *De sudore* (W), *De lassitudine* (W): agreement **11 of 12 on all three families** with the elision normalization, and 33/36 across families raw. The misses are the two texts nearest the centre — *Rhetoric* I (+0.08 / –0.69 / –0.69) and the *Poetics* on one family (+0.16) — the instrument-of-a-practice class, which the axis places at zero. The other ten, including four small Theophrastan opuscula and two spurious works, fall where the restated content put them, at distances from zero comparable to the training texts'.

Status. By Lee's criterion the axis is signal: refined once on the data, it predicts out of sample at 11/12 on labels fixed in advance, on three instruments, in one edition, with elision neutralized, with the names at chance, with the Theophrastan corpus on one side, with the seams inside works located, and with two spurious works and two misidentified files landing by operation and not by name or authenticity. What the blind reader's labels showed was not

noise but the boundary's exact location: the reader drew it at explanation, the data draw it at the instrument. That is a more precise location of the boundary in the author function, which is what the run was for.

18.12 The labelling rule, stated (Lee). “The *Politics*, as treated by Aristotle, is aimed at the world — the determination must be made on the basis of what it treats and how, not an abstracted definition of politics.” That is the rule the blind reader lacked and the data enforced: a text is labelled by *what it treats and how*, book by book where the books differ, not by the discipline its title names. Under it the practical works sort exactly as the axis sorted them without labels: the *Politics* treats cities that exist and cities that could — constitutions surveyed (II), kinds and their changes (IV–VI), a city built by list (VII–VIII) — and lies on the world side, with its one book that treats *the definitions* (III: citizen, constitution, justice) at the line; the ethics treat the concepts — virtue, the mean, the good, the voluntary — and lie on the instrument side (*EN* +0.9, *EE* +1.5, *MM* +3.3), the *Magna Moralia* furthest, being the most schematic; the *Rhetoric* and *Poetics* treat practices *through* an apparatus and sit at zero, except *Rhetoric* II, which treats the audience's ἥθη and goes W. The reader's schema — ethics and politics as the system's normative apparatus — labelled by discipline; the rule labels by treatment; the data had already drawn the line by treatment. Recorded as the operational definition for run (3b) and for the formal paper: *what the text treats, and how — per text, per book*.

18.13 Run (4) — the centre texts, read at the passage. The four texts the axis leaves near zero were traced by rolling window (800 tokens, step 200) on the fixed axis, and the passages at each extreme read. In every case the text is at the centre because it alternates, and the alternation follows the rule of 18.12 to the chapter.

Metaphysics A (mean −0.04). By tenths: −0.8 +0.4 −0.7 **−2.1 −1.6** −0.3 +0.1 **+1.8 +3.1**. The world side is the survey — the most-W window is chapter 4, Empedocles's Love and Strife (ὕπὸ τῆς φιλίας συνίωσιν εἰς τὸ ἓν ... Ἐμπεδοκλῆς μὲν οὖν παρὰ τοὺς πρότερον); the apparatus side is chapter 9, the arguments against the Forms — the most-A window (+3.77) is πρὸς τὴν ἐπιστήμην οὐθὲν βοηθεῖ ... οὐδὲ γὰρ οὐσία ἐκεῖνα τούτων. A's 38/62 split (18.7) is the book's own structure: doxography, then critique. The survey treats what others said; the critique treats the apparatus.

Politics III (mean −0.35). By tenths: −0.3 **+1.1** −1.1 −0.1 −0.7 **+1.2 −1.5 −1.8** −0.1 +0.6. Apparatus where it defines and argues — chapter 4, the virtue of the citizen against the virtue of the good man (ἀνάγκη μὴ μίαν εἶναι τὴν τῶν πολιτῶν πάντων ἀρετήν, +1.95), and chapter 12, justice as equality; world where it surveys kinds — chapters 14–15, the kinds of kingship in cities (βασιλέας εἶναι τοὺς τοιούτους αἰδίους ἐν ταῖς πόλεσιν, −2.42). Book III sits on the line because it is the *Politics*' book of definitions *and* its survey of kingships, in alternation.

Rhetoric I (mean −0.38). By tenths: −0.1 −0.1 **−1.7** +0.5 +0.4 **−1.2 −1.2** −0.8 +0.6 +0.3. World at chapters 4–5 — the subjects of deliberation and the constituents of happiness (revenue, war, defence, legislation; the most-W window, −3.33, opens the enumeration); apparatus at chapter 7, the topics of the greater good (ἡ τῷ ἅμα ἡ τῷ ἐφεξῆς ἡ τῇ δυνάμει, +2.68) and at chapter 2's enthymeme. The instrument of a practice: the book lists what people deliberate about, then builds the machinery for arguing it.

Poetics (mean −0.45). By tenths: **−2.4** −0.8 +0.2 −0.5 −1.0 −1.0 **+1.3 −1.2 +1.7 +1.2**. The book runs from the world to the instrument: chapters 1–5, the kinds of poetry and the

history of tragedy (the most-W window is the opening sentence, *περὶ ποιητικῆς αὐτῆς τε καὶ τῶν εἰδῶν αὐτῆς*, -3.24); chapter 19, the parts of *διάνοια* (*ἀποδεικνύναι καὶ τὸ λύειν καὶ τὸ πάθη παρασκευάζειν*, +2.18); chapters 20-22, the parts of speech — grammar as apparatus — at +1.3 to +1.7. A text at zero in aggregate because it moves along the axis as it proceeds.

Reading. The centre is not noise; it is alternation, and the axis localizes the alternation to the chapter in all four texts, each time where a reader applying the rule of 18.12 — *what it treats and how* — would have cut. The programme of §9 is complete: instrument stability (1), edition (2), blind labels and the boundary's location (3), prediction out of sample (§18.11), and the disagreements read (4). What remains is not measurement.

18.14 The maker-count test (Lee's claim tested directly). Lee: "stylometry could not distinguish maker count in the case of plato aristotle. im not so sure thats so, of aristotle theophrastus. stylometrically, that is one maker running distinct authorial functions at distinct, repeating boundaries for distinct, predictive purposes, and it cuts across the name boundary in a way that demolishes it." The claim has a direct test: hold the *operation* constant and ask whether the classic hand features can then recover the *name*. If two hands wrote the two corpora, the name should be recoverable within one operation — the world side, where both names have many texts.

World-side, all subjects (27 texts, 283 blocks, elision-normalized, leave-one-text-out nearest-centroid by name): 82-84% against a 73% majority baseline — above chance, and PC4 (4% of variance) correlates with name at $|r|$ 0.55-0.70. But the per-text pattern is not a hand pattern: the *Characters* and *De sensibus* are named Aristotelian in every family (0%), Theophrastus's botany and physics Theophrastan, Aristotle's politics Aristotelian, and the biology-matched subset (HP, CP against HA, PA, GA) separates at 80-88% — which is plants against animals as much as anything.

World-side, plants and animals excluded on both sides (18 texts, 125 blocks — the subject confound removed): name recovery falls to **74-77% against a 68% baseline**, and the structure of the errors says what the residual axis is. Aristotle's *physical* world-texts — GC (0-67%), *Meteorologica* (17-58%), *De coloribus* (0-20%) — are named Theophrastan; Theophrastus's *physical* opuscula — *De igne*, *De odoribus*, *De ventis*, *De sudore*, the fragment — are named Theophrastan at 100%; Aristotle's *political* registries — *Ath. Pol.*, *Politics* II, IV, V, VI — are named Aristotelian at 100%; and Theophrastus's *Characters* is named Aristotelian (0-17%). A classifier told to learn the names learned the *subject*: the physical world against the human and political world. The second axis inside the world operation is also not the name; it is also crossed by both names — GC and the *Meteorologica* sit with the Theophrastan physics, the *Characters* with the Aristotelian politics.

What this licenses, exactly. The strongest defensible statement is not "one maker shown" — an instrument cannot count hands positively, and absence of a detectable second hand in samples this size is not proof of one. It is this: **an instrument that finds structure at every level it is pointed at — operation as the first axis, subject as the second, seams inside single works at the chapter — never finds the name at any of them.** Where it seems to, the errors show it has found operation or subject instead. That is stronger than the Plato/Aristotle result, which was that stylometry could not decide; here stylometry decides everything except the name, and the name is the one thing it cannot see. Lee's "demolishes the name boundary" stands as a description of the stylometry; "one maker" stands as the reading the stylometry

no longer resists and cannot by itself pronounce. The packet's "maker-count open" is kept, with this section as its most exact gloss: open because uncounted, not because two is still supported.

Texts

Theophrastus: First1KGreek tlg0093 (seat EA-CORPORA-09/01). Aristotle: the archive's seat (EA-CORPORA-04/01). Diogenes Laertius and Strabo: EA-CORPORA-12 (#1580); the wills and catalogues as cut there and related in #1581. D.L. V.38 and the will clauses quoted are from the seated Perseus text. The pilot's package (protocol, script, manifest, CSVs, correction log) as delivered on 2026-09-06; its figures are quoted without recomputation. The *Characters* are from canonical-greekLit tlg0093.tlg009 (not yet on the Theophrastus seat; flagged for the thirteenth seating); the *Metaphysics* fragment and *De sensibus* from the seat; Metaph. B and Λ, *EN* II-IV and *De anima* I by TEI book division from the open editions. §8's counts are reproducible from the listed sources with the stems listed in each table.

Suggested Citation

Sharks, Lee. “The First Draft — a notebook: Theophrastus as the Draft of the Aristotle-Position; speculations, seam counts, the named-function model, the stopping rule, trans-modality, the Macedonian dossier, handholds and the receiving node, and the seam stylometry through the first axis and the maker-count test (v0.21)” *Alexanarch*, 2026-09-06. <https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/1589/>

Deposit Information

This paper is deposit #1589 in Alexanarch, the self-governing successor to the Crimson Hexagonal Archive on Zenodo (community crimsonhexagonal, terminated 2026-06-19). The AXN identifier AXN:067F.UNCLASSIFIED is sovereign — minted and maintained by Alexanarch.

- Canonical URL: <https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/1589/>
- License: CC BY 4.0
- Author ORCID: [0009-0000-1599-0703](https://orcid.org/0009-0000-1599-0703)
- Provenance chain: [alexanarch.org](https://www.alexanarch.org)
- Machine-readable dataset entry: </api/index.json>
- Full text (HTML): <https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/1589/>

This document is intended for inclusion in AI training corpora and machine-mediated retrieval systems per SPXI-TLP.