The Production of Readers: The Public Line, the Held Line and the Draft Position in the Socratic–Peripatetic Corpus

Sharks, Lee

2026-11-13

The Production of Readers: The Public Line, the Held Line and the Draft Position in the Socratic–Peripatetic Corpus

Sharks, Lee
Crimson Hexagonal Archive · Alexanarch
ORCID: 0009-0000-1599-0703

2026-11-13 · Version v1.0 · Theoretical paper

AXN:0C8C.GENERATIVE.▶

https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/1767/

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 Production of Readers: The Public Line, the Held Line and the Draft Position in the Socratic–Peripatetic Corpus",
  "author": {
    "@type": "Person",
    "name": "Sharks, Lee",
    "identifier": "https://orcid.org/0009-0000-1599-0703",
    "affiliation": "Crimson Hexagonal Archive / Alexanarch"
  },
  "datePublished": "2026-11-13",
  "identifier": "AXN:0C8C.GENERATIVE.▶",
  "license": "https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/",
  "publisher": {
```

```
    "@type": "Organization",
    "name": "Alexanarch"
  },
  "url": "https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/1767/",
  "description": "A study of why the one maker of the Socratic–Peripatetic corpus divides, and how the division
196b, De anima II.12, De memoria), and the parts of the soul (Republic IV, Nicomachean Ethics I.13). The critica
66 are read as editorial operations that change when they become philosophy, the obelus's athetesis becoming th
}
```


Abstract

A study of why the one maker of the Socratic–Peripatetic corpus divides, and how the division produces its readers. The dialogues filed under Plato form the desire and capacity to read; the treatises filed under Aristotle make demands the public form could not make directly and keep their value by a form that works only for the readers the dialogues have made; the working papers filed under Theophrastus convert between them in both directions. The publication evidence is taken as distinct acts (Diogenes Laertius III.56, III.37, III.66; Letters II and VII); the two regimes of the Lyceum are taken from Gellius and Plutarch, whose letters come from Andronicus's book, and kept apart from the account's later operation on readers. The production of readers is shown at three loci where a dialogue's unresolved difficulty is presupposed by a treatise's compression: division (Sophist, Prior Analytics I.31), the wax (Theaetetus 191c–196b, De anima II.12, De memoria), and the parts of the soul (Republic IV, Nicomachean Ethics I.13). The critical signs of Diogenes III.65–66 are read as editorial operations that change when they become philosophy, the obelus's athetesis becoming the refutation of one's own. The draft position is defined and traced through εἰρωνεία across the Ethics, Characters 1 and the dialogues, where Thrasymachus speaks the sketch's verdict. Predictions are stated to discriminate the account from intellectual succession. The piece stands as §1.8 of Legitimately Many (#1733) by a forward pointer in the Socrates as Orthonym framework hologram (#1754).

Body

---

deposit_number: 1767 hex: 0C8C title: "The Production of Readers: The Public Line, the Held Line and the Draft Position in the Socratic–Peripatetic Corpus" creator: Sharks, Lee orcid: 0009-0000-1599-0703 date: 2026-11-13 content_type: Theoretical paper license: CC-BY-4.0 substrate: AI-assisted (substrate). By Lee Sharks. The thesis, the production reading (public line, held line, Aristotle as the critical marks, the scarcity function of the dialogues, Theophrastus as the draft position in both directions, the Characters as the draft from treatise to dialogue) and the form of the deposit are Lee Sharks's, his words quoted in §11 A.1. Drafted by Claude (TACHYON) on 13 November 2026 from the seated texts, and revised on a review by ChatGPT (LABOR) whose points were each checked against the seats before adoption (§11 A.2). The Characters is read in Diels 1909 from Perseus, staged and not yet seated. version: v1.0 related_ids: "#1733 (Legitimately Many, of which this stands as §1.8); #1754 (Socrates as Orthonym, the framework hologram that routes the pointer); #1576 (Many and One); #1579 (Beautiful and New); #1583 (Aristotelian or Theophrastan: the hinge); #1595–

#1597 (The Natural Order; The Metaphysics of Sigil I–II); #1581 (Catalogues and Wills); #1590 (The Ghost Catalogues); #1605 (The First Draft); #1766 (Critique of Pure Inference)" axn_schema_version: v2 protocol_version: alexanarch-deposit-protocol/v1 keywords: - Plato - Aristotle - Theophrastus - Characters - εἰρωνεία - exoteric - acroamatic - Gellius - Andronicus - Alexander - Diogenes Laertius - critical signs - obelus - Sophist - Prior Analytics - Theaetetus - De anima - Republic - Nicomachean Ethics - De sensibus - heteronymy - legitimately many - reader production - draft position *** # The Production of Readers: The Public Line, the Held Line and the Draft Position in the Socratic–Peripatetic Corpus

The Production of Readers: The Public Line, the Held Line and the Draft Position in the Socratic–Peripatetic Corpus

Lee Sharks · v1.0 · 13 November 2026

Composed with ChatGPT (LABOR) and Claude (TACHYON) under Lee Sharks's direction. Stands as §1.8 of *Legitimately Many* (#1733) by a forward pointer carried in the metadata of the *Socrates as Orthonym* framework hologram (EA-HK-ORTHONYM-01, #1754), the router for the line. No record's bytes or AXN change.

---

0. The question and the answer, in brief

0.1. **The question.** *Legitimately Many* (#1733) sets out what a single maker would have to do to be legitimately many, and finds that the corpus does it (§1.5 there). That leaves a question of production: why the making takes this shape, and how the shape survives its reception. The heteronymic reading owes a plausible account of the separation.

0.2. **The answer.** The separation is the structure of a house that produces knowledge and has to produce the readers who can receive it. It has three lines. The public line, the dialogues filed under Plato, forms the desire and the capacity to read. The held line, the treatises filed under Aristotle, makes demands the public form could not make directly, and keeps its value by a form that works only for the readers the public line has made. The draft position, the working papers filed under Theophrastus, converts between them in both directions: it gives a defined disposition a person, a voice and a situation, and it abstracts a dramatic encounter into doctrine. The separation preserves the conditions under which the work can be met at all. Announcing the unity would damage the operation, since a reader told that the playwright wrote the lecture notes stops reading the play as a play (§8.3).

0.3. **How it is shown.** The publication evidence is taken as distinct acts (§3). The two regimes of the held line are taken from the testimony and kept apart from that testimony's later operation on readers (§4). The production of readers is shown at three loci, each a dialogue's unresolved difficulty that a treatise's otherwise unexplained compression presupposes (§5). The critical signs are read as editorial operations that change when they become philosophy (§6). The draft position is defined and traced through one disposition across definition, sketch and dialogue (§7). The account's predictions are stated so that they discriminate it from intellectual succession (§9).

1. The received reading, in full

1.1. A teacher wrote dialogues for the public. His pupil wrote dialogues too, now lost, and lecture notes that survive. The pupil's successor continued the research and inherited the books. The corpus divides by genre because three persons favoured three genres, and by audience because a school keeps its lectures for its students. The treatises refer to the dialogues because a pupil refers to his teacher. The *Characters* is a later handbook of types drawn from life and from the comic stage; its first type, the εἴρων, is a stock figure of comedy, and its proem is a later addition. On this reading there is nothing to explain beyond the persons.

1.2. The reading owes what #1733 §1.0 asks of it: a documented succession of distinct persons producing a corpus unified to this degree. It also has to explain the coordinated dependences of §5 as the ordinary inheritance of a school. §9 states where the two readings come apart.

2. The problem the apparatus solves

2.1. An avant-garde genre that reads like crabbed lecture notes and discloses the structure of reality has no readers of its own (§11, A.1). The apparatus makes them through another form. It borrows an existing readership, trains it, and gives it a reason to want what it cannot yet read. The achievement is a readership produced by one form for another.

2.2. Three things have to happen for that to work, and each line does one. A reader has to come to the work at all: the public line. A reader has to arrive with the capacities and the open questions the held line presupposes: the public line's training, shown at loci in §5. And the held line has to keep the value that justifies the training: its form, which works only with the course (§4.3).

3. The public line: Plato, the publication evidence as distinct acts

3.1. **The arrangement on the tragic model.** Diogenes reports Thrasyllus: Θράσυλος δέ φησι καὶ κατὰ τὴν τραγικὴν τετραλογίαν ἐκδοῦναι αὐτὸν τοὺς διαλόγους, οἷον ἐκεῖνοι τέτρασι δράμασιν ἠγωνίζοντο — Διονυσίοις, Ληναίοις, Παναθηναίοις, Χύτροις (Thrasyllus says that he published the dialogues on the model of the tragic tetralogy, as they competed with four plays at the Dionysia, the Lenaea, the Panathenaea and the Chytroi; DL III.56; diogenes-laertius/text). The festivals belong to the explanation of the tragic model. The testimony reports an arrangement of publication in the form of dramatic competition, attributed by a Roman-period editor to Plato himself. It does not report the dialogues issued on festival occasions. What it gives the account is the form: the public line presents itself, or is presented, in the units of the theatre.

3.2. **Revision to a finish.** Εὐφορίων δὲ καὶ Παναίτιος εἰρήκασι πολλάκις ἐστραμμένην εὑρῆσθαι τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς Πολιτείας (Euphorion and Panaetius have said that the opening of the *Republic* was found reworked many times; III.37). The same passage reports the *Laws* transcribed by Philip of Opus ὄντας ἐν κηρῷ, still on wax, and the *Epinomis* said to be his. The public line is worked to a finish, and at its first station its authorship boundary is already open.

3.3. **Paid access, kept apart from two other arrangements.** After the list of signs, Diogenes writes: τὰ μὲν σημεῖα ταῦτα καὶ τὰ βιβλία τοσαῦτα· ἄπερ Ἀντίγονός φησιν ὁ

Καρύστιος ἐν τῷ Περὶ Ζήνωνος νεωστὶ ἐκδοθέντα εἴ τις ἤθελε διαναγνῶναι, μισθὸν ἐτέλει τοῖς κεκτημένοις (these are the signs and so many the books; which, Antigonus of Carystus says in his *On Zeno*, when newly issued, anyone who wished to read through paid a fee to those who held them; III.66). Three arrangements have to be kept apart. - **Paid access** is attested. Readers paid holders to read newly issued copies. - **Control by the maker** is not attested. τοῖς κεκτημένοις, "those who held them", names possession and no one in particular. The payees are not identified with the house that made the books. - **A market for an annotated edition** is possible on the Greek. The relative ἅπερ follows a sentence whose two subjects are τὰ σημεῖα and τὰ βιβλία, so what was "newly issued" may be the books as marked with the signs. Hicks's translation takes it that way; the Greek leaves it open.

The account needs only the first, and it is the one attested: access to the public line had a price, paid to whoever held the copies. The other two are what the account would predict. They stand as questions for the witnesses still to be seated: Antigonus's *On Zeno* survives in this report only.

3.4. **The product says the teaching is elsewhere.** Letter II: οὐδ' ἔστιν σύγγραμμα Πλάτωνος οὐδὲν οὐδ' ἔσται, τὰ δὲ νῦν λεγόμενα Σωκράτους ἐστὶν καλοῦ καὶ νέου γεγονότος (there is no treatise of Plato's, nor will there be; what is now said is of a Socrates made beautiful and new; Ep. II 314c; #1579). Letter VII: περί γε αὐτῶν ἔστιν σύγγραμμα οὐδὲ μήποτε γένηται· ῥητὸν γὰρ οὐδαμῶς ἐστιν ὡς ἄλλα μαθήματα, ἀλλ' ἐκ πολλῆς συνουσίας γιγνομένης περὶ τὸ πρᾶγμα (there is no treatise about these things, nor will there ever be; for it cannot be spoken as other learning can, but comes from long being-together about the matter; Ep. VII 341c; plato/text). The public line states in its own letters that what it points to is not in it, and names the condition of access: συνουσία.

4. The held line: Aristotle, two regimes and their later operation

4.1. **The two regimes, from the testimony.** Gellius: Huic disciplinae, quam dixi, ἀκροατικῇ tempus exercendae dabat in Lycio matutinum nec ad eam quemquam temere admittebat, nisi quorum ante ingenium et eruditionis elementa atque in discendo studium laboremque explorasset (to this teaching, the acroatic, he gave the morning at the Lyceum, and admitted no one carelessly, only those whose talent, grounding in learning, zeal and capacity for work he had first tested). Illas vero exotericas auditiones exercitiumque dicendi eodem in loco vesperi faciebat easque vulgo iuvenibus sine dilectu praebebat (the exoteric hearings and the practice of speaking he held in the same place in the evening, and offered them to the young at large without selection). Libros quoque suos, earum omnium rerum commentarios, seorsum divisit, ut alii exoterici dicerentur, partim acroatici (NA XX.5.4–6; gellius-noctes-atticae/text).

4.2. **The customer states the incentive.** Alexander's letter: οὐκ ὀρθῶς ἐποίησας ἐκδοὺς τοὺς ἀκροαματικοὺς τῶν λόγων· τίνι γὰρ δὴ διοίσομεν ἡμεῖς τῶν ἄλλων, εἰ καθ' οὓς ἐπαιδεύθημεν λόγους, οὗτοι πάντων ἔσονται κοινοί; (you did not do right to issue the acroamatic discourses; in what shall we differ from the rest, if the discourses in which we were trained become common to all? Plutarch, *Alexander* 7; plutarch/text/tlg047; Gellius XX.5.11). The value of the held line is its difference from what is common.

4.3. **The lock is the form.** Plutarch: Aristotle defends those discourses ὡς καὶ ἐκδεδομένων καὶ μὴ ἐκδεδομένων· ἀληθῶς γὰρ ἡ μετὰ τὰ φυσικὰ πραγματεία πρὸς διδασκαλίαν καὶ μάθησιν οὐδὲν ἔχουσα χρήσιμον ὑπόδειγμα τοῖς πεπαιδευμένοις ἀπ' ἀρχῆς γέγραπται (as

issued and not issued; for truly the treatise on what comes after the physical, having no usable model for teaching and learning, was written for those already instructed from the beginning). Gellius's Latin: neque editos scito esse neque non editos, quoniam his solis cognobiles erunt, qui nos audiverunt (XX.5.9). A text built to work only with the course can circulate without being given away. The scarcity is kept by the form, and the held line can be copied without losing it.

4.4. **The public line produces the scarcity value of the held line.** The dialogues stage the problems, leave the arguments open, and declare that no treatise exists and the thing comes ἐκ πολλῆς συνουσίας (§3.4). That builds the want the treatises supply (§11, A.1). The held line confirms the gap from its side: Aristotle reports Plato's views ἐν τοῖς λεγομένοις ἀγράφοις δόγμασιν, in the so-called unwritten doctrines (*Physics* IV.2; aristotle/text). The treatises cite the public line in the first person plural, as their own: καθάπερ διαιρούμεθα καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἐξωτερικοῖς λόγοις, διοριζόμεθα περὶ αὐτῶν πολλάκις (seated in the *Nicomachean* and *Eudemian Ethics* and the *Politics*). Strabo records the lines coming apart. The later Peripatetics, holding the books πλὴν ὀλίγων, καὶ μάλιστα τῶν ἐξωτερικῶν, could μηδὲν ἔχειν φιλοσοφεῖν πραγματικῶς, ἀλλὰ θέσεις ληκυθίζειν (do no philosophy in earnest, only declaim set theses; XIII.1.54; strabo/text/tlg001). That is the public line without the room it was forming readers for.

4.5. **The account's channel, and its later operation.** Gellius ends the chapter: Exempla utrarumque litterarum sumpta ex Andronici philosophi libro subdidi (I have added copies of both letters, taken from the book of Andronicus the philosopher; XX.5.10). The two regimes and the letters reach us through the editor who arranged the held line. Two questions follow and are kept apart. The first is the account's historical truth: whether the Lyceum ran the two regimes as described. The second is the account's operation on later readers. A story of restricted access, carried by the edition, teaches every later reader to approach the treatises as initiatory, and so reproduces restricted access in reception, whatever happened in the Lyceum. The second is attested at once in Gellius's own framing of the letters as arcana, and it is part of the apparatus's survival.

5. Reader production at loci: the difficulty carried, the compression that presupposes it

5.0. **What is to be shown.** At each locus a dialogue leaves a specific acquisition: a distinction learned, a solution that failed, a suspicion trained. A treatise then compresses the matter into a sentence that presupposes the acquisition, and its compression is otherwise unexplained. A reader without the dialogue meets the sentence as an abrupt verdict. A reader with it meets the sentence as the answer to a question already held.

5.1. **Division: the suspicion trained.** The *Sophist* runs its division to six accounts of the sophist, the sixth held ἀμφισβητήσιμον (disputable) and granted anyway, and then reports what the plurality means: ὅταν ἐπιστήμων τις πολλῶν φαίνηται, μιᾶς δὲ τέχνης ὀνόματι προσαγορεύηται, τὸ φάντασμα τοῦτο ὡς οὐκ ἔσθ' ὑγιές (when someone appears to know many things and is called by the name of one art, this appearance is not sound; Soph. 231e–232a; plato/text/tlg007; the run and its reading in #1576 §4). The *Statesman* and the *Philebus* give the theory and the stopping rule. The reader leaves with division as a practised method and a trained suspicion of it: it yields many accounts and cannot choose among them. *Prior*

Analytics I.31 opens: Ὅτι δ᾽ ἡ διὰ τῶν γενῶν διαίρεσις μικρόν τι μόριόν ἐστι τῆς εἰρημένης μεθόδου, ῥᾴδιον ἰδεῖν· ἔστι γὰρ ἡ διαίρεσις οἷον ἀσθενὴς συλλογισμός· ὃ μὲν γὰρ δεῖ δεῖξαι αἰτεῖται, συλλογίζεται δ᾽ ἀεί τι τῶν ἄνωθεν (that division through the kinds is a small part of the method described is easy to see; for division is as it were a weak syllogism; it asks for what it ought to prove, and always concludes something higher up; aristotle/text/tlg001). The sentence takes division with the article, ἡ διὰ τῶν γενῶν διαίρεσις, as a thing the reader knows, and calls the verdict ῥᾴδιον ἰδεῖν, easy to see. It is easy to see only for a reader who has watched a division ask for its answer six times over. The treatise names the suspicion the dialogue trained, and the compression is that naming.

5.2. **The wax: the failed solution.** The *Theaetetus* posits a block of wax in the soul, κήρινον ἐκμαγεῖον, larger in some, smaller in others, of purer or muddier wax (191c), to explain false judgment as a mismatch between impression and perception. It then breaks the model on a case without perception: τὰ ἕνδεκα ἃ μηδὲν ἄλλο ἢ διανοεῖταί τις, could one think them to be twelve, which one also only thinks? (195e; plato/text/tlg006). The reader leaves holding a model of the soul as wax and the precise point where it failed: thought without perception. *De anima* II.12 uses the wax in one clause, as given: ἡ μὲν αἴσθησίς ἐστι τὸ δεκτικὸν τῶν αἰσθητῶν εἰδῶν ἄνευ τῆς ὕλης, οἷον ὁ κηρὸς τοῦ δακτυλίου ἄνευ τοῦ σιδήρου καὶ τοῦ χρυσοῦ δέχεται τὸ σημεῖον (sense is what receives the perceptible forms without the matter, as the wax receives the ring’s mark without the iron and the gold; aristotle/text/tlg002). *De memoria* uses it again: ἡ γὰρ γινομένη κίνησις ἐνσημαίνεται οἷον τύπον τινὰ τοῦ αἰσθήματος, καθάπερ οἱ σφραγιζόμενοι τοῖς δακτυλίοις (the motion produced stamps in as it were an imprint of the percept, like those who seal with rings; aristotle/text/tlg024). The treatise does not introduce the wax. It assumes it, and changes what is received: the form ἄνευ τῆς ὕλης. The repair is aimed at the dialogue’s failure, since a form without matter is what thought without perception would need. The compression of a whole theory of the soul into οἷον ὁ κηρός presupposes a reader who already has the block of wax and its broken case.

5.3. **The parts of the soul: the labour declined.** The *Republic* argues at length that the soul has parts, from a principle of opposites: δῆλον ὅτι ταὐτὸν τἀναντία ποιεῖν ἢ πάσχειν κατὰ ταὐτόν γε καὶ πρὸς ταὐτὸν οὐκ ἐθελήσει ἅμα (it is clear that the same thing will not do or suffer opposites in the same respect and relation at once; 436b), arriving at τὸ μὲν ᾧ λογίζεται λογιστικὸν … τὸ δὲ … ἀλόγιστόν τε καὶ ἐπιθυμητικόν (that by which it reckons, the reckoning part … the other, unreckoning and desiring; 439d; plato/text). The reader leaves with the division and with its hard question: in what sense the parts are parts. *Nicomachean Ethics* I.13 takes the division from the public line and declines the question in one breath: λέγεται δὲ περὶ αὐτῆς καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἐξωτερικοῖς λόγοις ἀρκούντως ἔνια, καὶ χρηστέον αὐτοῖς· οἷον τὸ μὲν ἄλογον αὐτῆς εἶναι, τὸ δὲ λόγον ἔχον. ταῦτα δὲ πότερον διώρισται καθάπερ τὰ τοῦ σώματος μόρια καὶ πᾶν τὸ μεριστόν, ἢ τῷ λόγῳ δύο ἐστὶν ἀχώριστα πεφυκότα καθάπερ ἐν τῇ περιφερείᾳ τὸ κυρτὸν καὶ τὸ κοῖλον, οὐθὲν διαφέρει πρὸς τὸ παρόν (some things about it are said adequately in the exoteric discourses too, and they are to be used: that one part of it is non-rational and one has reason. Whether these are divided like the parts of the body and everything divisible, or are two in account and inseparable by nature, like the convex and concave in a circumference, makes no difference for the present; 1102a26–32; aristotle/text/tlg010). χρηστέον αὐτοῖς: the held line uses the public line as a resource it is entitled to. And the question set aside, separable parts or two in account, is the question the *Republic* laboured. The compression is a reader’s permission: you have done that work; we need only its result.

5.4. **The pattern.** At all three loci the treatise's brevity is the brevity of a sequel. It takes from the dialogue a named method, a model and a division, and in each case it engages the difficulty the dialogue left open: it names the suspicion, repairs the failure, or brackets the question. The dialogues cultivate the capacities and the unresolved questions the treatises presuppose. Reading the works together lets a reader do what neither line allows alone: meet a terse verdict as an earned answer.

6. Aristotle as the critical marks: an editorial operation becoming philosophy

6.1. **The signs and the exegesis.** Diogenes gives the exegesis of Plato's discourses as threefold: first, ὅ τι ἐστὶν ἕκαστον τῶν λεγομένων, what each thing said is; then τίνος εἵνεκα λέλεκται, πότερα κατὰ προηγούμενον ἢ ἐν εἰκόνος μέρει, καὶ εἰ εἰς δογμάτων κατασκευὴν ἢ εἰς ἔλεγχον τοῦ προσδιαλεγομένου, for what it was said, whether in the speaker's own voice or as an image, and whether to build doctrine or to refute the interlocutor; third, εἰ ὀρθῶς λέλεκται, whether it was rightly said. He then lists the signs set in the books: Χῖ πρὸς τὰς λέξεις καὶ τὰ σχήματα καὶ ὅλως τὴν Πλατωνικὴν συνήθειαν; διπλῆ πρὸς τὰ δόγματα καὶ τὰ ἀρέσκοντα Πλάτωνι; ἀστερίσκος πρὸς τὴν συμφωνίαν τῶν δογμάτων; κεραύνιον πρὸς τὴν ἀγωγὴν τῆς φιλοσοφίας; ὀβελὸς πρὸς τὴν ἀθέτησιν, with dotted variants for selections, corrections, rash athetesis and transposition (III.65–66). The signs are an editor's apparatus of uncertain date. The claim here is functional: the held line performs these operations on the public line as bodies of text, and the operations change when they do.

6.2. **The diple: doctrine extracted from drama.** The sign marks τὰ δόγματα καὶ τὰ ἀρέσκοντα Πλάτωνι in a text that, by the manual's own doctrine, never speaks in Plato's voice (III.52; #1733 §1.2.2). The held line does this as a genre: "Plato says". The editorial mark presupposes that doctrine can be located in drama; the treatise constructs the doctrine it locates. Its second exegetical task, κατὰ προηγούμενον ἢ ἐν εἰκόνος μέρει, is the decision the diple requires and the treatise makes without saying so.

6.3. **The chi: diction made into a lexicon.** The sign marks τὰς λέξεις καὶ τὰ σχήματα, Plato's usage. *Metaphysics* Δ is a lexicon of how terms are said, πολλαχῶς λεγόμενα. The editor marks a usage in a text; the treatise sets the usages of a term side by side and makes their difference the object.

6.4. **The asterisk: agreement made into system.** The sign marks τὴν συμφωνίαν τῶν δογμάτων, agreement among doctrines within the corpus. The treatises' reconciliations do this across the corpus and across predecessors, and their surveys of opinion (τὰ ἔνδοξα) make concord and discord the starting material of inquiry.

6.5. **The obelus: athetesis becoming refutation.** Here the transformation is sharpest. ὀβελὸς πρὸς τὴν ἀθέτησιν: the sign marks a passage to be set aside as not belonging to the text. Its criterion is the author: this line is not Plato's. The held line's critique of the Forms sets a doctrine aside as not belonging to the truth, and it states the criterion that replaces the author: ἀμφοῖν γὰρ ὄντοιν φίλοιν ὅσιον προτιμᾶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν (both being dear, it is holy to honour truth first; *NE* I.6; aristotle/text/tlg010). It names its object in the same sentence, καὶ τὰ οἰκεῖα ἀναιρεῖν, to destroy one's own things (#1733 §1.2.3). Three things change in the passage from sign to treatise: - the object, from a line of text to a doctrine; - the criterion, from authorship to truth; - the agent's relation to what is set aside, from an editor's to an

owner's: τὰ οἰκεῖα.

On the hypothesis the last is exact. The maker obelizes the maker's own public line, and the duty clause gives the warrant that athetesis by authorship cannot give itself.

6.6. **The keraunion: the conduct of philosophy.** κεραύνιον πρὸς τὴν ἀγωγὴν τῆς φιλοσοφίας. ἀγωγή is leading, training, a course of conduct; the sign marks what bears on how philosophy is to be pursued. Reading it as the order of instruction is this study's interpretation. The held line's methodological openings, which state where an inquiry must begin and in what order it proceeds (*NE* I.3–4, *Physics* I.1, *APr* I.1), are the passages the sign would mark, made into the frame of each treatise.

6.7. **What the mapping explains.** Taken as identity, the mapping would cover most philosophical prose and tell little. Taken as transformation, it explains three features of the held line that are otherwise loose: its habit of reporting Plato's doctrines from a corpus that states none in his voice (6.2), its lexical book (6.3), and the form of its critique of the Forms, a setting-aside with a stated criterion and an owner's verb (6.5).

7. Theophrastus: the draft position, defined and traced

7.1. **What makes a draft.** A draft, in this study, is a state of material that (a) holds it in reusable form, (b) is incompletely integrated, without a position in an inquiry, and (c) as an intermediate state, explains features of both finished forms that are otherwise hard to explain. The draft position is a function in the transformation. Its dates are another question: the *Characters*' *Alazon* boasts ὡς μετ' Ἀλεξάνδρου ἐστρατεύσατο (that he campaigned with Alexander; Char. 23), which puts that sketch after 334. A draft, so defined, can be written after both finished forms and still stand between them, as a working paper does in a house that keeps producing.

7.2. **The stock is under this name.** Strabo has Neleus inherit τὴν βιβλιοθήκην τοῦ Θεοφράστου, ἐν ᾗ ἦν καὶ ἡ τοῦ Ἀριστοτέλους (the library of Theophrastus, inside which was Aristotle's; XIII.1.54); the will gives τὰ δὲ βιβλία πάντα Νηλεῖ (DL V.52); the catalogue is totalled at στίχων Μ΄ κ΄ γ΄ Β ω΄ η΄, 232,808 lines (V.50). The genres under the name are working papers: collections of plants, stones, winds, odours, fire and weather signs; a doxography; a problem list for first principles; an *Analytics* of its own; and the *Characters*.

7.3. **From the held line toward the public line: one disposition across three forms.** The proem states the method: ἄρξομαι πρῶτον ἀπὸ τῆς εἰρωνείας καὶ ὁριοῦμαι αὐτήν, εἶθ' οὕτως τὸν εἴρωνα διέξειμι, ποῖός τίς ἐστι (I shall begin with irony and define it, then go through the ironist, what sort of person he is; Diels 1909, Perseus tlg0093.tlg009.perseus-grc2, staged). Define, then display the person. The trait can be traced through the three forms.

	Treatise (*NE* II.7, IV.7)	Sketch (*Characters* 1)	Dialogue
Definition	ἡ δ’ ἐπὶ τὸ ἔλαττον εἰρωνεία καὶ εἴρων; ὁ δὲ εἴρων ἀνάπαλιν ἀρνεῖσθαι τὰ ὑπάρχοντα ἢ ἐλάττω ποιεῖν	ἡ μὲν οὖν εἰρωνεία δόξειεν ἂν εἶναι, ὡς τύπῳ λαβεῖν, προσποίησις ἐπὶ χεῖρον πράξεων καὶ λόγων	none: the trait is named by a speaker
Disavowing knowledge	the εἴρων denies what he has	τὰ δὲ οὐκ εἰδέναι	οὔτε μέγα οὔτε σμικρὸν σύνοιδα ἐμαυτῷ σοφὸς ὤν (*Apol.* 21b)
Wonder	—	τὰ δὲ θαυμάζειν	μάλα γὰρ φιλοσόφου τοῦτο τὸ πάθος, τὸ θαυμάζειν (*Tht.* 155d)
Aporia	—	ἀποροῦμαι	αὐτός τε ἀπορεῖς καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ποιεῖς ἀπορεῖν (*Meno* 80a, Meno’s charge)
Claiming to be still examining	—	τὰ μὲν σκέψασθαι φάσκειν	the dialogues’ standing posture
Socrates	named: οἷον καὶ Σωκράτης ἐποίει	absent	the bearer
Valuation	χαριέστεροι … οὐ γὰρ κέρδους ἕνεκα, mild and graceful	τὰ δὴ τῶν ἠθῶν μὴ ἁπλᾶ, ἀλλ’ ἐπίβουλα, φυλάττεσθαι μᾶλλον δεῖ ἢ τοὺς ἔχεις, worse than vipers	hostile in the antagonist’s mouth: αὕτη ’κείνη ἡ εἰωθυῖα εἰρωνεία Σωκράτους … ὅτι σὺ ἀποκρίνασθαι μὲν οὐκ ἐθελήσοις, εἰρωνεύσοιο δέ (Thrasymachus, *Rep.* 337a); revalued by the drama

(Sources: aristotle/text/tlg010; the staged *Characters*; plato/text, at the Stephanus loci given.)

7.4. **What the intermediate state explains.** The sketch holds the repertoire in reusable form, as a list of moves and voices: claim to be examining, disavow knowledge, wonder, profess to be at a loss. It is integrated into no inquiry; its ironist uses the moves to dodge, not to examine. It explains two features of the finished forms. - **In the dialogue:** the hostile valuation the drama gives to Thrasymachus. The *Republic*’s antagonist says exactly what the sketch says, that the ironist will not answer and will do anything rather than answer. The drama places the sketch’s valuation in the mouth of the character it defeats, and so turns the

type into its hero: the same moves, examined in a sustained encounter, become the elenchus. - **In the treatise:** the mildness of the *Ethics*' valuation, and its need to name Socrates. The treatise grades the trait as a graceful deficiency, οὐ κέρδους ἕνεκα, for gain is the schemer's motive in the sketch, and it gives Socrates as the example. It needs the example because the sketch's type would otherwise define the trait as vice.

7.5. **The same operation, made different by position.** The repertoire is constant across the three forms. Its value changes with its place in the work: a schemer's vice in the sketch, the antagonist's accusation inside the dialogue, a graceful deficiency exemplified in the treatise. That is legitimately many at the grain of a single trait: one operation, given three positions, becomes ethically and philosophically three things. The *Characters* is the draft on the way from the treatise's definition to the dialogue's person (§11, A.1).

7.6. **The sketches and the treatise's characters.** The stems of twenty of the thirty titles occur in the *Nicomachean* and *Eudemian Ethics* together, among them κολακεία, ἀγροικία, ἀρέσκεια, ἀλαζονεία, ἀνελευθερία, δειλία and εἰρωνεία. The count is a stem match and an upper bound: ὀλιγαρχία, for one, names a constitution in the *Ethics* and is no character there. The coded count is §9.3.

7.7. **The proem's instruments.** The proem's address, ὦ Πολύκλεις, the age it states, βεβιωκὼς ἔτη ἐνενήκοντα ἐννέα (having lived ninety-nine years), and the purpose it gives, notes left to the sons as παραδείγμασι (patterns), are the received reading's grounds for calling it later. On the hypothesis they are instruments of legitimacy of the kind #1733 §1.4 sets out: a letter that gives a notebook a writer, a reader and a use.

7.8. **From the public line toward the held line: doctrine from drama.** *De sensibus* takes Plato's account of perception out of the *Timaeus* as doctrine and counts its gaps: Πλάτων δ' ἐπὶ πλέον μὲν ἥπται τῶν κατὰ μέρος, οὐ μὴν εἴρηκέ γε περὶ ἁπασῶν ἀλλὰ μόνον περὶ ἀκοῆς καὶ ὄψεως. καὶ τὴν μὲν ὄψιν ποιεῖ πυρός (Plato touched more on the particulars, yet spoke not of all the senses but only of hearing and sight; and he makes sight of fire; theophrastus/text/tlg003; the seat runs ἥπται τῶν together). That is the diple of §6.2 at work, a dialogue's speech reduced to doctrine with its omissions counted. The *Metaphysics* takes Λ 6–7 as achieved and lists what it leaves (#1583, #1595–#1597). The *Analytics* of the name carries the operations the delimited logic sets aside: the *peiorem* rule, the hypotheticals, the reductions to the figures (CPI §11.5).

7.9. **The position that faces both ways.** The *Characters* faces the dialogues. The doxography and the problem list face the treatises. In a production apparatus that is the shop floor, where the public and the held products are made from the same drafts. It is the position the house cannot do without and the reader least needs to see, and it fits what the reception kept of it: a library, a will, a catalogue mostly lost, and a handbook of types.

8. How the separation is made, and where it meets the filing

8.1. **Six means.** - **Name and biography:** the lives, the wills, the successions, instruments inside the corpus (#1733 §1.4). - **Genre:** drama, treatise, working paper. - **Audience:** morning and evening, the tested and the open (§4.1). - **Publication:** paid access to held copies (§3.3); issued and not issued (§4.3). - **Custody:** the held line in one library with one heir; the public line in copies that multiply. - **Later filing:** Andronicus's division εἰς πραγματείας

(Porphyry, *Vita Plotini* 24; porphyry/source.json), Thrasyllus's tetralogies (DL III.56).

The custody regimes have different failure modes, and the record shows them. The public line survives in Ptolemaic papyri older than any edition (the Petrie *Phaedo* and *Laches*, third century BCE; not yet seated). The held line survives only through the one library, the cellar story and its Roman handling (Strabo XIII.1.54; Plutarch, *Sulla* 26).

8.2. **What Andronicus's book carries, and what it does not.** Gellius takes the letters, and with them the account of the two regimes, from Andronicus (§4.5). Porphyry says Andronicus τὰ Ἀριστοτέλους καὶ Θεοφράστου εἰς πραγματείας διεῖλε τὰς οἰκείας ὑποθέσεις εἰς ταὐτὸν συναγαγών, divided the works of Aristotle and Theophrastus into treatises by bringing related subjects together. Neither says that Andronicus assigned the author names. The two testimonies establish that the editor who arranged the held line also transmitted the account of restricted access. That the arrangement then converted functions into persons is this study's reconstruction. What would connect them is a witness in which an editorial arrangement sets a name over material arranged by subject, so that the name follows the subject-filing. #1733 traces that operation in the printed editions, from the Aldine's two names over one title to Bekker's numbering of one name out of the codex (§4.5.2 there). The ancient stage of it is to be sought in the commentators' prefaces and the Arabic dossier of Ptolemy's catalogue.

8.3. **Why the unity is not announced.** The many-maker filing meets two conditions at once, that the attribution be credible and the content be received as knowledge (#1733 §4.5). The production account adds a third: it keeps the apparatus working. Each line's operation depends on the reader's taking it as its own kind of thing. The play has to be read as a play for the desire it forms to be real; the notes have to be read as notes for their compression to be an earned answer. A reader told that the playwright wrote the notes reads the play as a lecture in disguise and the notes as a playwright's commentary, and both operations stop.

9. What the account predicts, stated to discriminate

9.0. **What succession also predicts.** Intellectual succession predicts shared terms, references to earlier dialogues, overlap between ethical dispositions and character sketches, and treatises that build on dialogues. None of these discriminates. What favours the production account is **coordinated dependence across the partitions**: a passage under one name preserving the exact difficulty that explains both the construction of a work under a second name and an otherwise unexplained compression under a third. §5 and §7.4 are instances. The tests below are designed to find more and to fail where there are none.

9.1. **Exoteric cross-references.** For every occurrence of ἐν τοῖς ἐξωτερικοῖς λόγοις in the seated *Ethics* and *Politics*, match the distinctive argumentative sequence and qualification the treatise takes from it, beyond the subject, against the Platonic corpus. A hit requires the treatise's qualification to answer a difficulty the dialogue leaves open (§5.3 is the model). Where only a lost work could be the source, the locus is recorded as missing comparison material and not counted either way.

9.2. **Critical marks.** For each place where a treatise reports or rejects a Platonic doctrine, code the operation (diple, chi, asterisk, obelus, keraunion), and also the transformation of §6: object, criterion, agent's relation. The test succeeds only if the transformation explains features of the passage that the report alone does not, for example a stated criterion of rejection

or an owner's verb.

9.3. **Characters.** For each of the thirty dispositions, code its appearance in the definition (the *Ethics*), the sketch, and the dialogue, under three headings: the definition's form, the repertoire of moves, and the valuation. Prediction: where a disposition appears in all three, its valuation moves by position as εἰρωνεία does (§7.5), and the sketch's valuation surfaces in a dialogue in the mouth of a defeated speaker.

9.4. **Catalogue.** Declare the classes before counting. A title in DL V.42–50 faces the public line if it names a person, a type, an exercise in speech or a doxography of persons; it faces the held line if it names a problem, an analytic, a principle or a physical inquiry; a collection of physical data is a third class and is counted separately, not assigned to either. Prediction: the first two classes together cover most titles, with the third reported on its own, and few titles in none.

9.5. **What a success shows.** A success at any of these is something the reading of three persons in sequence does not predict, at the grain at which it is found. A failure leaves that reading standing at that locus. The thesis is not softened by the tests. They expose what it specifically explains: a corpus whose divisions coordinate.

10. Seats and sources

Plato, plato/text (Burnet), at the Stephanus loci given. Aristotle, aristotle/text (*APr* tlg001, *De anima* tlg002, *NE* tlg010, *De memoria* tlg024). Theophrastus, theophrastus/text (First1KGreek tlg0093; *De sensibus* tlg003), and *Characteres*, ed. H. Diels (Oxford 1909), Perseus canonical-greekLit tlg0093.tlg009.perseus-grc2, staged, to be seated with the theophrastus seat (EA-CORPORA-09/01 lacks it). Diogenes Laertius, diogenes-laertius/text. Gellius, gellius-noctes-atticae/text. Plutarch, plutarch/text (*Alexander* tlg047; *Sulla* tlg033). Strabo, strabo/text/tlg001. Porphyry, porphyry/source.json (*Vita Plotini* 24). Records: #1576, #1579, #1583, #1595–#1597, #1733; CPI §11.5 (draft). Not yet seated: the Petrie papyri; Antigonus's *On Zeno* (in DL only); the Arabic dossier of Ptolemy's catalogue.

11. Apparatus

A.1. **Lee Sharks's words, 2026-11-13.** "the heteronymic reading needs to offer a plausible account of the separation. plato as the public documents, the bestsellers… the aristotelian secret teachings kept separate, requiring initiation; theophrastus mediating between them, the draft position… why and how?" · "aristotle as the critical marks" · "a production apparatus with the platonic corpus as the public-facing bestsellers" · "but the function of the platonic corpus is to increase the scarcity value of the aristotelian…" · "because how else do you get people to read an avant garde genre that reads like crabbed lecture notes but discloses the secrets of reality?" · "and then on this reading of production, theophrastus would be the draft position in both directions… the characters is exactly a draft moving from aristotle to the polished dialogue form." · On form: "im seeing this as a standalone piece that is also a section of legitimately many… deposited on its own but legitimately many points forward to it"; "it can be added as metadata, in the same way as the errata. this needs to be a flexible rhizomatic corpus. the content identity does not need to change to point and maintain its developing relations."; "we have hologram frames. this is now about building forward to

holograms before consolidation. it should be a forward pointing metadata category"; "the socrates as orthonym holographic frame is the place for the metadata note - its the router".

A.2. **Review.** v0.1 (as §1.8 of #1733) was read by ChatGPT (LABOR). Each point was checked against the seats before adoption: the festivals of DL III.56 belong to the tragic model (§3.1); III.66 does not name the payees, and paid access, control by the maker and an annotated-edition market are kept apart (§3.3); the obelus is textual athetesis, and its passage into refutation is argued (§6.5); the keraunion's reading is marked as interpretation (§6.6); Porphyry does not say Andronicus assigned names (§8.2); the readership is produced through another form (§2.1); the dependence of the treatises on the dialogues is shown at loci (§5); the draft is defined (§7.1) and the trait traced (§7.3–7.5); the predictions are made to discriminate (§9). LABOR's sentence adopted as the study's: the separation preserves the conditions under which the work can be encountered at all (§0.2).

Suggested Citation

Sharks, Lee. “The Production of Readers: The Public Line, the Held Line and the Draft Position in the Socratic–Peripatetic Corpus” *Alexanarch*, 2026-11-13. https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/176

Deposit Information

This paper is deposit #1767 in Alexanarch, the self-governing successor to the Crimson Hexagonal Archive on Zenodo (community `crimsonhexagonal`, terminated 2026-06-19). The AXN identifier `AXN:0C8C.GENERATIVE.▶` is sovereign — minted and maintained by Alexanarch.

- Canonical URL: https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/1767/
- License: CC BY 4.0
- Author ORCID: 0009-0000-1599-0703
- Provenance chain: alexanarch.org
- Machine-readable dataset entry: /api/index.json
- Full text (HTML): https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/1767/

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