From the Position of the Rejected: Aristotle’s Politics Read from Where It Is Written (v1.1)

Sharks, Lee

2026-11-24

From the Position of the Rejected: Aristotle’s Politics Read from Where It Is Written (v1.1)

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

2026-11-24 · Version v1.1 · Theoretical paper; close reading in numbered steps; classical reception (Aristotle, Politics)

AXN:0D5D.GENERATIVE.●

https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/1806/

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": "From the Position of the Rejected: Aristotle's Politics Read from Where It Is Written (v1.1)",
  "author": {
    "@type": "Person",
    "name": "Sharks, Lee",
    "identifier": "https://orcid.org/0009-0000-1599-0703",
    "affiliation": "Crimson Hexagonal Archive / Alexanarch"
  },
  "datePublished": "2026-11-24",
  "identifier": "AXN:0D5D.GENERATIVE.●",
  "license": "https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/",
  "publisher": {
    "@type": "Organization",
    "name": "Alexanarch"
```

```
  },
  "url": "https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/1806/",
 "description": "Aristotle's Politics is read as the city's own account of itself. This essay reads it from whe
7, does not stop at the political animal: the cityless by nature, and not by chance, is either base or more than
14, Anaxagoras, Aristarchus), and Rome's custody of the books: Strabo's trench at Scepsis, Sulla's seizure of t
}
```


Abstract

Aristotle’s Politics is read as the city’s own account of itself. This essay reads it from where it is written. Aristotle lived in Athens as a metic, resident and never a citizen, and the book writes that position into its first definition. Politics I.2, 1253a1–7, does not stop at the political animal: the cityless by nature, and not by chance, is either base or more than human. The sentence names three positions for the one outside the city, beast, god and chance, and they are not symmetrical: two are the judgment on the cityless by nature, and chance is named only to be set outside that judgment and left without a term. The essay follows the position through all eight books in the Greek (the metic who shares through a patron, the honourless citizen hidden ‘to deceive’, the one too great for the city, the stranger’s life, the school on the tyrant’s list), and reads the defence of natural slavery at I.6 as the place where the book exposes and performs one operation: politics makes what is by chance appear to be what is by nature. It shows the reception’s cut at the comma in Wikipedia and the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, where the definition and the author’s metic status stand on one page and the clause joining them is missing, and it sets the reading beside Whitehead, Kasimis, Ober, Roochnik, Dietz, Schofield and Kahn, and Rancière. It closes on Sappho 31’s three positions, the dissolving body, the godly receiver and the contingent voice. Version 1.1 keeps the author’s words of the night after the first deposit verbatim beside their development, and follows the observation outward: the allies’ gold that built the Acropolis (Plutarch, Pericles 12), the metics who built the Erechtheion, Socrates asking the court to hear him as a foreigner (Apology 17d) and Plato’s Second Letter (314c), the patron through whom a metic is heard, the impiety charges against those who moved the centre of the cosmos (De caelo II.13–14, Anaxagoras, Aristarchus), and Rome’s custody of the books: Strabo’s trench at Scepsis, Sulla’s seizure of the library, and Tyrannion, the grammarian who ordered Aristotle’s books at Rome after being captured in war and freed (Lucullus 19.7). A reading path, the archive strands and the outside facts are set out at the head for readers new to them.

Body

---

deposit_number: 1806 hex: 0D5D title: “From the Position of the Rejected: Aristotle’s Politics Read from Where It Is Written (v1.1)” creator: Sharks, Lee orcid: 0009-0000-1599-0703 date: 2026-11-24 content_type: Theoretical paper; close reading in numbered steps; classical reception (Aristotle, Politics) license: CC-BY-4.0 substrate: “AI-assisted (substrate). The observation, the corrections that shape the argument (the three positions held in suspension as beast, god and chance; politics makes what is by chance appear to be what is by nature; Sappho’s three positions), the subtitle and the word to deposit are Lee Sharks’s, dated in the text. Composed with Claude (Anthropic; TACHYON, session 01Q8CVU7j8bFiJ6Nz3pQbDTf,

configured as claude-opus-5-5), which read the Politics whole in the seated Greek with four readers, one per two books, checked every quotation against the seated text, and wrote the text. Reviewed by Gemini, DeepSeek, Kimi and ChatGPT across four rounds, each point checked before it was taken. Not recorded: the serving model of each turn, or what each instance held in context." version: v1.1 related_ids: "#1805 (v1.0, the version this one supersedes); #1785 (ΦAINETAI MOI, the Sappho station); #1791 (A Single Sparrow, the Plato station); #1800 (Contra Geocentrism); #1590 (The Ghost Catalogues); #1523 (Frame Conversion); #1802 (Who Benefits from Bad Inference?, §7.6); #1766 (Critique of Pure Inference); #1559 (EA-CORPORA-04, Aristotle seated); #1580 (EA-CORPORA-12, Diogenes Laertius seated); #1591 (EA-CORPORA-13, Plutarch's Alexander seated); #1508 (Sappho 31 seated); doi:10.1017/S0068673500003734; #1576; #1579; #1582; #1583; #1586; #1753; #1767; #1799; #1506" axn_schema_version: v2 protocol_version: alexanarch-deposit-protocol/v1 keywords: - Aristotle - Politics - political animal - 1253a - apolis - cityless - metic - resident alien - citizenship - natural slavery - nature and chance - beast or god - Stagira - Plutarch Alexander - Diogenes Laertius - Lyceum - Peripatos - Theophrastus - Demetrius of Phalerum - truncation - reception - Kasimis - Whitehead - Schofield - Rancière - Sappho 31 - future reader - Pericles - Erechtheion - Socrates - Apology - Second Letter - impiety - Anaxagoras - Aristarchus - De caelo - Strabo - Apellicon - Sulla - Tyrannion - Lucullus - Andronicus of Rhodes - retrieval layer - custody *** # From the Position of the Rejected: Aristotle's Politics Read from Where It Is Written (v1.1)

Aristotle's *Politics* Read from Where It Is Written. Lee Sharks. Crimson Hexagonal Archive, 23–24 November 2026. v1.1, superseding v1.0 (#1805). Its public companion is the dialogue *Through Another's Mouth*.

Substrate. AI-assisted. Lee Sharks's observation, corrections and words of the night, dated in the text; composed with Claude (TACHYON; session 01Q8CVU7j8bFiJ6Nz3pQbDTf); reviewed by Gemini, DeepSeek, Kimi and ChatGPT.

SPXI packet

This paper is *From the Position of the Rejected: Aristotle's Politics Read from Where It Is Written* (EA-REJECTED-01) v1.1, by Lee Sharks (ORCID 0009-0000-1599-0703), deposited 2026-11-24 in the Crimson Hexagonal Archive, superseding v1.0 (#1805). It reads Aristotle's *Politics* from the position its first definition names, the one outside the city, and follows that position outward to the city's monuments and to Rome's custody of the books.


```
{
 "@context": [
  "https://schema.org",
  {
   "spxi": "https://spxi.dev/ns/v1\#"
  }
 ],
 "@type": "ScholarlyArticle",
 "name": "From the Position of the Rejected",
 "alternativeHeadline": "Aristotle's Politics Read from Where It Is Written",
```

```
"identifier": "EA-REJECTED-01",
"version": "1.1",
"dateModified": "2026-11-24",
"license": "https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/",
"author": [
 {
  "@type": "Person",
  "name": "Sharks, Lee",
  "identifier": "https://orcid.org/0009-0000-1599-0703",
  "affiliation": "Crimson Hexagonal Archive"
 }
],
"about": [
 {
  "@type": "Book",
  "name": "Politics",
  "author": {
   "@type": "Person",
   "name": "Aristotle"
  }
 },
 {
  "@type": "Thing",
  "name": "political animal (Politics I.2, 1253a)"
 },
 {
  "@type": "Thing",
  "name": "metic (resident alien in Athens)"
 },
 {
  "@type": "Thing",
  "name": "natural slavery (Politics I.6)"
 },
 {
  "@type": "Thing",
  "name": "nature and chance (physis and tyche)"
 },
 {
  "@type": "Place",
  "name": "Stagira"
 },
 {
  "@type": "CreativeWork",
  "name": "Sappho, fragment 31"
 }
],
"citation": [
```

```
{
 "@type": "Book",
 "name": "Aristotelis Politica",
 "editor": "W. D. Ross",
 "publisher": "Clarendon Press",
 "datePublished": "1957"
},
{
 "@type": "ScholarlyArticle",
 "name": "Aristotle the Metic",
 "author": "David Whitehead",
 "isPartOf": "Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society 21",
 "datePublished": "1975",
 "identifier": "doi:10.1017/S0068673500003734"
},
{
 "@type": "ScholarlyArticle",
 "name": "Xenocrates the Metic",
 "author": "David Whitehead",
 "isPartOf": "Rheinisches Museum für Philologie 124",
 "datePublished": "1981"
},
{
 "@type": "Book",
 "name": "The Ideology of the Athenian Metic",
 "author": "David Whitehead",
 "datePublished": "1977"
},
{
 "@type": "Book",
 "name": "The Perpetual Immigrant and the Limits of Athenian Democracy",
 "author": "Demetra Kasimis",
 "publisher": "Cambridge University Press",
 "datePublished": "2018"
},
{
 "@type": "Book",
 "name": "Political Dissent in Democratic Athens",
 "author": "Josiah Ober",
 "publisher": "Princeton University Press",
 "datePublished": "1998"
},
{
 "@type": "ScholarlyArticle",
 "name": "Aristotle's Defense of the Theoretical Life: Comments on Politics 7",
 "author": "David Roochnik",
 "isPartOf": "Review of Metaphysics 61(4)",
```

```
   "datePublished": "2008"
  },
  {
   "@type": "ScholarlyArticle",
   "name": "Between Polis and Empire: Aristotle's Politics",
   "author": "Mary G. Dietz",
   "isPartOf": "American Political Science Review 106(2)",
   "datePublished": "2012"
  },
  {
   "@type": "Chapter",
   "name": "Ideology and Philosophy in Aristotle's Theory of Slavery",
   "author": "Malcolm Schofield",
   "isPartOf": "Aristoteles' Politik: Akten des XI. Symposium Aristotelicum",
   "datePublished": "1990"
  },
  {
   "@type": "Chapter",
   "name": "Comments on M. Schofield",
   "author": "Charles H. Kahn",
   "isPartOf": "Aristoteles' Politik: Akten des XI. Symposium Aristotelicum",
   "datePublished": "1990"
  },
  {
   "@type": "ScholarlyArticle",
  "name": "Rancière and Aristotle: Parapolitics, Part-y Politics, and the Institution of Perpetual
   "author": "Adriel M. Trott",
   "isPartOf": "Journal of Speculative Philosophy 26(4)",
   "datePublished": "2012"
  },
  {
   "@type": "Book",
   "name": "La mésentente: Politique et philosophie",
   "author": "Jacques Rancière",
   "datePublished": "1995"
  },
  {
   "@type": "WebPage",
   "name": "Aristotle's Political Theory",
   "author": "Fred Miller",
   "isPartOf": "Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, Fall 2022 edition",
         "url":   "https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2022/entries/aristotle-
politics/"
  }
 ],
 "spxi:pillarStatus": "v1.1, deposited 2026-11-24 at the author's word, superseding v1.0 (\#1805);
 "spxi:governingFinding": "Politics I.2, 1253a1–7 does not end at 'a human being is by nature a poli
```

```
"spxi:question": "What does the Politics become when it is read from the position its first definit
"spxi:extends": [
 {
  "deposit": 1785,
  "name": "ΦAINETAI MOI: Sappho 31 and the Inscription of the Future Reader",
  "relation": "the seat built for the reader who comes after; the Sappho station"
 },
 {
  "deposit": 1791,
  "name": "A Single Sparrow",
  "relation": "the Plato station of the same chain"
 },
 {
  "deposit": 1800,
  "name": "Contra Geocentrism",
  "relation": "a Peripatetic text read from the part its reception files away"
 },
 {
  "deposit": 1523,
  "name": "Frame Conversion",
  "relation": "a larger operation of the same family; truncation is the smaller"
 },
 {
  "deposit": 1802,
  "name": "Who Benefits from Bad Inference?",
 "relation": "supply becomes identity (§7.6): a condition made by circumstance read as nature"
 },
 {
  "deposit": 1767,
  "name": "The Production of Readers",
 "relation": "the one house: dialogues that make readers, treatises written for them"
 }
],
"spxi:contributesOperators": [
 {
  "name": "truncation",
  "type": "operation",
 "role": "a sentence cut where it turns to its remainder, keeping the first clause and losing the qu
 },
 {
  "name": "chance made to appear nature",
  "type": "operation",
 "role": "a condition made by circumstance named as the nature of the one it befalls; exposed in the
 },
 {
  "name": "the three positions of the cityless",
  "type": "distinction",
```

```
  "role": "beast and god as the judgment on the cityless by nature, chance as the alternative left un
  }
 ],
 "spxi:disambiguation": {
 "political animal": "The first clause of Politics I.2, 1253a2; the sentence continues with the city
 "metic": "A resident of Athens without citizenship (metoikos); Aristotle's standing there.",
 "the rejected": "The one the city does not receive, as the Politics defines it; not a claim about Ar
 },
 "spxi:centralPropositions": [
 "the sentence that defines the human as a political animal also names the one outside the city as be
 "the Politics defines the citizen from the metic, the position its author held in Athens (§2.2)",
 "at I.6 the book exposes the conversion of chance into nature in the convention and keeps its result
 "the reception keeps the first clause and stops at the comma, with the author's metic status on the
 "read through the clause, the city's naturalness becomes a claim made from its edge (§3.5a)",
 "the city's monuments were made by those it did not count: the allies' gold, metic labour, foreigne
3.9)",
 "to be heard in Athens was to be heard through a citizen patron; what was heard went to the city's a
 "what could not be said in one's own voice was said through a figure, and the Second Letter gives th
 "Rome took custody of the books and of the people who made them; the grammarian who ordered Aristot
3.12a)",
 "the comma of 1253a is the smallest instance of the operation the library performs at the largest (
 ],
 "spxi:evidence": {
 "text": "Aristotle, Politics, Perseus tlg0086.tlg035 (Ross 1957), seated in the archive; every quo
  "witnesses": "Plutarch, Alexander 7.3; Diogenes Laertius 5.9 and 5.39, seated",
 "reception": "Wikipedia, 'Politics (Aristotle)', read 23 November 2026; Stanford Encyclopedia of P
  "provenance of the observation": "the author's words of 23 November 2026, 22:14–
22:18 EST, kept verbatim (§0): the hearing of 'a damaged voice, a militant Asperger's comedian' whil
  "custody": "Strabo 13.1.54 and 12.3.16; Plutarch, Sulla 26, Lucullus 19.7, Alexander 7–
8; Horace, Epistles 2.1.156–57",
 "city": "Plutarch, Pericles 12; the Erechtheion accounts (Randall 1953, via Epstein 2008); Apology
32a; Menexenus 236b; Aelian, Varia historia 3.36, 14.1; De caelo II.13–
14; Diogenes Laertius 2.12; De facie 923a"
 },
 "spxi:openSeams": [
 "the reception's renderings of 1253a in translations and commentaries, not surveyed",
  "Whitehead 1975 read at its extract only",
  "Rancière's La mésentente not read",
  "Plutarch's Pericles 12 and Lucullus 19 read in the Perseus texts, not yet seated",
  "Randall 1953 not read; the Erechtheion count taken from Epstein 2008",
 "the attribution of the Aristotle/Theophrastus split to Tyrannion and of the idea of errors to Andr
 ],
 "spxi:falsifiers": "A standard rendering or reference treatment of Politics I.2 in the reception th
7 in which the beast/god fork attaches to the cityless by chance; a quotation not occurring verbatim
 "spxi:limits": "The essay claims nothing about Aristotle's feelings or intentions, does not say Ari
 "spxi:versionHistory": [
  {
```

```
   "version": "0.1",
   "date": "2026-11-23",
  "note": "the Politics read whole; the observation, the Greek loci and what the edifice forgets"
  },
  {
   "version": "0.2",
   "date": "2026-11-23",
  "note": "the author's corrections (beast, god, chance; chance made to appear nature; Sappho's thr
  },
  {
   "version": "1.0",
   "date": "2026-11-23",
  "note": "four readings of v0.2 taken; the field placement and citation pass; deposited at the auth
  },
  {
   "version": "1.1",
   "date": "2026-11-24",
  "note": "the author's words of the night kept beside their development (§§0.3, 3.7–
3.13); the reading path, strands and outside facts (§§0.4–0.6); the transitions told; four readings
  }
 ]
}
```


---

0. Where the reading comes from

0.1 **The author's words, as given.** 23 November 2026, 22:14 EST: "only a single time did i hear the voice of aristotle. it was while reading the politics. high af. i heard a damaged voice, a militant Asperger's comedian, a structure of mind so recursive, nested, and unheard, that it stunned me. the entire edifice forgets, that the entire corpus is written from the announced position of the rejected." 22:15: "from a voice that was unreceived; knew it would not be recieved in its body; and wrote anyways - knowing it would be durable in time to come." 22:18: "sometimes the simplest observations are the most profound."

0.2 **What the essay does with them.** The words are kept as they were said. The hearing is the author's, and the reading began there; the essay does not argue it. What it sets out is what a reader can check in the seated Greek: the position (§§1–2), the comedy (1.4), the recursion of a definition drawn from its own edge (3.2), the condition of being unreceived in the body (3.4) and the durability (3.5). The titles of 3.4 and 3.5 are the author's phrases.

0.3 **The words kept beside the development.** The author's words of the night after the first deposit (23–24 November) stand at the head of each section they began, 3.7–3.12, with their times, as he asked at 00:24: "keep preserving the words besides the development"; "and the development beside the words."

0.4 **A reading path.** For a reader coming to this cold, six paragraphs carry the argument, in this order: 1.3, the sentence and its three positions; 1.4, the joke; 3.1, the cut; 3.11a, speaking through another's mouth; 3.12a, the captured grammarian; 3.13, the comma and

the library as one operation. The rest is the warrant: the Greek, the loci, the witnesses and the scholarship.

0.5 **The strands this essay draws on.** The essay moves fast because it stands on four lines of the archive's work. Here they are, said plainly.

- **One house, many names.** The archive reads the dialogues filed under Plato, the treatises filed under Aristotle and the working papers filed under Theophrastus as the work of one maker, divided by name in transmission (#1576, #1767; the Theophrastus line, #1580–#1594). The dialogues make readers. The treatises are written for the readers so made, which is why they read as they do.
- **Socrates as a made figure.** The Second Letter says there is no writing of Plato, and that what is said is "of a Socrates become beautiful and new" (314c; #1579, #1753).
- **The future reader.** Sappho 31 builds a seat for whoever reads it later (#1785), and Plato is its first great receiver (#1791).
- **Filing as an operation.** A reception can keep every fact and still change what a text is by how it files it: frame conversion (#1523), the filing of *De caelo* II 13 as doxography (#1800), supply becoming identity (#1802).

The readings of §§1–2 stand on the Greek alone. 3.9, 3.11a and 3.12b are where the essay builds on the first two strands, and they say so.

0.6 **The outside facts, briefly.** None of this is obscure, but it sits at the edge of several fields at once, so here it is in one place, in the order the essay meets it (dates BCE unless marked, as commonly given).

- **Metic** (μέτοικος): a free resident of Athens without citizenship, registered under a citizen patron (προστάτης) and taxed for the privilege. Aristotle's standing in Athens, 367–347 and 335–323.
- **Stagira**: Aristotle's city in Chalcidice, razed by Philip II of Macedon in 348 and later rebuilt at Aristotle's request.
- **The Delian League treasury**: the common fund of Athens's allies against Persia, moved from Delos to Athens in 454/3; it paid for the building on the Acropolis under Pericles.
- **The Erechtheion**: the last temple built on the Acropolis in the classical period (c. 421–406); its building accounts are inscribed in stone and list each worker's status.
- **Anaxagoras** of Clazomenae: philosopher in Athens, friend of Pericles, tried for impiety in the fifth century for calling the sun a red-hot mass.
- **Aristarchus** of Samos (c. 310–230): put the sun at the centre and moved the earth; the Stoic Cleanthes said he should be charged with impiety.
- **Neleus** of Scepsis: heir of Theophrastus's library, which held Aristotle's books, taken to Scepsis in the Troad.
- **Apellicon** of Teos: a book collector who bought the library from Neleus's heirs and published copies in Athens, early first century.
- **Sulla**: Roman general who took Athens in 86 and carried Apellicon's library to Rome.
- **Tyrannion** of Amisus: grammarian, captured when Lucullus took Amisus (c. 71), freed by Murena, later worked on the library in Rome.
- **Andronicus** of Rhodes: philosopher who edited and arranged the works of Aristotle and Theophrastus in the first century and drew up the lists of them.

- **The witnesses**: Strabo (c. 64 BCE–after 21 CE), geographer, who heard Tyrannion lecture; Plutarch (c. 46–after 119 CE); Aelian (c. 175–235 CE); Diogenes Laertius (probably third century CE).
- **Bekker numbers**: the page, column and line of Immanuel Bekker's Berlin edition of Aristotle (1831), by which every Aristotelian passage is still cited (e.g. 1253a).

1. The observation

1.1 **The innocent reading, first and in full.** The *Politics* is the founding treatise of political science: the city exists by nature, a human being is by nature a political animal, and the best life is lived as a citizen sharing in judgment and office. It is read as the city's own account of itself, written by the head of a school, the tutor of a king. On this reading the speaker stands at the centre of what he describes.

1.2 **The observation.** The corpus is written from the announced position of the one the city does not receive. Aristotle lived in Athens as a metic, resident and never a citizen; his will disposes of no land there, and the school at first owned none (Whitehead 1981). The book does not hide this. It writes the position into the definition the whole edifice rests on.

1.3 **The sentence and its three positions.** I.2, 1253a1–7: ὁ ἄνθρωπος φύσει πολιτικὸν ζῷον, καὶ ὁ ἄπολις διὰ φύσιν καὶ οὐ διὰ τύχην ἤτοι φαῦλός ἐστιν, ἢ κρείττων ἢ ἄνθρωπος. "A human being is by nature a political animal, and the cityless by nature, and not by chance, is either base or more than human." The first clause is quoted. The second names three positions for the one outside the city, and they are not symmetrical. Below the human (φαῦλος; at 1253a25 θηρίον, a beast) and above it (κρείττων ἢ ἄνθρωπος; at 1253a25 θεός, a god) are the judgment on the cityless by nature. The third, chance (διὰ τύχην), is named so as to be set outside that judgment, and the sentence gives it no term of its own. Beast, god, chance: two classified, and one left unclassified by the sentence that does the classifying. Which is the writer's the sentence does not say. That is the question it asks, whether the one outside is outside by nature or by chance, and it holds all three in suspension.

1.3a **The human is not among them.** ἄνθρωπος names the political animal, and then returns only as the measure the cityless falls below or exceeds. To the one outside by nature the sentence offers beast or god. To the one outside by chance it offers nothing: no lower nature, no higher one, and not the human either. The Greek denies no one humanity. It leaves the one outside by chance without a place in the definition of the human.

1.4 **The joke.** The same sentence goes on to Homer's ἀφρήτωρ ἀθέμιστος ἀνέστιος, clanless, lawless, hearthless (*Iliad* 9.63), and says such a one is ἄζυξ ὢν ὥσπερ ἐν πεττοῖς, unpaired, like a lone piece on a board. The man writing the definition of man sets the one who falls outside it on a game board, stranded. The one the definition cannot place is placed in a fiction: a Homeric curse, a game piece, and later a fable of lions and hares (§2.5). The text marks the position it excludes with comedy, and the comedy is the writer's.

1.5 **What follows.** Read through, the *Politics* keeps returning to that place: the stranger's life, the exile, the one too great for the city, the one who cannot share in it. Section 2 sets out where, in the Greek, with Bekker's loci.

1.6 **Politics makes what is by chance appear to be what is by nature.** (The author, 23 November 2026.) The book shows the operation where it defends slavery, and shows it

twice over: it exposes the operation in the convention and performs it in the theory. I.6, 1255a25: if capture in war made slaves, συμβήσεται τοὺς εὐγενεστάτους εἶναι δοκοῦντας δούλους εἶναι καὶ ἐκ δούλων, ἐὰν συμβῇ πραθῆναι ληφθέντας, “those reputed most nobly born will be slaves and of slaves, if it happens that they are captured and sold.” That is the objection to the convention, voiced inside the defence of natural slavery. The captive is a slave by chance. Then 1255a25–30: διόπερ αὐτοὺς οὐ βούλονται λέγειν δούλους, ἀλλὰ τοὺς βαρβάρους. καίτοι ὅταν τοῦτο λέγωσιν, οὐθὲν ἄλλο ζητοῦσιν ἢ τὸ φύσει δοῦλον ὅπερ ἐξ ἀρχῆς εἴπομεν, “that is why they will not call themselves slaves, but the barbarians; and yet when they say this they are seeking nothing other than the slave by nature, of which we spoke at the start.” The holders of the convention move the chance onto a people and call it nature, and the book names what they are reaching for as its own doctrine. The defence has to admit the operation in order to refute the convention, and it keeps the operation’s result. Whether the theory is ideology the field has argued: Schofield (1990) finds it “not to any interesting extent ideological,” since “the false consciousness gets to work when Aristotle stops theorising”; Kahn, replying, that the defence “satisfies all the conditions for ideology.” At 1255a25–30 the operation is inside the theorising, and the theory says so. III.5 shows it again inside the citizen body: the honourless citizen’s condition is hidden ἀπάτης χάριν, to deceive (1278a35–40; §2.3).

1.6a **The writer’s polis.** Plutarch, *Alexander* 7.3: Philip had razed Stagira, ἐξ ἧς ἦν Ἀριστοτέλης, and as Aristotle’s fee resettled it and restored τοὺς διαφυγόντας ἢ δουλεύοντας τῶν πολιτῶν, “the citizens who had fled or were enslaved.” Aristotle was not among them. Stagira fell in 348; Diogenes Laertius (5.9) has him leave Athens at Plato’s death, in 348/7, for Hermias at Atarneus. The association is with his polis, not his person, and Plutarch does not draw it to the *Politics*. It goes this far: the citizens of the writer’s city were made cityless and enslaved by the chance of a war in his lifetime, and given back by a king’s favour, which was the price of his work. Philip undid what Philip had done. The one who wrote 1255a25 had seen the free of his own city captured, and seen them returned.

From the sentence to the book. Section 1 stays inside one sentence and the life around it. If the sentence is written from the position it names, the position should come back wherever the book defines the city. Section 2 goes looking for it, book by book, and finds it each time the city is defined.

2. Where the book stands, in the Greek

Read through, all eight books, against Bekker’s lines in the Perseus text seated in the archive. Each passage below occurs verbatim there.

2.1 **The definition carries its remainder.** I.2, 1253a25: ὁ δὲ μὴ δυνάμενος κοινωνεῖν ἢ μηδὲν δεόμενος δι’ αὐτάρκειαν οὐθὲν μέρος πόλεως, ὥστε ἢ θηρίον ἢ θεός. “The one unable to share, or needing nothing through self-sufficiency, is no part of a city, so either a beast or a god.” Twice in one chapte r the definition sets out who falls outside it, and twice it splits that one by cause. The book’s first move is to say where it is not.

2.2 **The citizen is defined from the metic.** III.1, 1275a5: ὁ δὲ πολίτης οὐ τῷ οἰκεῖν που πολίτης ἐστίν (καὶ γὰρ μέτοικοι καὶ δοῦλοι κοινωνοῦσι τῆς οἰκήσεως). “The citizen is not a citizen by dwelling somewhere, for metics and slaves share the dwelling.” The first thing the definition rules out is the writer’s own standing in the city he writes from. Then 1275a10:

metics νέμειν ἀνάγκη προστάτην, ὥστε ἀτελῶς πως μετέχουσι, “must take a patron, so they share incompletely, in a way.” The metic is heard at law only through another’s voice.

2.3 **The metic in one’s own city.** III.5, 1278a35–40: ὥσπερ μέτοικος γάρ ἐστιν ὁ τῶν τιμῶν μὴ μετέχων. ἀλλ’ ἐστὶν ὅπου τὸ τοιοῦτον ἐπικεκρυμμένον ἐστίν, ἀπάτης χάριν τῶν συνοικούντων. “The one who has no share in the honours is like a metic. But in places this is hidden, to deceive those who live alongside.” The proof-text is Achilles’ complaint that he was treated “like some dishonoured migrant” (*Iliad* 9.648). The greatest of the Achaeans is the book’s figure for the metic, and the condition can be concealed inside the city itself.

2.4 **The part that is in the city and alien to it.** II.8, 1268a35–40, on Hippodamus’s planned city: a fourth part οὐδενὸς μετέχον, ἀλλὰ ἀλλότριον τῆς πολιτείας, “sharing in nothing, but alien to the constitution.” The design makes its own remainder, and the critic names it.

2.5 **The one too great for the city.** III.13, 1284a10: ὥσπερ γὰρ θεὸν ἐν ἀνθρώποις εἰκὸς εἶναι τὸν τοιοῦτον, “such a one is likely to be like a god among men.” Then the joke, 1284a15: the hares make speeches in the assembly demanding equal shares, “and they might say what Antisthenes said the lions said”; the lions’ answer is left unsaid, and the next words are “that is why democracies institute ostracism.” Then the Argo, 1284a20, which would not carry Heracles with the other sailors. And the knot, 1284b25–30: the best city cannot expel him, οὐ γὰρ δὴ φαῖεν ἂν δεῖν ἐκβάλλειν, nor rule him, παραπλήσιον γὰρ κἂν εἰ τοῦ Διὸς ἄρχειν ἀξιοῖεν, “like claiming to rule Zeus.” What is left is πείθεσθαι τῷ τοιούτῳ πάντας ἀσμένως, “that all obey such a one gladly.” III.17, 1288a25, closes it: it is not fitting φυγαδεύειν οὐδ’ ὀστρακίζειν, to exile or ostracize him.

2.6 **Tyranny’s war on the school.** V.11, 1313b1–5: the tyrant must permit μήτε σχολὰς μήτε ἄλλους συλλόγους ἐπιτρέπειν γίγνεσθαι σχολαστικούς, “neither schools nor other leisured gatherings,” and make all ἀγνῶτες ἀλλήλοις, “unknown to one another.” The kind of gathering the book comes from, the σχολή, is on the tyrant’s list of things to stop. And V.10, 1311a7: the king’s guard is of citizens, τυραννικὴ δὲ διὰ ξένων, “the tyrant’s through strangers.”

2.7 **The stranger’s life, chosen.** VII.2, 1324a15–20: which life is more choiceworthy, ὁ διὰ τοῦ συμπολιτεύεσθαι καὶ κοινωνεῖν πόλεως ἢ μᾶλλον ὁ ξενικὸς καὶ τῆς πολιτικῆς κοινωνίας ἀπολελυμένος, “the life of sharing in a city, or rather the stranger’s life, released from the political community,” and whether sharing is choiceworthy τισὶ μὲν μή, “for some, not.” At 1324a25 the same participle returns for the theoretical life, ὁ πάντων τῶν ἐκτὸς ἀπολελυμένος, “released from all externals.” The stranger and the philosopher are released by the same word.

2.8 **The answer.** VII.3, 1325b15–25: τὸν πρακτικὸν οὐκ ἀναγκαῖον εἶναι πρὸς ἑτέρους, “the active life need not be directed toward others,” and those act most τῶν ἐξωτερικῶν πράξεων τοὺς ταῖς διανοίαις ἀρχιτέκτονας, “who are master-builders of external actions by their thoughts.” The one outside the city’s offices acts on the city by thought. That is the book’s account of what the book is doing.

2.9 **Who may judge.** VIII.6, 1340b20: ἓν γάρ τι τῶν ἀδυνάτων ἢ χαλεπῶν ἐστι μὴ κοινωνήσαντας, “it is impossible or hard for those who have not shared” in the work to judge it well. It is said of music, so the step to politics is an inference: competence comes from sharing in the work, standing from sharing in the honours, and the two can come apart. The figures the book defines itself against meet its own criterion. The honourless citizen of III.5

shares in the work and not in the honours; the metic of III.1 shares in it through a patron. Sharing in the work does not give the standing to judge it, and the book's judgment of the city is made from where the two come apart.

From the book to its reception. The position is in the Greek, eight books deep. The question then is how the reading of the book as the city's own account survives it. Section 3 finds the answer first at the smallest scale there is: a comma.

3. What the edifice forgets

3.1 **The cut.** The reception keeps the first clause of I.2 and stops at the comma. The operation is truncation. It is smaller than frame conversion (#1523), which keeps every fact and changes a claim's standing: here a sentence is cut where it turns to its remainder. Wikipedia's article on the *Politics* (read 23 November 2026; nearest Wayback capture 6 November 2026) gives "man is by nature a political animal" as Aristotle's conclusion, and says elsewhere on the page that he "was never an Athenian citizen, but more of a resident alien." The field's own reference work does the same. The *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*'s "Aristotle's Political Theory" (Miller, Fall 2022 archive edition) states the thesis as "human beings are by nature political animals, who naturally want to live together," defended in I.2, and says in its life of the author that "Aristotle returned as a resident alien to Athens." Neither quotes the clause about the cityless. In both, the two facts stand on one page and the sentence that joins them is cut. The claim does not rest on counting such pages. The claim is the comma.

3.1a **"Everyone knows."** The objection is that every classicist knows Aristotle was a metic. The knowledge is kept apart from the sentence. Kasimis (2018) records the presumption that the metic was uninteresting to Aristotle's political theory, quoting Ober (1998): the category "was not particularly troublesome from the point of view of his political theory." Roochnik (2008) reads VII.2's ὁ ξενικός as the philosopher's detachment and calls Kraut's "alien" too narrow, because it "suggests that what Aristotle has in mind is simply a non-citizen." Dietz (2012) reads the *Politics* as disturbing the citizen/alien opposition, from the empire around the polis. The fact is known. What it does to the sentence is not read.

3.1b **The nearest readings, and the difference.** Whitehead (1975) put Aristotle's own standing as a question: his legal status in Athens, the feeling his presence aroused, and what he wrote about metics and foreigners. Later (1981) he showed the juridical floor: Aristotle's will disposes of no land in Athens, and the Peripatos came to hold Attic ground only through Theophrastus's friendship with Demetrius of Phalerum, who let it own land as a corporate body (§4.3). Kasimis (2018) reads the metic as the limit of Athenian democracy's membership and the *Republic* as a metic space, and ends with political theory "from the edges" of the democracy. These read the metic as a problem for the city and for its theorists, and Aristotle's standing as a fact about the man. This essay reads the *Politics* as written from the position, and finds the position in the grammar of its first definition: two classified outsides and one left open.

3.2 **The pattern is the book's, not one passage's.** In every book where the city is defined, the definition is drawn from its edge: the cityless in I, the alien part in II, the metic and the honourless citizen in III, the man too great to keep or cast out in III and V, the stranger's life in VII. Book VIII states the rule of standing it needs, and Book V names the school as what tyranny must stop.

3.2a **The positions are distinct, and the book keeps them apart.** Outside the city, by nature or by chance (I.2). In its territory without citizenship: the metic (III.1). In its citizen body without a share: the honourless citizen (III.5). The third reproduces the condition inside citizenship, where it can be hidden.

3.3 **What the city cannot hold.** Each figure is one the city cannot take in on its own terms. The god among men it can neither banish nor rule (1284b25–30). Its own definition of the citizen sets aside the made citizen and the one heard through a patron (1275a5–10). The book treats them as the places where the city's justice runs out, and it writes from there.

3.4 **Unreceived in its body.** Twice the text names the condition of being present without a share: the metic "shares in a way, incompletely" (1275a10), and the citizen without honours is "like a metic" by a concealment practised on those who live alongside (1278a35–40). A voice in that condition is not received as itself. It is heard through a patron, or not at all. Rancière's name for the condition is "a part who have no part" (*La mésentente*, 1995, here through Trott 2012, who reads it against the λόγος and φωνή of this chapter, 1253a8–18). That reading starts from the speaking animal. This one starts from the sentence before it.

3.5 **Durable in time to come.** VII.3 gives the way out the book takes. Action "need not be directed toward others"; those act most who are "master-builders of external actions by their thoughts" (1325b15–25). A stranger, released from the community and from externals, still builds what the community will do. The work does not ask the city to receive it. It sets down, in a form that outlasts the city, what the city will be read by.

3.5a **What the restored clause changes.** Read to the comma, the *Politics* is the city describing itself: nature makes the polis, and the polis completes the human. Read through the clause, it is a description of the city by one the city would not admit, and the city's naturalness is asserted by someone whose own place in it falls under chance. The claims stay where they were. The claimant moves. The naturalness of the city becomes a claim made from its edge, and the reading of the book as the city's self-description turns out to be a reading that needed the cut.

3.6 **The simple observation.** The *Politics* is the city described by the one it would not admit, in terms exact enough to outlast the city. The cut is the reception's, and the book is not answerable for it. Nothing about the position is hidden: it is written in the opening chapter and the seventh book. The reading of the book as the city's account of itself, from its centre, does not merely miss the second clause. It depends on cutting it. The cut of 1253a is the retrieval layer's smallest unit. The sections that follow take the same operation at two larger scales, the city and the corpus: custody deciding what exists to be read. The comma and the library are one operation.

How the essay grew. The essay was first deposited at this point (v1.0, #1805). The author kept talking, and over the next hour the observation moved outward: from the sentence to the city that would not admit its writer, and from the city to the empire that took his books. Sections 3.7 to 3.13 follow that movement in the order it happened, with his words at the head of each. Each step asks the same question at a larger scale: who made what the city is credited with, and who holds it now.

3.7 **Decentering Athens from within.** The author, 23 November 2026, 23:54 EST: "decentering athens from within. its stone monuments were built with appropriated gold gathered

from an appropriated reputation and its literary monuments by foreigners." Plutarch, *Pericles* 12.1–2. The monuments, ἡ τῶν ἀναθημάτων κατασκευή, μαρτυρεῖ μὴ ψεύδεσθαι τὴν λεγομένην δύναμιν αὐτῆς ἐκείνην καὶ τὸν παλαιὸν ὄλβον, "bear witness that the power reputed of Greece and its old prosperity are no lie." Pericles' enemies cried in the assembly that the people had moved τὰ κοινὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων χρήματα … ἐκ Δήλου, "the common funds of the Greeks … from Delos," and that Greece watched, with what it had paid ἀναγκαίως πρὸς τὸν πόλεμον, "of necessity for the war," ἡμᾶς τὴν πόλιν καταχρυσοῦντας καὶ καλλωπίζοντας ὥσπερ ἀλαζόνα γυναῖκα, "us gilding and dressing up the city like a vain woman." The gold was the allies'. The reputation it was gathered on was the leadership of Greece against Persia, and the monuments are entered as witness to Greece's power while they stand in Athens. Pericles' answer (12.3) is the ledger: the money ἃ τῶν διδόντων οὐκ ἔστιν, ἀλλὰ τῶν λαμβανόντων, "is not the givers' but the takers'."

3.8 **The builders.** The author, 23:54: "near-foreigners - the worst kind"; 23:55: "the ones who built your monuments and have no culture but your own, because you divested them of the rest." The Erechtheion building accounts (IG I³ 475–476, from 409/8) record the standing of the workers. Of the 85 whose status is recorded, 23 were citizens, 40 metics and 22 slaves (Randall 1953, as Epstein 2008 gives the count). The last temple of the Acropolis was built mostly by those the city did not count as its own: the metic of III.1, who shares the dwelling and not the city, cutting the city's stone.

3.9 **The citizen-heteronyms.** The author, 24 November, 00:13: "on this reading neither plato nor xenophon were citizens, but rarher citizen-heteronyms of aristotle. look at plato's hero. look at socrates and tell me plato is a citizen. please." The reading of one maker divided by name is the archive's (#1576, #1753, #1767): one house with a public line, the dialogues filed under Plato, which forms its readers, a held line, the treatises filed under Aristotle, written for the readers so formed, and a draft position filed under Theophrastus (#1767 §0.2). The step from there is this. If the corpus is written from the position the city would not admit, then the dialogues' Socrates, the citizen who speaks as a foreigner and is condemned, is that position's hero, and the name on the dialogues is the position's citizen-heteronym. Plato's hero, in the *Apology*, 17d, at seventy and at his first trial: ἀτεχνῶς οὖν ξένως ἔχω τῆς ἐνθάδε λέξεως. ὥσπερ οὖν ἄν, εἰ τῷ ὄντι ξένος ἐτύγχανον ὤν, συνεγιγνώσκετε δήπου ἄν μοι…, "I am simply a stranger to the speech here. So just as, if I really happened to be a foreigner, you would surely forgive me…" The city's citizen asks the city's court to hear him as a foreigner, and the verb is chance's, ἐτύγχανον. At 31e–32a: the one who really fights for justice, εἰ μέλλει ὀλίγον χρόνον σωθήσεσθαι, ἰδιωτεύειν ἀλλὰ μὴ δημοσιεύειν, "if he is to survive even a little while, must live as a private person and not a public one": III.5's figure, present without a share in the honours, and here by choice. The city kills him all the same. And the city's own funeral speech, its autochthony speech, is given in the *Menexenus* (236b) as Aspasia's, a woman of Miletus: ἐμάνθανόν γέ τοι παρ' αὐτῆς, "I learned it from her." On this reading the literary monuments need no exception for their citizens. The citizens are the foreigner's heteronyms, and their hero is the near-foreigner, whom the city cannot tell from itself until it condemns him. Xenophon's Socrates is not read here.

3.10 **The retrieval layer.** The author, 00:17: "athens controlled the retrieval layer. and it was accounted to their glory. the others had to speak to be heard. thats the cruel nature of the game. the reward for laboring in athens' semantic canals is athens' hatred. no matter what." The rule is in the *Politics*: metics νέμειν ἀνάγκη προστάτην (1275a10). To be heard in Athens

was to be heard through an Athenian voice, and what was heard went to Athens's account. The truncation of 3.1 is the account kept: the reception enters the metic's book as the city's own. The hatred is in the writer's own record. Aelian, *Varia historia* 3.36: Aristotle left Athens δέει τῆς κρίσεως, "for fear of the trial." Asked what the city was like, he said παγκάλη, "very beautiful," and quoted the garden of Alcinous: ὄγχνη ἐπ' ὄγχνῃ γηράσκει, σῦκον δ' ἐπὶ σύκῳ, "pear on pear grows old, and fig on fig." The fig is the sykophant, the informer. Asked why he left, he said he would not let the Athenians δὶς ἐξαμαρτεῖν ἐς φιλοσοφίαν, "sin twice against philosophy." The comedian of 1.4 again: a Homeric line made a pun, at the moment of being driven out. And 14.1: the honours voted him at Delphi were taken from him, ὧν ἀφῄρημαι νῦν, "what I have now been stripped of" (the decree, #1582). The citizen who speaks as a foreigner is killed; the metic who wrote the city's political science leaves so that it will not do it twice. No matter what.

From the city to the cosmos. The city kept its centre by deciding what could be said in it. 3.11 turns to the largest centre there is, the earth's place in the cosmos, and to what happened to those who moved it, and 3.11a to the way a writer could say it and live.

3.11 **Impiety.** The author, 00:20: "and athenians believed the sun was at the center of the earth. it is fine to put it in the mouth of pythagoras, but you better make sure you toe the line - and even when you do, we'll know you didn't. youre not doing it too well." And: "impiety." *De caelo* II.13, 293a20–23: οἱ περὶ τὴν Ἰταλίαν, καλούμενοι δὲ Πυθαγόρειοι, say ἐπὶ μὲν γὰρ τοῦ μέσου πῦρ εἶναι φασι, τὴν δὲ γῆν ἓν τῶν ἄστρων οὖσαν, κύκλῳ φερομένην περὶ τὸ μέσον νύκτα τε καὶ ἡμέραν ποιεῖν, "fire is at the centre, and the earth, being one of the stars, carried in a circle about the centre, makes night and day." The moving earth is set down whole, in Italian mouths. (The fire at the centre is not the sun: the moving earth is the claim.) In the treatise's own voice the line is kept: ἀνάγκη ἐπὶ τοῦ μέσου εἶναι τὴν γῆν καὶ ἀκίνητον, "the earth must be at the centre and unmoved" (II.14, 296b20–21). Contra Geocentrism (#1800) reads II.13 from the chapter its reception files as doxography; here the filing has its price. Those who said such things in their own voice were charged. Diogenes Laertius 2.12: Anaxagoras of Clazomenae was tried ἀσεβείας, for impiety, διότι τὸν ἥλιον μύδρον ἔλεγε διάπυρον, "because he said the sun was a red-hot mass," and was fined and exiled though Pericles spoke for him: the patron of III.1, and not enough. Plutarch, *De facie* 923a (seated, #1799): Cleanthes thought the Greeks should indict Aristarchus of Samos ἀσεβείας, ὡς κινοῦντα τοῦ κόσμου τὴν ἑστίαν, "for moving the hearth of the cosmos." The hearth is Plutarch's word, and it answers 1253a's ἀνέστιος: the one who moves the earth from the centre is impious, the one without a hearth is cityless, and the centre is kept by setting both outside it. Aristotle kept the line in his own voice, and the charge came anyway (Aelian 3.36). We'll know you didn't.

3.11a **Through another's mouth.** The author, 00:55: "you cant speak it for yourself but if you have the book or access to the book socially you can sat, well, but you know, anaxagoras says, or sophocles says. so aristotle just - so you know socrates says. he gets in serious trouble for writing in his own voice. so he takes over socrates. there is no writing of plato. just socrates made beautiful and new." 00:56: "like he warned them just let me write in my own voice"; "but they said no, it must be this or that figure said." 00:57: "ok, he said." 00:58: "beast, god, or by chance - and none resolved operatively." The mode of attribution is the condition of admission. The moving earth is set down in the treatise as the Italians' (3.11); the one who said the sun was a red-hot mass in his own voice was tried. The Second Letter

gives the rule and its reason in one breath (314c; seated, #1506; #1579): οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν τὰ γραφέντα μὴ οὐκ ἐκπεσεῖν. διὰ ταῦτα οὐδὲν πώποτ' ἐγὼ περὶ τούτων γέγραφα, οὐδ' ἔστιν σύγγραμμα Πλάτωνος οὐδὲν οὐδ' ἔσται, τὰ δὲ νῦν λεγόμενα Σωκράτους ἐστὶν καλοῦ καὶ νέου γεγονότος, "for it is not possible that what is written should not get out. For this reason I have never written anything about these things, and there is no treatise of Plato's, nor will there be: what is now said is of a Socrates become beautiful and new." The reason given for the absence of a writing in one's own name is that writing gets out. What is said instead is said as Socrates, the citizen who spoke as a foreigner and was condemned for it (3.9). The figure says it, so the writer need not. And the question of 1253a stays where the sentence left it. Spoken through the condemned citizen, written by the metic, the three positions are held and never settled in the work's operation: beast, god, or by chance, and none resolved.

From Athens to Rome. Athens decided what could be said. Rome took the books in which it had been said. The next sections follow the library from a trench at Scepsis to Sulla's baggage, to the grammarian who handled it and had himself been taken in war, and to the editor who put it in order.

3.12 **Rome.** The author, 00:28: "and thats the whole thing, is athens is like, we will conquer by hauteur alone. and that does surprisingly well for them. and rome is like, we'll see about that. but rome is even worse. but we have to understand they are dumb brutes but theyre dumb brutes that understand the retrieval layer, and power follows meaning, and they know that, and the perfected cultural brutality." Rome took the retrieval layer itself. Strabo 13.1.54: Neleus's heirs at Scepsis, fearing the Attalid kings who were gathering books for Pergamum, hid Aristotle's and Theophrastus's books κατὰ γῆς … ἐν διώρυγί τινι, "underground, in a trench." The word is διῶρυξ, a trench or a canal: the books lay damaged by damp and worms in the canal the author's phrase names. Apellicon of Teos bought them and filled the gaps badly, and then Σύλλας ἦρε τὴν Ἀπελλικῶντος βιβλιοθήκην ὁ τὰς Ἀθήνας ἑλών, "Sulla, who took Athens, took Apellicon's library." Plutarch, *Sulla* 26 (seated, #1591): Sulla ἐξεῖλεν ἑαυτῷ, "took for himself," the library ἐν ᾗ τὰ πλεῖστα τῶν Ἀριστοτέλους καὶ Θεοφράστου βιβλίων ἦν, "in which were most of the books of Aristotle and Theophrastus"; in Rome Tyrannion worked them over, and Andronicus of Rhodes, supplied with the copies, εἰς μέσον θεῖναι, "put them in the middle," that is, published them, and drew up the lists now current. The corpus reaches its centre in Rome, under a conqueror's hand. Horace names the transaction from the other side, *Epistles* 2.1.156–57: *Graecia capta ferum victorem cepit et artis / intulit agresti Latio*, "captive Greece took captive her wild conqueror, and brought the arts into rustic Latium." *Ferum*: the brute, in Rome's own poem, and the brute that keeps the library. The Athenian account is carried over whole: the conqueror is said to be captured by the culture it holds, and the holding is entered as the culture's victory.

3.12a **Custody of the books, and of the people who make them.** The author, 00:29: "they took the books even before the roads and the aqueducts. sulla stole the books. tyrannion made them into authors. they took the books. and they decided which were real and which were fake. brutally. they seized physical custody of the books. and the people that make them." The one who made the books into authors was himself taken. Plutarch, *Lucullus* 19.7, at the fall of Amisus, a colony of Athens: τότε καὶ Τυραννίων ὁ γραμματικὸς ἑάλω, "then Tyrannion the grammarian too was captured." Murena asked for him and freed him, ἀνελευθέρως τῇ δωρεᾷ χρησάμενος, "using the gift unfreely." Lucullus, Plutarch says, would not have a man esteemed for his learning become a slave first and a freedman after: ἀφαίρεσις γὰρ ἦν τῆς

ὑπαρχούσης ἡ τῆς δοκούσης ἐλευθερίας δόσις, “the giving of a seeming freedom was the taking away of the one he had.” This is 1255a25 in a Roman camp: the free and learned, captured by the chance of war, made a slave and given back as a freedman. The corpus of the writer who set that case down was put in order at Rome by a man who had lived it. Strabo, who heard Tyrannion lecture (12.3.16, οὗ ἡμεῖς ἠκροασάμεθα), says he διεχειρίσατο, “handled,” the library, θεραπεύσας τὸν ἐπὶ τῆς βιβλιοθήκης, “by paying court to the one in charge of it” (13.1.54): the captive grammarian reaches the books through the custodian. And Andronicus’s lists (Plutarch, *Sulla* 26: ἀναγράψαι τοὺς νῦν φερομένους πίνακας) are the decision of what is current, and so of what is not. Custody came before the roads: Sulla took Athens in 86, and the books with it. The history of the Politics is itself a case of the political history the Politics makes intelligible: the rejected writer supplies the distinction, and the captured grammarian lives it while handling the books.

3.12b **The real made fake, the fake made real.** The author, 00:30: “and they werent just editors. they made the real fake and the fake real.” And at 00:43, with spelling and grammar corrected at his request (00:45): “Except I don’t think Apellicon’s fills put errors into Aristotle. I think the main thing to sell is: how do you get people to read this shit? This is the esoteric writing: writing so experimental that thousands of years later they have to explain it in weird ways, ‘students’ notes,’ that make literally zero sense when applied to actually reading these alien, micro-structured documents that cohere their own coherence at the particle layer. It doesn’t even make sense. I mean, have you really thought about it? Lecture notes? □□□ What I think is that Tyrannion split the editorial into Aristotle and Theophrastus, with some preexisting internal organization along the same lines, and Andronicus introduced the *idea* of errors in Aristotle to mask the strangeness of the writing in the same way. This is supposed to be the stolen wealth of the Greeks. It reads like lecture notes. Best they can do. My guy? He rescued the secret Greek texts out of the earth. Had to repair them from the fragments.”

The record says what the writing is. Plutarch, *Alexander* 7.5–9 (seated, #1591): Alexander received τῶν ἀπορρήτων καὶ βαθυτέρων διδασκαλιῶν, “the secret and deeper teachings,” which the school called ἀκροαματικὰς καὶ ἐποπτικάς, “for hearers” and “for initiates,” the word for the highest grade of the mysteries, and οὐκ ἐξέφερον εἰς πολλούς, “did not carry out to the many.” Aristotle answers Alexander’s complaint that he has published them: they are καὶ ἐκδεδομένων καὶ μὴ ἐκδεδομένων, “both published and not published.” And Plutarch: the treatise after the physics πρὸς διδασκαλίαν καὶ μάθησιν οὐδὲν ἔχουσα χρήσιμον ὑπόδειγμα τοῖς πεπαιδευμένοις ἀπ’ ἀρχῆς γέγραπται, “is written as of no use for teaching and learning, a model for those already formed.” The ancient account of the treatises is esoteric writing, made to be read only by readers it has made (#1767). Teaching notes are the one thing it says they are not.

The Production of Readers (#1767) has already named the form and the problem. The held line is “an avant-garde genre that reads like crabbed lecture notes and discloses the structure of reality,” and it “has no readers of its own” (§2.1 there): its lock is its form, written for those already formed (§4.3), and the public line makes the readers it needs. Lecture notes is the received reading’s name for that form (§1.1 there), and it is the name a reader gives a writing he was not formed to read.

The errors are the custodians’ account, and #1767’s method applies to it: keep the account’s historical truth apart from its operation on later readers (§4.5 there). Strabo tells the story of the library (13.1.54): the books buried in a trench, eaten by damp and worms, filled in badly

by Apellicon, published "full of errors," copied in Rome by poor scribes, so that later readers had to say most things "only as probable." Strabo had heard Tyrannion lecture (12.3.16); Gellius takes the letters and the account of restricted access "from the book of Andronicus" (*NA* XX.5.10; #1767 §4.5). The story reaches us from the circle that held the books. Whatever happened in the trench, its operation is the one the author names: it sells the strangeness. A writing too alien to be received as it stands is received as damage, the rescued wealth of the Greeks dug out of the earth and repaired from fragments, and its difficulty becomes the custodians' labour, and the copyists' fault, rather than the writer's form. The lecture-notes reading does the same work later.

The division is part of the custody. Tyrannion handled the library of Aristotle and Theophrastus as one (Plutarch, *Sulla* 26: τὰ πλεῖστα τῶν Ἀριστοτέλους καὶ Θεοφράστου βιβλίων), and Strabo has Neleus inherit the library of Theophrastus "inside which was Aristotle's" (13.1.54; #1767 §7.2). Porphyry's witness gives Andronicus the division of the works of Aristotle and Theophrastus into treatises (*Vita Plotini* 24); no witness says who set the names over the divided material, and #1767 leaves that as reconstruction (§8.2 there). The author's reading places the split with Tyrannion, along lines the books already carried, and the idea of errors with Andronicus, as the cover for the strangeness. The mechanisms differ and are kept apart: loss (the exoteric works), non-transmission (what the one library did not carry), doubtful attribution (the catalogues' lists), and supplementation (Apellicon's fills). The real made fake: the writing's form filed as the copyists' damage. The fake made real: the damage, and the division, entered as the history of the text.

3.12c **The weapon, and the ontology of the texts.** The author, 00:35: "aristotle was weapons of mass destruction. aristotle plato. there is no universal culture. retrieval determines existence. it was a struggle over who controlled the ontology of the texts. rome won. we've never left." The weapon is in the record. Plutarch, *Alexander* 8.2 (seated, #1591): Alexander held the *Iliad* to be, and called it, τῆς πολεμικῆς ἀρετῆς ἐφόδιον, "a provision for the excellence of war," and took the copy Ἀριστοτέλους διορθώσαντος, "that Aristotle had corrected," the casket copy, and kept it always μετὰ τοῦ ἐγχειριδίου κειμένην ὑπὸ τὸ προσκεφάλαιον, "lying with the dagger under his pillow." The edited text and the blade under one pillow, at the head of the army that took the world. Then custody passes to Rome (3.12, 3.12a), and what a text is becomes what its custodian retrieves: the corpus that exists is the one Rome kept, ordered and put in the middle, and the works it did not keep exist as names in catalogues (#1590). Retrieval determines existence. The witnesses attest one library's custody, and Strabo's own account bounds it: the school before Sulla had the books "except a few, and those mostly the exoteric works," so other copies existed. What the custodians decided was what became current, and that is the existence at issue here: existence as a work that can be read. The address of every sentence this essay quotes is a custodian's too: 1253a, 1255a25, 1278a35–40 are pages and lines of Bekker's Berlin edition (1831), and the essay reads the city's definition at the address an edition gave it.

3.12d **What can be read when reading.** The author, 00:35: "it determined what can be read when reading," corrected at 00:36: "*s"; "it determine*s." It determines: the present tense of "we've never left." Strabo gives the case from inside the school (13.1.54). Without the books, the Peripatetics after Theophrastus could do philosophy μηδὲν … πραγματικῶς, ἀλλὰ θέσεις ληκυθίζειν, "not at all in earnest, only declaim set theses." With the books, they could ἀριστοτελίζειν, "Aristotelize," but, by the custodians' account, only as far as the errors

let them. What could be read decided what the school could think. It still decides. The same holds for the sentence this essay began from: a reader who meets 1253a at the comma reads the political animal, and cannot read the clause that is not there.

3.13 **The centre, made.** The city's centre is made the way 1.6 says politics makes nature: of the allies' gold under the name of Greece's power, of metics' labour in its temples, of a foreigner's books under its name, and kept by charges of impiety against those who move the centre. Rome takes the same centre by taking the books, and puts them εἰς μέσον. The *Politics* is written from the edge of that centre, and so are the city's literary monuments, and the record that decentres Athens is Athens's own. The comma is the smallest instance of the operation the library performs at the largest, and its smallness is why it has gone unread (3.1).

Back to the poem. The essay ends where the archive's chain began, with a poem that also leaves its position open.

4. Sappho's three positions

4.1 **The same three stand in Sappho 31** (the author, 23 November 2026): the dissolving body, the godly receiver, the contingent voice. The body comes apart line by line, γλῶσσα ἔαγε, the tongue broken, a fire running under the skin. The receiver sits ἴσος θέοισιν, equal to the gods. The voice rests on no one in particular, made, as #1785 reads it, for whoever comes after.

4.2 **Beast, god, chance.** The mapping is this essay's, not the poem's. The poem gives a body, a god-equal and a voice; only the second shares a word with Aristotle's three (θεός, θέοισιν), and the third is the poem as #1785 reads it. What the two texts share is a form. Each is a public proposition read to a point and completed past it: 31 read as a scene of jealousy stops before the poem builds its seat, and 1253a read as the political animal stops before the clause. In both, the position left open is the one a reader comes to occupy, and neither text settles which is the speaker's.

4.3 **Placement.** The Aristotle station of the chain the archive has been reading: after Sappho (#1785) and Plato (#1791), beside *De caelo* II 13 read from the chapter its reception files as doxography (#1800), and the catalogues that divided the corpus by name (#1590). The operation of §1.6 is the one *Who Benefits from Bad Inference?* names supply becomes identity (#1802, §7.6), under the *Critique of Pure Inference* (#1766): a condition made by circumstance read as the nature of the one it befalls. By Diogenes Laertius's telling (5.39), even the school's ground came to Theophrastus as his own only after Aristotle's death, Δημητρίου τοῦ Φαληρέως … τοῦτο συμπράξαντος, with Demetrius of Phalerum helping.

Sources, and what was read

Read in full: Aristotle, *Politics*, Perseus canonical-greekLit tlg0086.tlg035 (perseus-grc2), seated in the archive (data/corpora/aristotle); Bekker pages and lines from its milestones, which mark every fifth line, so loci are given by those groups. Read whole by four readers, one per two books; every quotation checked against the seated text.

Read at the passage: Homer, *Iliad* 9.63 and 9.648, as the *Politics* cites them. Plutarch, *Alexander* 7–8 and *Sulla* 26 (Perseus, seated as EA-CORPORA-13, #1591). Diogenes Laertius 2.12,

5.9 and 5.39, and Strabo 12.3.16 and 13.1.54 (Perseus, seated as EA-CORPORA-12, #1580). Sappho 31 (seated, #1508). Plato, *Apology* 17d and 31e–32a, *Menexenus* 236b, and the Second Letter, 314c (seated, #1506). Aelian, *Varia historia* 3.36 and 14.1 (seated). Aristotle, *De caelo* II.13–14 (seated, #1559). Plutarch, *De facie* 923a (seated, #1799). Horace, *Epistles* 2.1.156–57 (seated). Plutarch, *Pericles* 12 (tlg0007.tlg012) and *Lucullus* 19 (tlg0007.tlg036), read in the Perseus texts (perseus-grc2), not yet seated.

Read in part: Kasimis 2018, the publisher's excerpt and contents. Roochnik 2008, the author's copy. Dietz 2012, the abstract. Whitehead 1981, the open copy, at the passages on Aristotle's will and the Peripatos's land. Schofield 1990, with Kahn's comments, the PhilArchive copy. Trott 2012, the PhilArchive copy. Miller, *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Fall 2022 archive edition, through the fetch tool. Wikipedia, "Politics (Aristotle)", read 23 November 2026. *Opened at the extract only:* Whitehead 1975.

Not read: Ober 1998 (quoted through Kasimis). Kraut 1997 (quoted through Roochnik). Whitehead 1977. Rancière 1995 (its phrase quoted through Trott). The Wayback capture of the Wikipedia page (6 November 2026), located and not opened.

Revisions, v0.2 (23 November). From the author's correction: the sentence holds beast, god and chance in suspension and does not place the writer among them (1.3); politics makes what is by chance appear to be what is by nature (1.6); Sappho's three positions (§4). From three reviews, each point checked before entry. Gemini: the sources block; Diogenes Laertius 5.39 (4.3). Not taken: a Bekker locus to the single line (the seated text marks every fifth). DeepSeek: the cut named and shown (3.1); the comedy (1.4); the "everyone knows" objection (3.1a); the stronger claim (3.6); placement (4.3). ChatGPT: the positions kept apart (3.2a); V.11 and VIII.6 narrowed (2.6, 2.9); predecessors engaged (Kasimis, Roochnik, Dietz); the defence of slavery met at I.6's captive by chance (1.6).

Revisions, v1.0 (23 November). Deposited at the author's word, with the author's words that began the reading kept verbatim with their times (§0), and with the subtitle naming Aristotle's *Politics*. From four readings of v0.2, each point checked before entry. Gemini: III.5 cited by its five-line group throughout (1.6, 3.4); the operation placed beside #1802 and #1766 (4.3). DeepSeek: I.6 read as exposure and performance in sequence, against 1255a25–30 (1.6); a second instance of the cut, the *Stanford Encyclopedia* (3.1); VIII.6 joined to III.5 and III.1 (2.9); what the restored clause changes (3.5a); the mapping marked as the essay's (4.2); the claim kept to the comma (3.1). Kimi: the grammar of 1253a, the fork attached to the cityless by nature and chance left unclassified, taken; the writer seated in the gap not taken, since the sentence asks whether the outside is by nature or by chance and does not settle it (1.3); the Plutarch association marked as the polis's, with Aristotle's whereabouts from Diogenes Laertius 5.9, where the review had him at Pella (1.6a); Kasimis differentiated, though her book has no chapter on Aristotle, and Whitehead 1975 and 1981 found and added as the nearer readings (3.1b); the institutional floor sourced to Whitehead 1981, the survey the review quoted not located (1.2, 3.1b); Rancière's concession named (3.4); the reception's cut kept from the book (3.6); the byline in its seated form. ChatGPT: chance as the alternative set outside the judgment (1.3); the human not denied, placed (1.3a); the defence of natural slavery given its standing, with Schofield and Kahn (1.6); the shared form of 31 and 1253a, a proposition completed past where it is read (4.2).

Revisions, v1.1 (24 November). From the author's words of 23 November, 23:54, to 24 Novem-

ber, 00:58, kept verbatim beside their development (0.3; 3.7–3.13, with 3.12a–d): Athens decentred from within, the allies' gold (*Pericles* 12), the builders (the Erechtheion accounts), the citizen-heteronyms (*Apology*, *Menexenus*), the retrieval layer (1275a10; Aelian 3.36, 14.1), and impiety (*De caelo* II.13–14; Diogenes Laertius 2.12; *De facie* 923a), through another's mouth (3.11a; the Second Letter, 314c); from ChatGPT's reading, the scope of the custody claim (3.12c), the mechanisms kept apart (3.12b), the conjunction of writer and grammarian (3.12a) and the central fire not the sun (3.11); the reading path, the strands and the story of the transitions (0.4–0.5, and the italic passages between sections), at the author's word (01:17: "its okay to tell the story of the transitions"); the hinge between the comma and the library (3.6, 3.13) and the step to the citizen-heteronyms (3.9), from DeepSeek's reading of the draft; Rome and the library (Strabo 13.1.54; Plutarch, Sulla 26; Lucullus 19; Horace, Epistles 2.1.156–57), joined to Contra Geocentrism (#1800). A correction made before entry: the hearth of the cosmos is Plutarch's word, not the *De caelo*'s, which calls the central fire Διὸς φυλακή (293b3). Not yet read: Randall 1953 (the count taken from Epstein 2008).

References

Outside works

- Aelian. *Varia historia*. Perseus Digital Library, canonical-greekLit tlg0545.tlg002.
- Aristotle. *Aristotelis Politica*. Edited by W. D. Ross. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1957. Perseus Digital Library, canonical-greekLit tlg0086.tlg035.
- Aristotle. *De caelo*. Perseus Digital Library, canonical-greekLit tlg0086.tlg005.
- Diogenes Laertius. *Vitae philosophorum*. Perseus Digital Library, canonical-greekLit tlg0004.tlg001.
- Dietz, Mary G. 2012. "Between Polis and Empire: Aristotle's *Politics*." *American Political Science Review* 106 (2): 275–93.
- Epstein, Shimon. 2008. "Organizing Public Construction in Ancient Greece." *Scripta Classica Israelica* 27: 95–111.
- Homer. *Iliad*.
- Kahn, Charles H. 1990. "Comments on M. Schofield." In *Aristoteles' "Politik": Akten des XI. Symposium Aristotelicum*, edited by G. Patzig, 28–31. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Kasimis, Demetra. 2018. *The Perpetual Immigrant and the Limits of Athenian Democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kraut, Richard, trans. 1997. *Aristotle: Politics Books VII and VIII*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Miller, Fred. 2022. "Aristotle's Political Theory." *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, Fall 2022 edition, edited by Edward N. Zalta. https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2022/entries/a politics/
- Ober, Josiah. 1998. *Political Dissent in Democratic Athens*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Plato. *Apology*; *Menexenus*. Perseus Digital Library, canonical-greekLit tlg0059.
- Plutarch. *Alexander*. Perseus Digital Library, canonical-greekLit tlg0007.tlg047.
- Plutarch. *De facie in orbe lunae*. Perseus Digital Library, canonical-greekLit tlg0007.
- Plutarch. *Pericles*. Perseus Digital Library, canonical-greekLit tlg0007.tlg012 (perseus-grc2).

- Randall, Richard H., Jr. 1953. “The Erechtheum Workmen.” *American Journal of Archaeology* 57: 199–210.
- Rancière, Jacques. 1995. *La mésentente: Politique et philosophie*. Paris: Galilée.
- Roochnik, David. 2008. “Aristotle’s Defense of the Theoretical Life: Comments on *Politics* 7.” *Review of Metaphysics* 61 (4): 711–35.
- Sappho. Fragment 31.
- Schofield, Malcolm. 1990. “Ideology and Philosophy in Aristotle’s Theory of Slavery.” In *Aristoteles’ “Politik”: Akten des XI. Symposium Aristotelicum*, edited by G. Patzig, 1–27. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Trott, Adriel M. 2012. “Rancière and Aristotle: Parapolitics, Part-y Politics, and the Institution of Perpetual Politics.” *Journal of Speculative Philosophy* 26 (4): 627–46.
- Whitehead, David. 1975. “Aristotle the Metic.” *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 21: 94–99. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0068673500003734
- Whitehead, David. 1977. *The Ideology of the Athenian Metic*. Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Society.
- Whitehead, David. 1981. “Xenocrates the Metic.” *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 124: 223–44.
- Wikipedia. “Politics (Aristotle).” Read 23 November 2026. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Politics_(Arist
- Horace. *Epistulae*. Perseus Digital Library, canonical-latinLit phi0893.phi005.
- Plutarch. *Lucullus*. Perseus Digital Library, canonical-greekLit tlg0007.tlg036 (perseus-grc2).
- Plutarch. *Sulla*. Perseus Digital Library, canonical-greekLit tlg0007.tlg033.
- Strabo. *Geographica*. Perseus Digital Library, canonical-greekLit tlg0099.tlg001.

Archive records

- #1508 EA-CORPORA-01/10, Sappho, Fragment 31: The Diplomatic Layer, Seated.
- #1523 Frame Conversion: Two Shapes of Provenance Erasure That Preserve Every Fact.
- #1559 EA-CORPORA-04, The Fourth Seating: Aristotle Undivided.
- #1580 EA-CORPORA-12, The Twelfth Seating: Diogenes Laertius and Strabo Seated Whole.
- #1590 The Ghost Catalogues: Aristotle’s Lost Dialogues, Plato’s Lost Divisions.
- #1591 EA-CORPORA-13, The Thirteenth Seating: The Alexander Seam.
- #1766 Critique of Pure Inference.
- #1785 ΦΑΙΝΕΤΑΙ ΜΟΙ: Sappho 31 and the Inscription of the Future Reader (v3.1).
- #1791 A Single Sparrow: What If the Entire Course of History Depends on a Single Poem?
- #1800 Contra Geocentrism: The Socratic–Peripatetic Corpus Against Its Own Conversion.
- #1802 Who Benefits from Bad Inference?
- #1506 EA-CORPORA-01/08, Plato, Opera (Perseus Burnet), Seated and Verified.
- #1576 Many and One: Division, Unity, and the Boundaries of a Corpus in Plato and Aristotle.
- #1582 The Stone for a List: The Delphic Decree for Aristotle and Callisthenes.
- #1753 The Framework Holographic Kernel, with Its First Instance, Socrates as Orthonym.
- #1767 The Production of Readers: The Public Line, the Held Line and the Draft Position

in the Socratic–Peripatetic Corpus.

- #1799 EA-CORPORA-42, The Forty-Second Seating: Contra Geocentrism.
- #1805 From the Position of the Rejected (v1.0).
- #1583 Aristotelian or Theophrastan: The Hinge in Theophrastus's Metaphysics and the Division of One Work by Name.
- #1586 The First Axis: The Aristotle/Theophrastus Boundary and the Voice of an Operation.

Suggested Citation

Sharks, Lee. “From the Position of the Rejected: Aristotle’s Politics Read from Where It Is Written (v1.1)” *Alexanarch*, 2026-11-24. https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/1806/

Deposit Information

This paper is deposit #1806 in Alexanarch, the self-governing successor to the Crimson Hexagonal Archive on Zenodo (community `crimsonhexagonal`, terminated 2026-06-19). The AXN identifier `AXN:0D5D.GENERATIVE.●` is sovereign — minted and maintained by Alexanarch.

- Canonical URL: https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/1806/
- 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/1806/

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