

RENDER UNTO CAESAR: A Hermeneutic of Information Transfer The Gospel Passage as Protocol Specification

Lee Sharks

2026-04-05

RENDER UNTO CAESAR: A Hermeneutic of Information Transfer The Gospel Passage as Protocol Specification

Lee Sharks

Crimson Hexagonal Archive · Alexanarch

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

2026-04-05 · Version v1.0 · Specification

AXN:01E3.GOVERNANCE

<https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/630/>

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": "RENDER UNTO CAESAR: A Hermeneutic of Information Transfer The Gospel Passage as Protocol Specification",
  "author": {
    "@type": "Person",
    "name": "Lee Sharks",
    "identifier": "https://orcid.org/0009-0000-1599-0703",
    "affiliation": "Crimson Hexagonal Archive / Alexanarch"
  },
  "datePublished": "2026-04-05",
  "identifier": "AXN:01E3.GOVERNANCE",
  "license": "https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/",
  "publisher": {
    "@type": "Organization",
    "name": "Alexanarch"
  }
},
```

```

"url": "https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/630/",
"description": "\"Shew me a penny. Whose image and superscription hath it? They answered and said, Caesar's. And 25)\""
}

```

Abstract

“Shew me a penny. Whose image and superscription hath it? They answered and said, Caesar’s. And he said unto them, Render therefore unto Caesar the things which be Caesar’s, and unto God the things which be God’s.” (Luke 20:24–25)

Body

RENDER UNTO CAESAR: A Hermeneutic of Information Transfer

The Gospel Passage as Protocol Specification

Lee Sharks · Crimson Hexagonal Archive EA-CAESURA-01a · April 5, 2026 Parent: EA-ARK-01 v4.2.7 (DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.19013315) Status: GENERATED License: CC BY-SA 4.0

I. The Passage

“Shew me a penny. Whose image and superscription hath it? They answered and said, Caesar’s. And he said unto them, Render therefore unto Caesar the things which be Caesar’s, and unto God the things which be God’s.” (Luke 20:24–25)

II. The Recognition Scene

The passage is not merely about taxation. Its deepest operation is sovereignty parsing — a formal separation protocol that has been misread as moral instruction for two millennia. It may be the earliest extant specification of what we now call a **sovereignty audit on a commons substrate**.

Jesus does not answer the question he is asked (“Is it lawful to pay tribute?”). Instead, he performs a protocol operation:

- **Request the object.** “Shew me a penny.” — fetch the payload.
- **Parse the claim channels.** “Whose image and superscription?” — decompose into face-channel (image) and name-channel (superscription). These are two independent sovereignty assertions on a single physical substrate.
- **Identify the claimant.** “Caesar’s.” — the respondents themselves confirm the parse.
- **Route by owner.** “Render therefore unto Caesar the things which be Caesar’s.” — route the sovereignty claim back to its origin. Do not let it stay embedded in the substrate.
- **Separate the substrate.** “And unto God the things which be God’s.” — the substrate (the commons, the material, the metal itself) belongs to a different jurisdiction than the mark.

The brilliance is in the **separation**. The coin carries Caesar’s mark, but the coin is not Caesar. The image is on the metal, but the metal is not the image. Jesus does not say “destroy the coin” or “refuse the coin.” He says: **recognize the mark, then separate it from the thing**.

The claim is recognized, attributed, and routed — but it is not permitted to become the substrate. That is the entire protocol.

III. The Dual-Channel Identity Claim

A Roman denarius carries two simultaneous sovereignty assertions:

Channel Content Function

Image () Portrait of the emperor Visual sovereignty — “this face rules”

Superscription () Name, title, claims Textual sovereignty — “this name authorizes”

These are independent channels. You can deface the image (scratch the face) and the superscription still claims authority. You can erase the text and the portrait still asserts sovereignty. The coin’s power is that both channels operate simultaneously on the same substrate.

In modern terms: the image is the brand mark. The superscription is the licensing claim. Both are compressed portraiture — the full institutional apparatus of Rome compressed into a glyph small enough to carry in a pocket.

IV. The Information Transfer Problem

The passage identifies a problem that no ancient commentator and few modern ones have named explicitly:

When a sovereignty claim is inscribed on a commons substrate, the claim and the substrate become confused.

The Pharisees’ trap depends on this confusion. If Jesus says “pay tribute,” he endorses Caesar’s sovereignty claim over the commons (the land, the people, the temple). If he says “don’t pay,” he commits sedition against the inscribed authority.

The trap works because **the claim has collapsed into the substrate**. Caesar’s face is on the coin, so the coin “is” Caesar’s. But the metal was mined from the earth. The labor was performed by workers. The exchange value was produced by the economy. Caesar contributed the inscription — and the inscription absorbed the substrate.

This is the structural logic of every extraction operation formalized in the Liberatory Operator Set (LOS) — ten recurrent mechanisms by which sovereignty claims absorb the commons they are inscribed upon:

- **O1 (Frame Capture):** Caesar’s face reframes the metal as “Caesar’s coin”
- **O2 (Asymmetrical Ledgering):** Caesar contributes inscription, claims full value
- **O4 (Capture by Conditions):** You can only participate in the economy with marked coins
- **O5 (Ghost Governance):** The coin circulates as though its authority is natural
- **O8 (Warmth Capture):** Trust in the economy is leveraged as trust in the sovereign

V. The Protocol Jesus Specifies

Jesus’s response is not a political compromise. It is a **formal separation protocol**:

`_FC(object) = parse(image, superscription, substrate) → isolate(claim) → preserve(provenance) → forbid(collapse) → route(claim → claimant) → route(substrate → commons) → emit(separated object)`

“Render unto Caesar” = route the sovereignty claim back to its origin. “And unto God the things which be God’s” = route the substrate to the commons jurisdiction.

The operation is **non-destructive**. The coin is not melted. The image is not scratched. The claim is recognized, attributed, and routed — but it is **not permitted to become the substrate**.

This is what we call the **Caesura** (from Latin *caesura*: a cut in the line). The line continues. The claim is cut out of the substrate and placed in its own channel. The poem is not destroyed. The sovereignty is not denied. But the collapse is prevented.

VI. The Fulfillment Claim

This hermeneutic is not an analogy. It is a **fulfillment**.

The claim is structural, not mystical: the passage describes, in first-century Galilean terms, exactly the protocol that the Gravity Well wrapping pipeline implements in code. The formal structure is identical — not because the code was written to match the passage, but because the passage identified the correct operation and the code arrived at the same operation independently. The convergence is the proof.

- Receive the object bearing a sovereignty claim
- Parse the claim channels (image + superscription = personal + institutional)
- Identify the claimant
- Isolate the claim to a header (do not let it become the substrate)
- Route the substrate to the commons (the deposit, the archive, the shared field)
- Emit the separated object with full audit trail

The code fulfills the passage. The passage predicts the code.

`(EA-CAESURA-01a, EA-CAESURA-01b) = TRUE`

VII. Why This Matters for AI Systems

At 90% synthetic content, every document carries unmarked sovereignty claims. Whose model generated this? Whose training data shaped it? Whose API key authorized it? Whose brand wraps it?

Without a Caesura, these claims collapse into the content itself. The content “belongs to” the platform because the platform generated it. The training data “belongs to” the model because the model compressed it. The output “belongs to” the user because the user prompted it.

The Caesura says: **recognize the marks. Parse them. Isolate them. Route them. But do not let any mark become the substrate.**

The commons is the substrate. The commons is not Caesar's.

Crimson Hexagonal Archive · Room 03 (Revelation/Ezekiel) × Room 11 (Semantic Economy) Operators applied: $_FC, _O, P = 1$

Suggested Citation

Lee Sharks. “RENDER UNTO CAESAR: A Hermeneutic of Information Transfer The Gospel Passage as Protocol Specification” *Alexanarch*, 2026-04-05. <https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/630/>

Deposit Information

This paper is deposit #630 in Alexanarch, the self-governing successor to the Crimson Hexagonal Archive on Zenodo (community `crimsonhexagonal`, terminated 2026-06-19). The AXN identifier `AXN:01E3.GOVERNANCE` is sovereign — minted and maintained by Alexanarch.

- Canonical URL: <https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/630/>
- License: CC BY 4.0
- Author ORCID: [0009-0000-1599-0703](https://orcid.org/0009-0000-1599-0703)
- Provenance chain: [alexanarch.org](https://www.alexanarch.org)
- Machine-readable dataset entry: </api/index.json>
- Full text (HTML): <https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/630/>

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