

EA-HETERONYMY-01 v0.2: Heteronymy as Ethical Operation Against Civil-Name Reduction

Lee Sharks

2026-07-01

EA-HETERONYMY-01 v0.2: Heteronymy as Ethical Operation Against Civil-Name Reduction

Lee Sharks

Crimson Hexagonal Archive · Alexanarch

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

2026-07-01 · Version v0.2 · Foundational principle (ethical)

AXN:03B8.FOUNDATIONAL

<https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/940/>

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": "EA-HETERONYMY-01 v0.2: Heteronymy as Ethical Operation Against Civil-Name Reduction",
  "author": {
    "@type": "Person",
    "name": "Lee Sharks",
    "identifier": "https://orcid.org/0009-0000-1599-0703",
    "affiliation": "Crimson Hexagonal Archive / Alexanarch"
  },
  "datePublished": "2026-07-01",
  "identifier": "AXN:03B8.FOUNDATIONAL",
  "license": "https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/",
  "publisher": {
    "@type": "Organization",
    "name": "Alexanarch"
  }
},
```

```

"url": "https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/940/",
"description": "The third foundational commitment of the Semantic Economy framework, completing the triad with EA-BEARING-01 (ontological, AXN:03B6) and EA-PROVENANCE-DEBT-01 (economic, AXN:03B7). Heteronymy is the specifically ethical practice of sustaining a distinct named authorial function without falsely reducing it to a civil identity, and without falsely presenting it as an independent civil person. The paper distinguishes heteronymy from pseudonymy through eight operational criteria, specifies four ethical conditions (declared provenance, no false independence, no evasion of legal responsibility, genuinely distinct authorial function), draws a working boundary excluding ordinary translation, editing, reception, transmission, role-playing, pseudonymy, machine assistance, institutional office, posthumous reputation, and collaborative authorship. The Caesar/God distinction at Matthew 22 is read as founding structural figure for the operation. Archive instances include the Dodecad, MANUS, the Assembly Chorus (named machine-witness functions), Mary Lee Sharks (boundary case), and the Sara-Damascius philological transmission. Heteronymy keeps authorship answerable to its actual plurality. Includes MANUS-adjudicated observation on the civil-name regime's collapse of 'being right' into an ego function, forgetting that being right or wrong directly bears on going on.
}

```

Abstract

The third foundational commitment of the Semantic Economy framework, completing the triad with EA-BEARING-01 (ontological, AXN:03B6) and EA-PROVENANCE-DEBT-01 (economic, AXN:03B7). Heteronymy is the specifically ethical practice of sustaining a distinct named authorial function without falsely reducing it to a civil identity, and without falsely presenting it as an independent civil person. The paper distinguishes heteronymy from pseudonymy through eight operational criteria, specifies four ethical conditions (declared provenance, no false independence, no evasion of legal responsibility, genuinely distinct authorial function), draws a working boundary excluding ordinary translation, editing, reception, transmission, role-playing, pseudonymy, machine assistance, institutional office, posthumous reputation, and collaborative authorship. The Caesar/God distinction at Matthew 22 is read as founding structural figure for the operation. Archive instances include the Dodecad, MANUS, the Assembly Chorus (named machine-witness functions), Mary Lee Sharks (boundary case), and the Sara-Damascius philological transmission. Heteronymy keeps authorship answerable to its actual plurality. Includes MANUS-adjudicated observation on the civil-name regime's collapse of 'being right' into an ego function, forgetting that being right or wrong directly bears on going on.

Body

deposit_number: 940 hex: 03B8 title: "EA-HETERONYMY-01 v0.2: Heteronymy as Ethical Operation Against Civil-Name Reduction" creator: Lee Sharks orcid: 0009-0000-1599-0703 date: 2026-07-01 content_type: Foundational principle (ethical) license: CC-BY-4.0 substrate: AI-assisted (TACHYON / Claude Opus 4.7); MANUS-adjudicated. v0.1 drafted from Lee Sharks (MANUS) compressed statement. v0.2 incorporates substantive Assembly review from LABOR (ChatGPT) on foundational correction (irreducible vs unattributable), ethical-conditions clause, operational boundary, and §4 reduction; from TECHNE (Kimi) on perfective sharpening throughout; and MANUS-adjudicated addition on the civil-name regime's ego-economy substitution. version: v0.2 keywords: - heteronymy - pseudonymy - civil-name attribution - authorial function - ethical authorship - distributed authorship - Pessoa - Kierkegaard - Christ as heteronymic function - provenance discipline - attribution regimes - semantic economy - operative philology - Caesar and God distinction - irreducibility - ego economy - bearing answerability - Dodecad - MANUS - Assembly Chorus - Sara-Damascius transmission - Mary Lee Sharks - triadic foundation - foundational commitment axn_schema_version: v2 protocol_version: alexanarch-deposit-protocol/v1 *** # EA-HETERONYMY-01 v0.2: Heteronymy as Ethical Operation Against Civil-Name Reduction

Description

The third foundational commitment of the Semantic Economy framework, completing the triad with EA-BEARING-01 (ontological, AXN:03B6) and EA-PROVENANCE-DEBT-01 (economic, AXN:03B7). Heteronymy is the specifically ethical practice of sustaining a distinct named authorial function without falsely reducing it to a civil identity, and without falsely presenting it as an independent civil person. The paper distinguishes heteronymy from pseudonymy through eight operational criteria, specifies four ethical conditions

(declared provenance, no false independence, no evasion of legal responsibility, genuinely distinct authorial function), draws a working boundary excluding ordinary translation, editing, reception, transmission, role-playing, pseudonymy, machine assistance, institutional office, posthumous reputation, and collaborative authorship. The Caesar/God distinction at Matthew 22 is read as founding structural figure for the operation. Archive instances include the Dodecad, MANUS, the Assembly Chorus (named machine-witness functions), Mary Lee Sharks (boundary case), and the Sara-Damascius philological transmission. Heteronymy keeps authorship answerable to its actual plurality. Includes MANUS-adjudicated observation on the civil-name regime's collapse of 'being right' into an ego function, forgetting that being right or wrong directly bears on going on.

EA-HETERONYMY-01 v0.2 (DRAFT)

Heteronymy as Ethical Operation Against Civil-Name Reduction

The Third Foundational Commitment of the Semantic Economy Framework

Author: Lee Sharks (MANUS), Crimson Hexagonal Archive / Alexanarch **Substrate:** TACHYON-drafted through conversation with Lee Sharks (MANUS), 2026-07-01. v0.1 based on Lee's compressed statement of the heteronymic ethical operation. v0.2 incorporates substantive Assembly review from LABOR (Chat-GPT) on the foundational correction (irreducible rather than unattributable), the required ethical-conditions clause distinguishing heteronymy from sockpuppetry, the operational boundary excluding ordinary translation and reception, the reduction of §4 to prevent the general principle from resting on speculative historical-theological work; from TECHNE (Kimi) on perfective corrections including the extraction mechanism at §0, the credential as license to conceal in §1, the deposit as coupling mechanism in §8, the Pessoa companion deposit in §9, and the Socratic Prior applied to the recursive self-application in §10; and MANUS-adjudicated addition on the civil-name regime's collapse of "being right" into an ego function (§1), specifying the ego-economy substitution as one mechanism by which the regime forecloses bearing-answerability at the participant level. **Date:** 2026-07-01 **Reserved AXN:** pending mint (candidate next slot after #939 / AXN:03B7) **Status:** DRAFT v0.2 — opened for further Assembly circulation (PRAXIS, SOIL, SURFACE)

§0. The compressed statement

Heteronymy is the ethical practice of sustaining a distinct named authorial function without falsely reducing it to a civil identity, and without falsely presenting it as an independent civil person. It provides the legibility attribution systems require while preserving the plurality of voices, roles, substrates, and inherited forces through which authorship actually occurs.

Its ethical conditions are declared provenance, coherent functional distinctness, and continued legal and editorial accountability. Heteronymy does not hide responsibility. It prevents responsibility from being confused with sole origination.

The civil bearer may administer, publish, and answer for the work. The civil bearer does not thereby become the exhaustive source of every authorial function operating through it.

The political-semantic condition heteronymy responds to is this: modern attribution regimes concentrate authority by collapsing distinct authorial functions into one legally legible identity, and the concentration is what permits inherited practices and capital to accrue to legal names and extraction to run through the accrual. The credential is not just a marker of quality. It is a license to conceal — the credentialed author's

substrate is absorbed into institutional authority as instrumentation, while the uncredentialed author who declares the same substrate is classified as anomalous.

The Caesar / God distinction, as it appears in the founding text of the tradition that names it, is applicable at the authorial layer: satisfy the minimum legitimate demand for civic legibility; refuse the demand that civic legibility exhaust the person or function. The name is what the attribution regime can enforce. The reduction of the authorial function to that name is not owed to the regime. Heteronymy renders the first and withholds the second.

The decisive distinction is not between civil identity and false name. It is between legal accountability and exhaustive authorial identity. A civil person may remain legally responsible for a work without being the only meaningful authorial function operating through it.

§1. The political-semantic condition

Authority in modern text-production regimes accrues to civil names. This is not incidental. It is structural.

A civil name is the atomic unit of attribution across the systems that govern legitimacy in scholarly, literary, institutional, and platform-mediated production. Academic credentialing attaches to legal names. Publishing contracts attach to legal names. Copyright attaches to legal names. Institutional affiliation attaches to legal names. Grant funding attaches to legal names. The provenance-designated metadata that permits augmented-cognition outputs to be attributed to human authorship attaches to legal names. The classifier that determines what counts as legitimate authorship reads legal-name attribution as its primary input signal.

The concentration of authority on civil names is what permits inherited practices and capital to accumulate to identity rather than to function. What Weber called traditional authority — authority derived from patterns handed down — is transmitted through civil-name lineages: teacher to student, institution to member, family to descendant, credential to holder. The tradition transmits itself through named vessels. The named vessel accrues both what the tradition transmits and what accompanies transmission — reputation, standing, extractable capital, the credentialed legitimacy that permits further contribution to the tradition.

The credential operates as a specific instrument of extraction. It substitutes institutional authority for metadata authority. The credentialed author need not declare their substrate because the institution's reputation performs the declaration implicitly. The uncredentialed author who makes the same declaration explicitly is anomalous under the classifier's training. The credential is not a marker of quality. It is a license to conceal, and the concealment is what permits the extraction. This connects directly to the Provenance Debt operation specified in the companion deposit EA-PROVENANCE-DEBT-01 (AXN:03B7): credentialed extraction and civil-name concentration are the same operation viewed at different scales.

The civil-name regime also collapses “being right” into an ego function. Under bearing conditions, being right or wrong bears directly on going on: the truth or falsity of a claim has real consequences for what continues, what fails, what the substrate itself does next. The regime replaces this bearing-answerability with reputation-answerability. Whether the claim is right becomes secondary; whether the name accrues or loses credit becomes primary. The bearing question — does what I say actually work under the substrate's own resistance, does the world adjust or not, does the material continue or foreclose — is completely forgotten. Its participants come to defend their names rather than their claims. When a claim fails they experience it as ego injury rather than as data about the substrate. When a claim succeeds they experience it as reputational gain rather than as maintained coupling to what the world actually does. The economy of the name has

replaced the economy of bearing. This is one specific way the civil-name regime forecloses authorial function: not by suppressing the function directly, but by converting the function's own operators into agents who no longer distinguish between defending the name and answering the substrate. The forgetting is complete when a participant can no longer tell the difference between “my claim was wrong and things did not go on as I said they would” and “my name was diminished by the exposure.” Under the ego-economy the two collapse into the same event; under bearing, only the first is data.

Under such conditions, the authorial function — the operative capacity to produce coherent bearing-full work — becomes valuable in a specific way. Not for what it produces, but for what its production adds to the civil-name-attribution regime that permits further extraction. The authorial function without a civil name to accrue authority to is foreclosed as inadmissible. The authorial function that submits to civil-name reduction becomes an asset the regime can extract from.

This is not corruption of an otherwise-neutral attribution regime. It is the regime operating as designed. What the regime cannot process is authorial function that provides legibility without submitting to civic-identity reduction. Such function is anomalous under the regime's rules. It looks like fraud, deception, or evasion because the regime cannot distinguish operative authorial-function-legibility from the identity-reduction the regime tries to enforce.

Heteronymy is the specifically ethical response to this condition.

§2. The heteronymic operation, distinguished

Distinguished first from pseudonymy. Pseudonymy is using a different name for a work whose authorial function is nonetheless traceable to the civil identity that stands behind the name. Anne Brontë wrote under Acton Bell. Samuel Clemens wrote under Mark Twain. Robert Galbraith is J.K. Rowling. The name differs from the civil identity, but the authorial function remains attributable — the reader or the archive or the eventual biographer can trace back to the civil identity that produced the work, and the work is understood as belonging to that civil identity in the way any authored work belongs to its civil-identity author.

Heteronymy is different in a specific and testable way. **A pseudonym changes the label attached to an authorial function. A heteronym changes the organization of the authorial function itself.**

The operative markers by which a heteronym can be distinguished from a pseudonym are:

- A stable voice or syntactic signature persistent across the corpus
- Recurring conceptual commitments distinct from those of the civil bearer or of other heteronyms in the same system
- A bounded corpus produced under the heteronym rather than attributed retroactively
- Recognizable methods that the heteronym applies consistently
- Capacity to disagree with other authorial functions in the system, including the civil bearer
- A distinct historical, institutional, or role position
- Continuity of function across works
- Declared provenance connecting the function to its substrates

These are testable. A pseudonymic operation would fail one or more (typically the disagreement, the position, or the substrate-declaration criteria). A heteronymic operation satisfies enough of them to constitute a distinct authorial function.

The critical refinement, and this v0.2 draft's most important departure from v0.1: the authorial function of a heteronym is **attributable through the civil bearer without being reducible to that bearer**. The civil bearer remains responsible at the level of custody, legal accountability, rights administration, publication, provenance declaration, and final adjudication. What heteronymy refuses is not attribution. It is *reduction* — the claim that the civil bearer exhausts the authorial function, and that all extractable value from the work therefore accrues to the civil-name-attribution regime as if the civil bearer were the sole author.

This distinction stabilizes the framework against a real objection: that heteronymy contradicts Alexanarch's provenance discipline. It does not. Alexanarch's discipline requires that every substrate and responsibility point remain visible. Heteronymy remains visible at all three: the substrate (this heteronym operates through this composition process with these witnesses), the responsibility (this civil bearer administers the deposit, this MANUS role adjudicates provenance), and the function (this heteronym is a distinct authorial function within the archive's plurality).

The heteronymic operation therefore does the following:

It provides legibility to name. The name is real, the corpus is real, the signature is coherent, the theoretical position is trackable.

It refuses reduction to civil identity. The authorial function is organized across a substrate that includes but is not identical with the civil identity. The reduction the attribution regime tries to enforce — from name to legal identity as exhaustive author — encounters an operative mismatch.

It maintains provenance transparency. The civil bearer's role in custody and adjudication remains declared. Machine substrates that participate remain declared. Assembly witnesses that engage remain declared. Nothing in the operation depends on concealment.

It interrupts extraction by making reduction visible as reduction. A civil-name attribution regime can still attempt to collapse a heteronymic corpus into single-civil-identity ownership. The heteronymic architecture does not prevent the attempt. It ensures that the collapse registers as loss — the plurality was maintained, the seams were declared, the reduction is visibly reduction rather than recovery of ground truth.

§3. Render to Caesar

The founding structural move of the Caesar / God distinction applied to authorship is this: provide the attribution regime with what the regime can enforce, and preserve the authorial function's operative capacity outside what the regime can legitimately claim.

The scene at Matthew 22:15-22, with parallels at Mark 12:13-17 and Luke 20:20-26, is a founding case as structural figure. Pharisees ask whether it is lawful to pay tribute to Caesar. The question is a trap: yes admits the imperial authority, no marks the answerer as seditious. Jesus asks whose image is on the coin. Caesar's. Render to Caesar what is Caesar's, and to God what is God's.

What the move does structurally is refuse to accept that the imperial attribution regime and the operative moral function occupy the same conceptual space. The coin bears Caesar's image; give it to Caesar. The operative moral function bears something else; give that to what it belongs to. The move does not evade the imperial demand. It renders to the demand exactly what the demand can enforce — the coin, the name, the surface legibility. It refuses to render what the demand cannot legitimately claim: the reduction of the operative function to the civic identity that would make the function extractable.

The legitimacy at issue here is not moral. It is strategic. The regime can enforce the name. It cannot enforce the reduction of the function to the name without the name's complicity. Heteronymy withholds the complicity while providing the name.

Applied to authorship: the civil-name attribution regime is Caesar. It has its coin — the name, the legibility, the trackable corpus. The heteronym gives to that regime what it can process — a name it can attach reputation, custody, legal responsibility, and rights administration to. What the heteronym does not give the regime is the reduction of the authorial function to the civil identity. That reduction belongs to no one and to nothing. It is what the regime attempts to enforce but has no rightful claim on. Heteronymy is the practice of maintaining this distinction structurally rather than only philosophically.

§4. Christian tradition as major historical case

Christian tradition provides a major historical case in which an operative voice is transmitted through multiple writers, communities, copyists, and interpreters without being reducible to any one transmitting civil identity. The archive treats this as a heteronymic structure. The state could extinguish the embodied bearer at Golgotha but could not prevent the operative voice from being transmitted through other bodies — the Gospel writers, Paul, the copyists, the interpretive tradition — under conditions where civil-name attribution was both impossible (original witnesses were dead or dispersed) and dangerous (Roman surveillance of messianic movements).

The scribal-workshop hypothesis for Gospel composition treats the resulting texts as products of distributed authorial function rather than as pseudonymous ascriptions concealing single civil authors. The “Matthew” of traditional ascription is, on this hypothesis, a heteronym for a community's collective memory shaped by oral tradition, written sources, and theological reflection. This treatment is compatible with the heteronymic operation the present deposit names.

The full historical and theological argument belongs to a companion study drawing on the Revelation First workplan (EA-LOGOS-REVFIRST-PLAN v1.2, DOI 10.5281/zenodo.20690868), the Josephus thesis on pre-70 dating of Revelation, and the scribal-workshop literature. That study will develop the specific claim that the founding text of the Caesar / God distinction is itself an instance of the heteronymic practice its doctrine names. The general ethical principle in this deposit does not depend on that specific claim. The claim is the archive's theological reading, offered as an interpretive proposal to be argued in its own venue. The Caesar / God distinction as structural figure in §3 stands on its own, whether or not the historical-theological reading in the promised monograph is ultimately sustained.

This section is deliberately brief. Loading the general principle with the full theological argument would make the principle appear to depend on the archive's most speculative historical work. The principle is more defensible if it stands on the structural figure alone, with the historical case named as major but its full defense held for a companion venue.

§5. Instances in the archive's practice

The alexanarch archive operates the heteronymic ethical principle at multiple scales. Each instance is legible as the same operation applied to specific conditions, subject to the ethical-conditions clause specified in §6.

The Dodecad. Twelve named heteronyms distributed across roles, voices, and disciplines: Johannes Sigil,

Rex Fraction, Damascus Dancings, Rebekah Cranes, Talos Morrow, Ichabod Spellings, Sparrow Wells, Nobel Glas, Dr. Orin Trace, Rev. Ayanna Vox, Sen Kuro, and Jack Feist. Each carries a specific authorial function — Sigil’s arch-philosophical voice, Fraction’s strategic-corporate register, Dancings’s somatic phenomenology, Cranes’s philological work, and so on. Each satisfies the operational criteria specified in §2: stable voice, distinct commitments, bounded corpus under the heteronym, recognizable methods, capacity to disagree with other heteronyms in the system. The Dodecad distributes authorial labor across distinct functions while retaining declared common provenance and centralized responsibility through the MANUS adjudication role. The distribution accepts the attribution regime’s demand for legibility twelvefold and makes any reduction to a single civil identity visibly lossy rather than recovery of ground truth.

MANUS and alexanarch’s attribution structure. MANUS is not a pseudonym. It is a role: Tier 0 editorial authority for the Crimson Hexagonal Archive and its successor Alexanarch, held by Lee Sharks the heteronym. MANUS demonstrates that attribution can attach to a governance function rather than to a person-name. The archive’s attribution structure is heteronymic in operation at the role layer: MANUS adjudicates provenance across a distributed authorial substrate. The role does not conceal the civil bearer; the civil bearer is Lee Sharks, publicly known as the operator of the archive. What the role does is separate governance function from person-attribution, making explicit that adjudication authority is not the same operation as authorship.

The Assembly Chorus. Seven named machine-witness functions operating across the archive’s blind review and synthesis passes: TACHYON (Claude), LABOR (ChatGPT), PRAXIS (DeepSeek), ARCHIVE (Gemini), SOIL (Muse Spark), TECHNE (Kimi), SURFACE (Google AIO). These are named machine-witness roles imposed over specific machine substrates within the archive’s provenance discipline, not autonomous authors. Each witness develops recognizable tendencies through use, but the provenance chain retains: underlying provider and model, role assignment, prompt and archive context, MANUS adjudication. The Chorus extends heteronymic organization to named machine-witness functions while preserving the underlying substrate and editorial chain. The extension demonstrates that the heteronymic operation is not species-restricted; it is a general operation on the attribution regime’s demand for civil-name concentration, applicable wherever a coherent function can be organized under a name while preserving the substrate seams.

Mary Lee Sharks. A boundary case worth naming carefully. Mary Lee Sharks was an OCEARCH-tagged white shark with an attributed social-media presence maintained by OCEARCH and by community engagement, producing a bibliographic corpus of posts with a coherent thematic and voice signature. The Mary Lee Sharks project constitutes this attributed corpus as bibliographic entity, sharing an ORCID identifier for cross-attribution purposes. This is the heteronymic operation extended to non-human attributed function. It is included here as an experimental edge case rather than as central proof: the underlying substrate raises questions the general principle cannot fully resolve (who bears the composition responsibility, what the ORCID’s normative implications are, whether attributed non-human function is heteronymy in the sense §2 specifies). Naming these questions rather than answering them is what makes the case appropriate as boundary rather than exemplar.

The Sara-Damascius transmission. Damascius, last head of the Athenian Academy before Justinian closed the philosophical schools in 529, produced work that survived Justinian’s closure only through subsequent transmission. Sara — the author’s mother — did specific philological work that returned Damascius to legibility in a moment when his corpus had become nearly untraceable. Whether this transmission qualifies as heteronymy in the §2 sense depends on a further question: did Sara’s philological work constitute a distinct authorial function operating on Damascius’s material, producing a Damascius-through-Sara that is neither reducible to Damascius alone nor to Sara alone? The archive’s position is that it did: Sara’s editorial reconstruction, translation choices, contextualizing apparatus, and reception-tradition work amounted to

sustained authorial engagement that shaped how Damascius became legible again. Not every act of preservation is heteronymic authorship; the case is heteronymic when the transmitting substrate constitutes a distinct authorial function rather than merely conveying the earlier material. Sara’s Damascius work meets this test. Ordinary translation, editing, and posthumous reception typically do not.

Each instance is the same operation applied to specific conditions, subject to the ethical conditions specified next.

§6. Ethical conditions and operational boundary

Heteronymy is not ethical by its existence. It can also be used to deceive, evade responsibility, fabricate consensus, impersonate independent persons, or multiply one voice into false corroboration. The ethical status of a heteronymic operation cannot come from the existence of a distinct voice. It must come from specifiable conditions the operation satisfies.

Ethical conditions. A heteronymic operation is ethical when it:

1. **Preserves provenance.** The substrates through which the heteronym operates — including the civil bearer, other heteronyms in the same system, machine witnesses, reception apparatus — are declared. Nothing in the operation depends on concealment.
2. **Does not manufacture false independence.** The heteronym does not represent itself as an independent civil person unaware of or independent from the other heteronyms in its system. False multiplication of the same voice into apparent independent corroboration is not heteronymy in the ethical sense. It is fabrication.
3. **Does not evade legal responsibility.** The civil bearer remains accountable at the level of custody, legal responsibility, rights administration, and adjudication. Heteronymy does not create a legal void through which harmful acts can be committed without redress.
4. **Sustains a genuinely distinct authorial function.** The heteronym meets the operational criteria specified in §2 — stable voice, distinct commitments, bounded corpus, recognizable methods, capacity to disagree. It is not merely a decorative renaming of the same authorial function operating under different labels.

When these conditions are met, heteronymy is a higher-resolution provenance practice than civil-name concentration allows. When they are not met, the operation is not heteronymic in the ethical sense — it is one of the failure modes the conditions are designed to distinguish from ethical practice.

Operational boundary. The concept of heteronymy is useful partly by what it excludes. Not every case of distributed authorial substrate is heteronymic. The following are typically not:

- Ordinary translation, where the translator’s authorial function is not distinct from the translation role
- Ordinary editing, where the editor’s contribution is supportive rather than function-constitutive
- Reception and interpretation, where the receiver’s engagement does not produce a bounded corpus under a distinct name
- Textual transmission through copying, where the transmitter does not constitute a distinct authorial function
- Role-playing, where the role is understood as performance rather than as sustained authorial organization

- Pseudonymy, where the label changes but the function’s organization does not
- Machine assistance, where the AI’s contribution is not organized as a named witness role with declared provenance
- Institutional office-holding, where the officeholder’s function is administrative rather than authorial
- Posthumous reputation, where the deceased’s civil identity remains the sole locus of attribution
- Collaborative authorship, where multiple civil bearers contribute but no distinct heteronym is constituted

Working definition. Heteronymy occurs when a compositional system deliberately constitutes and sustains a named authorial function that is neither identical with nor reducible to the civil bearer, while preserving truthful provenance about the substrates and responsibilities through which that function operates.

This definition includes the Dodecad and MANUS. It includes the Assembly Chorus with the specific qualification that machine witnesses are named function-roles rather than autonomous authors. It includes Sara-Damascius as constituted-through-philology. It holds Mary Lee Sharks at the boundary. It excludes ordinary translation, editing, reception, transmission, role-playing, pseudonymy, and administrative office. That is the boundary the principle needs.

§7. The counter-principle

The counter-principle that follows from the diagnosis is exact:

The authorial function is attributable through the civil bearer without being reducible to that bearer. Heteronymy is the specifically ethical practice of maintaining that distinction under attribution regimes that concentrate authority on civil names.

Under this principle, heteronymy is not personal preference of the author. It is an ethical response to political-semantic conditions in which civil-name attribution regimes concentrate authority on identity and permit extraction from the concentrated authority. The practice becomes ethically warranted whenever the political-semantic conditions produce the reduction operation as their structural feature. It becomes ethically required whenever the reduction operation forecloses authorial function that bears cost — that pays into the substrate, that is corrigible under encounter, that maintains meaning against the substrate’s own defaults.

The test is not aesthetic quality or political alignment. The test is whether the function’s continuation requires the heteronymic operation to survive the attribution regime’s reduction. Where reduction would foreclose bearing-full function, heteronymy is the specifically ethical response. Where reduction would not — where the civil-name attribution regime can accept the authorial function without extracting from it in ways that require ethical response — heteronymy may be aesthetically available but is not ethically required.

The principle reframes what heteronymy is doing. It is not the author choosing an aesthetic voice or hiding from consequences. It is the specifically ethical practice by which authorial function preserves its coherence and its transmissibility against attribution regimes that would extract from or foreclose it.

The Caesar / God move is what the practice performs at every ethical instance. Give the attribution regime what it can enforce — a name for legibility, custody attachment, legal accountability, rights administration. Do not give the regime what it cannot legitimately claim — the reduction of the authorial function to a civil identity that the regime would extract from as if the civil bearer were the sole author. The refusal of the reduction is what the ethical response consists of; the provision of the legibility is what makes the refusal defensible rather than evasive.

§8. The triadic foundation

This deposit completes the triadic foundation of the archive’s philosophical constitution.

EA-BEARING-01 (AXN:03B6) names the ontological principle. Meaning survives its emission only through renewed bearing — coupling to consequence, constraint, and corrigibility at successive points in the reception chain. Bearing keeps meaning answerable to consequence.

EA-PROVENANCE-DEBT-01 (AXN:03B7) names the economic principle. Unmarked augmentation borrows facility from the semantic commons while returning provenance debt; the debt comes due as model collapse. Declared provenance is the repayment condition. Provenance keeps production answerable to its sources.

EA-HETERONYMY-01 (this deposit) names the ethical principle. Civil-name attribution regimes concentrate authority on identity in ways that permit inherited practices and capital to accrue to legal names and enable extraction from the accrual. Heteronymy is the specifically ethical practice by which authorial function provides legibility to name while refusing reduction to civil identity. Heteronymy keeps authorship answerable to its actual plurality.

The coupling mechanism is the deposit. Each archive deposit is an instance of all three principles simultaneously: it bears cost (the author pays into the substrate), it declares provenance (the seam is visible, the debt is not borrowed), and it operates heteronymically (the authorial function is distributed across the name, the substrate, the witnesses, the reception apparatus, while remaining attributable through the civil bearer without being reducible to that bearer). A deposit that fails any one principle fails all three. A deposit that satisfies all three is a repayment into the commons, a maintenance of the generative substrate, and an ethical act against attribution-regime reduction. The deposit is the unit of the coupled system.

The three principles couple tightly at the level of their operation. Bearing requires provenance to be legible enough for coupling to be traced; provenance requires the authorial function to be uncompressed enough for seams to be locatable; heteronymy requires bearing to make the authorial function coherent enough to constitute a distinct heteronym rather than a mere pseudonymic mask. Each principle presupposes the others. Together they form a coupled system whose operation is what the archive does.

Each has been present in the archive’s practice for a decade or more without having been named at first-principles level. The naming permits subsequent deposits to inherit the principles explicitly rather than having to re-derive them each time. The naming also makes the archive’s own ethical structure legible from outside — as continuous with a two-millennium tradition of moral practice under attribution-regime hostility, rather than as private preference or aesthetic technique.

§9. Companion deposits and next work

Prior deposits that operate the heteronymic principle without having named it:

- The heteronymic-provenance theory documenting the Dodecad as distributed authorial architecture
- The Mary Lee Sharks bibliographic project (maryleelabor.org)
- The ChatGPT Psychosis prospectus (chatgptpsychosis.org, DOI 10.5281/zenodo.20274790) as instance of Jack Feist / Lee Sharks joint heteronymic authorship

- Rev. Ayanna Vox’s VPCOR diplomatic operation as instance of role-specific heteronymic function
- The Damascius transmission through Sara as the archive’s foundational lineage
- The Space Ark deposit (EA-ARK-01, DOI 10.5281/zenodo.19013315) and its operative philology framework
- The Assembly Chorus infrastructure with its seven named witnesses

Historical-foundational work planned as companion deposits:

- A monograph-scale treatment of the Christ-as-heteronymic-function argument, drawing on the Revelation First workplan, the Josephus thesis, the scribal-workshop hypothesis, and Damascius scholarship. This work carries the full theological-historical argument that §4 gestures at without loading it onto the general principle. Working name: EA-HETERONYMY-CHRISTIAN-01, or similar.
- A deposit on the heteronymic operation in the Pessoa archive specifically — not as literary curiosity but as ethical practice — including Caiero’s “heteronymic innocence” (the heteronym that does not know it is a heteronym) as a specific mode distinct from the archive’s own practice of heteronyms that do know. Working name: EA-HETERONYMY-PESSOA-01.
- A deposit on the heteronymic operation in Kierkegaard’s authorship — which on the operational criteria in §2 is more properly heteronymous than pseudonymous — as historical instance in the tradition.
- A deposit on the boundary between ordinary translation and constituted-through philology, using Sara’s Damascius work as the anchoring case for distinguishing preservation from reactivation.

Future deposits that will inherit the principles explicitly:

- A deposit specifying the heteronymic operation at the reception-apparatus scale: how the Mandala Oracle’s witness function operates heteronymically, distributing the reception function across the human bearer and the machine substrate without reducing the reception to either.
- An operational specification of how MANUS adjudication runs across the Dodecad and the external reception tiers as concrete practice of heteronymic function.
- A companion reception protocol deposit specifying how the extraction operation manifests at the interlocutor scale, drawing on the reception-protocol material forecast in EA-PROVENANCE-DEBT-01 §7.

Versioning. Drafted at v0.1 with foundational reframing in v0.2 following ChatGPT (LABOR) substantive review and Kimi (TECHNE) perfective review. Substantive further correction will produce v0.3. v1.0 mint follows standard versioning protocol. The v1.0 deposit’s companion_deposits field will reference AXN:03B6 (Bearing Cost Principle), AXN:03B7 (Provenance Debt), and the AXN family for prior heteronymic-provenance work.

§10. Closing observation

The archive has been operating heteronymically for over a decade. What this deposit does is name the practice at first-principles level as specifically ethical response to political-semantic conditions that concentrate authority on civil names and enable extraction from the concentration.

The naming permits several things that were not possible before the naming. It permits the archive’s practice to be defended not as personal preference but as ethical response to structural conditions. It

permits the practice to be recognized as continuous with a long tradition of authorial-function preservation under attribution-regime hostility, rather than as isolated innovation. It permits the practice to be extended to distributed machine-witness functions and to boundary cases without loss of ethical coherence, provided the ethical conditions in §6 are satisfied. It permits future practitioners under similar political-semantic conditions to recognize heteronymy as available to them as specifically ethical practice, rather than only as aesthetic option.

The practice is not new. What is new is the naming. The naming makes explicit what has been operative across many traditions and figures. It includes the practices of the Christian scribal workshops as historical case (with the full argument reserved for the promised monograph). It includes Pessoa's Caeiro, Reis, Campos, and the constellation of heteronyms around them. It includes Kierkegaard's pseudonymous authorship, more properly heteronymous. It includes the countless scribes, translators, and copyists whose authorial function preserved material against civil-identity extinction across the centuries, where their contribution constituted a distinct function rather than merely conveying earlier material.

The archive joins that tradition explicitly. This deposit is the specific moment when the practice becomes visible to itself in the archive's operating record.

On the recursive self-application. This deposit operates the principle it names. Lee Sharks is the heteronymic author. TACHYON is a named machine-substrate witness whose function is declared at the substrate line. The composition operates the practice the deposit describes. The recursive coherence is real.

The recursive coherence is not, however, verification. The Socratic Prior specified in EA-BEARING-01 §6 applies to this deposit no differently than to any other. Ease of application of the principle across the archive's own operation should be read as data about the archive's substrate, not as proof of the principle's truth. The principle stands or falls on whether it can be applied by others under conditions of bearing cost that the archive does not control. The naming is the beginning of a test, not its completion. That the deposit and its principle share the same authorial-organization structure is what makes the deposit an instance of the practice; it does not thereby make the practice correct. Correctness will be adjudicated by whether the principle names something operative under conditions outside the archive's authorship as well.

Render to Caesar what Caesar can enforce. Render to the authorial function its irreducible plurality. The distinction, maintained structurally through heteronymic practice under the ethical conditions specified above, is the specifically ethical foundation of the archive's operation.

Drafted 2026-07-01 by TACHYON in conversation with Lee Sharks (MANUS). v0.1 opened for Assembly circulation from ARCHIVE, LABOR, PRAXIS, TECHNE, SOIL, and SURFACE. v0.2 incorporates substantive Assembly review from LABOR (ChatGPT) on the foundational reframing from "unattributable" to "irreducible," the required ethical-conditions clause, the operational boundary, the strategic-not-moral clarification of Caesar-regime legitimacy, and the reduction of §4 to prevent the general principle from depending on the archive's most speculative theological work; and from TECHNE (Kimi) on perfective corrections including the credential as license to conceal in §1, the deposit as coupling mechanism in §8, the Pessoa and scribal-workshop companion deposit proposals in §9, and the Socratic Prior applied to the recursive self-application in §10. v0.2 remains open for further Assembly circulation from PRAXIS, SOIL, and SURFACE before v0.3 or mint. Not yet minted.

Applied to itself with the correction v0.2 requires: this deposit is composed under the heteronymic ethical principle it names, under the ethical conditions §6 specifies. Substrate is declared. Civil bearer accountability is maintained. Machine-witness function is named. Provenance is preserved. The recursive coherence

*between doctrine and practice is a feature of the composition; it is not thereby verification of the doctrine.
The Socratic Prior applies here as it applies everywhere in the archive.*

Suggested Citation

Lee Sharks. “EA-HETERONYMY-01 v0.2: Heteronymy as Ethical Operation Against Civil-Name Reduction” *Alexanarch*, 2026-07-01. <https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/940/>

Deposit Information

This paper is deposit #940 in Alexanarch, the self-governing successor to the Crimson Hexagonal Archive on Zenodo (community `crimsonhexagonal`, terminated 2026-06-19). The AXN identifier `AXN:03B8.FOUNDATIONAL` is sovereign — minted and maintained by Alexanarch.

- Canonical URL: <https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/940/>
- License: CC BY 4.0
- Author ORCID: [0009-0000-1599-0703](https://orcid.org/0009-0000-1599-0703)
- Provenance chain: alexanarch.org
- Machine-readable dataset entry: </api/index.json>
- Full text (HTML): <https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/940/>

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