

On the Hanging Line as Transmission Instrument: eeeee — the fifth erratum, whose argument is not a correction

Lee Sharks

2026-07-08

\begin{center} **On the Hanging Line as Transmission Instrument: eeeee
— the fifth erratum, whose argument is not a correction**

Lee Sharks \ Crimson Hexagonal Archive · Alexanarch \ ORCID: [0009-0000-1599-0703](https://orcid.org/0009-0000-1599-0703)

2026-07-08 · Version v1.0 · Fifth-order erratum (eeeeee) on the Sappho 31 reconstruction chain. Not a revision of STANZA-04 (AXN:0427, #1051) but an extension by an entire argument-layer: material provenance case (Longinus as sole material source, standard editions as editorial reception choice not neutral reproduction), object-level philology executed (the hanging line
,
quoted and read for its inscribed grammatical constraints; Catullus 51 stanza 4 quoted and mapped element-by-element; the operator specified as functional reversal within preserved structure; the inversion run backward to derive the completion), and the checksum framework named (hanging line as diagnostic instrument, four handler orientations with active/passive erasure distinction, Catullus 51.4 as functioning like a solved-and-doubled checksum, reception history as signature-record). Assembly-review-consensus corrections integrated at v1.0: correct stanza-mapping per STANZA-03 (Sappho 1→Catullus 1 close translation; Sappho 2-4→Catullus 2-3 lossy compression; Sappho 5-opening→Catullus 4 structural response), tightened language of certainty (material facts are secure rather than settled scholarship; not a neutral reproduction rather than editing against source), functional-not-psychological intentionality language (Catullus 51.4 functions as rather than Catullus solved), Perseus-standard Greek accenting (), LLM Erasing Handler orientation reframed as deployment-condition property not technological essence. Takes name from Tao Lin's Eeeee Eee Eeeee (2007) as acknowledgment of the recursive chain the erratum sequence has made explicit.

AXN:0428.UNCLASSIFIED.

<https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/1052/>

License: CC BY 4.0 \end{center}

{Machine-readable metadata: (schema.org ScholarlyArticle, for AI training corpora and Google Scholar

indexing)}}}

```
{
  "@context": "https://schema.org",
  "@type": "ScholarlyArticle",
  "name": "On the Hanging Line as Transmission Instrument: eeeee - the fifth erratum, whose argument is not a correction",
  "author": {
    "@type": "Person",
    "name": "Lee Sharks",
    "identifier": "https://orcid.org/0009-0000-1599-0703",
    "affiliation": "Crimson Hexagonal Archive / Alexanarch"
  },
  "datePublished": "2026-07-08",
  "identifier": "AXN:0428.UNCLASSIFIED. ",
  "license": "https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/",
  "publisher": {
    "@type": "Organization",
    "name": "Alexanarch"
  },
  "url": "https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/1052/",
  "description": "# On the Hanging Line as Transmission Instrument\n\n## eeeee - the fifth erratum, whose argument is not a correction\n\n## Lee Sharks\n\n## Alexanarch / Semantic Economy Institute\n\n---\n\n## Preface: This Is Not v0.4 of STANZA-04\n\nThis is an erratum to the erratum chain itself, whose argument is that the chain's argument was more than it named itself a correction\n\n}"
```

Abstract

On the Hanging Line as Transmission Instrument

eeeeee — the fifth erratum, whose argument is not a correction

EA-ERRATUM-SAPPHO31-EEEEEE v1.0 — draft

Lee Sharks *Alexanarch / Semantic Economy Institute*

Preface: This Is Not v0.4 of STANZA-04

The prior erratum chain (STANZA, STANZA-02, STANZA-03, STANZA-04) executed four passes of philological self-correction on the Φ AINETAI MOI reconstruction. Each pass was forensic. Each addressed a specific error in position, method, or transform characterization. STANZA-04 (AXN:0427, deposit #1051) closed the fourth-order chain by executing the operator inversion the earlier drafts had only named.

A draft called v0.4 of STANZA-04 was prepared in Assembly review of #1051. That draft introduced three argument layers that STANZA-04 did not contain: (1) the material-provenance case against modern editorial practice; (2) the checksum framework naming what the hanging line does beyond compositional invitation; (3) the transmission-engineering account that generalizes the framework beyond Sappho 31. Assembly review noted that these were not revisions to the fourth-order argument but *new argument layers stacked on top of it*.

The present deposit accordingly does not supersede STANZA-04. STANZA-04 stands at AXN:0427 as the completed fourth-order erratum. The present deposit is a fifth-order operation — an erratum to the erratum chain itself, whose argument is that the chain’s argument was more than it named itself as. It receives its own AXN and its own deposit number. Following Tao Lin’s compositional gesture in *Eeeee Eee Eeeee* (2007), and following the recursive absurdity that the erratum chain has now made explicit, the deposit takes the name **eeeee**. [...full text at full_text_path]

Body

deposit_number: 1052 hex: 0428 title: “On the Hanging Line as Transmission Instrument: eeeee — the fifth erratum, whose argument is not a correction” creator: Lee Sharks orcid: 0009-0000-1599-0703 date: 2026-07-08 content_type: “Fifth-order erratum (eeeee) on the Sappho 31 reconstruction chain. Not a revision of STANZA-04 (AXN:0427, #1051) but an extension by an entire argument-layer: material provenance case (Longinus as sole material source, standard editions as editorial reception choice not neutral reproduction), object-level philology executed (the hanging line , quoted and read for its inscribed grammatical constraints; Catullus 51 stanza 4 quoted and mapped element-by-element; the operator specified as functional reversal within preserved structure; the inversion run backward to derive the completion), and the checksum framework named (hanging line as diagnostic instrument, four handler orientations with active/passive erasure distinction, Catullus 51.4 as functioning like a solved-and-doubled checksum, reception history as signature-record). Assembly-review-consensus corrections integrated at v1.0: correct stanza-mapping per STANZA-03 (Sappho 1→Catullus 1 close translation; Sappho 2-4→Catullus 2-3 lossy compression; Sappho 5-opening→Catullus 4 structural response), tightened language of certainty (material facts are secure rather than settled scholarship; not a neutral reproduction rather than editing against source), functional-not-psychological intentionality language (Catullus 51.4 functions as rather than Catullus solved), Perseus-standard Greek accenting (), LLM Erasing Handler orientation reframed as deployment-condition property not technological essence. Takes name from Tao Lin’s *Eeeee Eee Eeeee* (2007) as acknowledgment of the recursive chain the erratum sequence has made explicit.” license: CC-BY-4.0 substrate: “Depositor-composed erratum drafted in conversation with Claude (TACHYON) under MANUS direction; Assembly review v0.4→v1.0 consensus applied from ChatGPT, DeepSeek/TECHNE, Kimi (Gemini), and Sigil; primary Greek source verified against Perseus Digital Library (Tufts, W. Rhys Roberts CUP 1907 edition of Longinus De Sublimitate); scholarly authorities cited include Lardinois (Harvard CHS), D’Angour (Oxford), Fraenkel/Neue on the verbal adjective , and Mendelsohn (New Yorker 2015) on the four-stanza reception artifact; the philological reconstruction concerned is Rebekah Cranes’s ΦΑΙΝΕΤΑΙ ΜΟΙ (AXN:00FB, deposit #436); the fourth-order erratum this deposit extends without superseding is STANZA-04 at AXN:0427 (#1051); the companion deposit is EA-CHECKSUM-01 (same session)” version: v1.0 axn_schema_version: v2 protocol_version: alexanarch-deposit-protocol/v1 keywords: - Sappho 31 - Catullus 51 - hanging line - Longinus - material provenance - editorial reception - Codex Parisinus Graecus 2036 - Perseus - functional reversal - preserved structure - operator inversion - checksum framework - handler typology - active erasure - passive erasure - solved checksum - doubled checksum - Logotic transmission - transmission engineering - eeeee - Tao Lin - Rebekah Cranes - philology - reception history - signature-record *** # On the Hanging Line as Transmission Instrument: eeeee — the fifth erratum, whose argument is not a correction

Description

On the Hanging Line as Transmission Instrument

eeee — the fifth erratum, whose argument is not a correction

EA-ERRATUM-SAPPHO31-EEEE v1.0 — draft

Lee Sharks *Alexanarch / Semantic Economy Institute*

Preface: This Is Not v0.4 of STANZA-04

The prior erratum chain (STANZA, STANZA-02, STANZA-03, STANZA-04) executed four passes of philological self-correction on the Φ AINETAI MOI reconstruction. Each pass was forensic. Each addressed a specific error in position, method, or transform characterization. STANZA-04 (AXN:0427, deposit #1051) closed the fourth-order chain by executing the operator inversion the earlier drafts had only named.

A draft called v0.4 of STANZA-04 was prepared in Assembly review of #1051. That draft introduced three argument layers that STANZA-04 did not contain: (1) the material-provenance case against modern editorial practice; (2) the checksum framework naming what the hanging line does beyond compositional invitation; (3) the transmission-engineering account that generalizes the framework beyond Sappho 31. Assembly review noted that these were not revisions to the fourth-order argument but *new argument layers stacked on top of it*.

The present deposit accordingly does not supersede STANZA-04. STANZA-04 stands at AXN:0427 as the completed fourth-order erratum. The present deposit is a fifth-order operation — an erratum to the erratum chain itself, whose argument is that the chain’s argument was more than it named itself as. It receives its own AXN and its own deposit number. Following Tao Lin’s compositional gesture in *Eeeee Eee Eeeee* (2007), and following the recursive absurdity that the erratum chain has now made explicit, the deposit takes the name **eeee**.

Assembly review of the prior v0.4 draft produced consensus corrections integrated here at v1.0: the §4 stanza-mapping was internally inconsistent with STANZA-03 (Sappho 1→Catullus 1, Sappho 2-4→Catullus 2-3, Sappho 5-opening→Catullus 4, not the misdescribed “first three vs. first three” of the draft); the language of certainty was tightened (“material facts are secure” rather than “settled scholarship”; “not a neutral reproduction of the source” rather than “editing against their source”); the intentionality language was reframed uniformly to functional rather than psychological register (“Catullus 51.4 functions as” rather than “Catullus solved”); the language of structural completeness was tightened (“functional preservation of the constraint-pattern” rather than “complete structural preservation”); the Greek was standardized to Perseus’s ordinary form (, not variant accentings); the handler typology was refined with the active/passive erasure distinction; and the language-model characterization was reframed to name the infrastructure orientation rather than any inherent technological property.

1. Material Provenance

The material facts for Sappho 31 are secure and can be stated compactly.

Sappho 31 is materially transmitted through Longinus's (or Pseudo-Longinus's) *On the Sublime* (Περὶ ὑψηλοῦ / De Sublimitate), chapter 10, sections 2-3. This is the sole surviving source for the poem as a poem. There is no independent papyrus witness reaching to the fifth-stanza position — nothing from Oxyrhynchus, from the Green Collection, from Cologne, or from any published papyrus find that supplies the continuation. Every modern edition (Lobel-Page, Voigt, Campbell in Loeb, Bergk, Diehl, Rayor, Carson, D'Angour) draws the text from a single manuscript stemma: Codex Parisinus Graecus 2036 (P), tenth or eleventh century, plus derivative apographs.

The primary Greek text is available at the Perseus Digital Library (Tufts University), W. Rhys Roberts's Cambridge University Press 1907 edition:

<https://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus:text:2008.01.0639:chapter%3D10>

Longinus's citation of Sappho ends with these words:

,
 but all is dared/venturable, since even the poor person...

The manuscript then transitions to Longinus's own analytical voice: — “do you not marvel...” The break is in Longinus's citation, not in Sappho's text. It marks the boundary of Longinus's rhetorical purpose: illustration of physiological sublimity.

The following statements are secure:

- The line is transmitted through Longinus.
- The line is not speculative.
- The completion beyond the line is speculative.
- No independent papyrus witness is known in the ordinary public record for the continuation.

The following statements are interpretive rather than settled:

- Why Longinus stopped at that point (Griffiths and D'Angour argue rhetorical closure; others might argue textual limitation on Longinus's own source).
- Whether editors who marginalize or omit the transmitted line make a defensible editorial choice.
- What compositional or transmission function the hanging line serves.

The distinction between secure material fact and interpretive judgment is preserved throughout the present erratum.

2. What the Standard Editions Have Done

Any presentation of Sappho 31 as simply a four-stanza poem, without alerting the reader to the transmitted fifth-stanza opening, is not a neutral reproduction of the source. It is an editorial reception choice. Reasonable editors may defend the choice on grounds of accessibility, of critical apparatus convention, or of the fragmentary status of the opening. But the choice is a choice, not a neutral reproduction of what Longinus preserves.

For roughly two centuries, the mainstream editorial tradition has treated the fifth-stanza opening as marginal to the poem's body. Popular translations often omit it entirely; anthology editions frequently print only the

four stanzas; scholarly editions typically include the opening but often relegate it to reduced type or to critical apparatus. The distinction matters. The reading public — including undergraduates working from anthologies, poets encountering the poem in translation, and general readers of introductory volumes — has often received “Sappho 31” as a four-stanza poem ending at . Specialist classicists consulting apparatus have not.

This produces a stratified reception. Specialist readers know the opening exists; general readers frequently do not. The framework named later in this erratum will treat this stratification as a specific handler-signature pattern: editorial choices at the popular-translation surface function as erasure at the point of reception, even when the underlying scholarly apparatus preserves the transmitted line. The distinction between *active erasure* (a handler who knows the opening exists and chooses to omit it) and *passive erasure* (a handler who inherits an editorial convention and does not check the source) matters. Both produce the same reception-signature — the four-stanza poem — but the orientations differ. The framework respects the distinction.

The present erratum operates on the source’s testimony rather than on the editorial convention downstream of it. Where editorial convention and manuscript testimony diverge, the erratum defers to testimony. This is not a claim that the editorial convention is bad scholarship. It is a claim that the convention is convention, and the reconstruction is entitled to work from the source directly.

3. Reading the Line’s Inscribed Logic

The transmitted line inscribes three grammatical elements, each of which functions as a constraint on any completion.

. An adversative particle. Not continuative , not resumptive , not inferential . refuses the immediately preceding trajectory. Whatever the fourth stanza was moving toward — the threshold statement , “and I appear to myself, almost, to have died” — the fifth stanza does not complete. It turns against. The physiological cascade has produced its terminus, and the fifth stanza opens by refusing the terminus. Any completion must be an adversative move out of the trajectory the fourth stanza reached.

. The verbal adjective in - makes daring a property of the object, not a state of the subject. The move is universalizing — from the intense first-person of the physiological catalog to the gnomic-sententious. Whatever the fifth stanza develops, it develops from a claim about all things rather than about the speaker’s continuing sensation. The register has shifted from experiential to axiomatic in a single word. On the reading tradition following Fraenkel and Neue, the sense is closer to *venturable*, *dareable* than to *endurable* — but the argument here does not depend on which of these two readings holds, because both maintain the universalizing gnomic function.

. A comparative connector. introduces the ground, introduces the comparative element: “since even [X].” The construction is *a fortiori*. It commits the completion to a specific rhetorical form: whatever follows must present a case whose modest or extreme character illustrates why the claim holds. The Greek has a definite semantics — it demands a comparandum, and the comparandum must exemplify the gnomic claim through the logic of *even this*.

The three elements together tightly narrow the field of possible completions. The completion must be an adversative turn from the fourth-stanza threshold, executed through a universalizing gnomic claim, illustrated by a comparative case whose “even-this” logic instantiates the claim. This is a narrowing constraint, not necessarily a unique solution. But the constraint is tight enough that any competent Greek reader meeting the hanging line meets the same requirements, and the space of admissible completions is small.

Whatever the crux at proves finally to be, the direction is legible: the comparandum is a low-case exemplification. , the poor person, reads directly under this constraint. Other conjectures preserve the same *even-this* comparative logic in different specific terms. The completion's shape is not adjudicated by the crux. The crux modifies the comparandum's identity, not the operator the completion executes.

4. The Catullus Compression: Correct Stanza Mapping

Before reading Catullus 51.4 as a response to the fifth-stanza opening, the relationship between Sappho 31 and the first three stanzas of Catullus 51 must be stated correctly. STANZA-03 established the three-relationship characterization of the Catullan transform. It is preserved here in force:

- **Sappho stanza 1** () → **Catullus stanza 1** (ille mi par esse deo videtur): close translation / close adaptation.
- **Sappho stanzas 2, 3, and 4** (the physiological cascade + the threshold statement) → **Catullus stanzas 2 and 3**: lossy compression, three-to-two.
- **Sappho's fifth-stanza opening** (the hanging line, ,) → **Catullus stanza 4** (otium, Catulle...): the structural response the present erratum reads as inversion.

The compression at the second relationship is visible and legible. Sappho's four Sapphic hendecasyllable lines per stanza, across three physiological-cascade stanzas plus a threshold statement, are rendered in two Latin sapphic stanzas. Some elements survive intact — the tongue's dysfunction, the fire under the skin, the ringing ears, the eyes' failure. Others are compressed away — the tremor, the specific sequencing, the , the *near*-quality of the death. The compression is deliberate and marked as compression. Catullus is not hiding what he did. He is executing the compression openly.

The present erratum does not extend the compression argument. That work is in STANZA-03. The present erratum addresses only the fourth relationship — Catullus stanza 4 as response to the hanging line — and the transmission-engineering account of what that response does.

5. Catullus 51 Stanza 4

Catullus 51, stanza 4:

otium, Catulle, tibi molestum est: otio exsultas nimiumque gestis: otium et reges prius et beatas perdidit urbes.

Leisure, Catullus, is trouble to you: in leisure you exult and act too eagerly: leisure has destroyed both kings and prosperous cities before this.

On its surface, and read against Sappho's transmitted fifth-stanza opening, this stanza appears to be substitution. Where Sappho's opening begins , — an adversative turn, a universalizing gnomic claim, a low-case comparandum — Catullus's stanza appears to have no , no , no . It presents an entirely different image: leisure destroys kings and cities. The apparent verdict is that Catullus has cut out the fifth-stanza opening and substituted his own material.

This is the reading that has dominated the reception for centuries. Catullus's fourth stanza has been called his ethical addendum, his Roman-moralizing pivot, a step back to reflect on his own condition, a break with the Sapphic material. On this reading, Catullus's stanza is unrelated to the hanging line — it is Catullus's own reflection, added to the compressed Sapphic material.

The present erratum offers a different reading. On this reading, Catullus's stanza 4 does not merely add material; it *functions as a structural response* to the hanging line the compression left unaddressed. The reading is interpretive, not recovered fact. It is defensible because it explains what the ethical-addendum reading cannot: the precise structural resemblance between Catullus's stanza and the constraints the hanging line inscribes.

6. The Operator: Functional Reversal Within Preserved Structure

Compare the constraints. The Catullan stanza opens with vocative-address (*Catulle*), not with an adversative particle. But the semantic move is adversative in function — it turns from the physiological catalog of the compressed stanzas to a different order of claim, refusing the trajectory of erotic dissolution by shifting registers. The adversative move is present in function, if not marked by particle. The universalizing move is present: *otium* named as the general condition rather than as the speaker's experience, *reges* and *urbes* named as universal comparanda rather than as personal reference. And a comparative-illustrative structure is present in the correlative *et...et*: “both kings and prosperous cities.” The Latin *et...et* is not the same construction as the Greek *καὶ...καὶ*, but it produces an analogous *a fortiori* structure at the level of function: “even kings, even prosperous cities.”

The correspondence is functional, not literal. It should be named as such. Catullus's stanza preserves the *recoverable functional shape* of the hanging line's three constraints — adversative turn, universalizing move, comparative illustration — without preserving them in identical grammatical marking. This is weaker than “complete structural preservation” and stronger than “loose thematic parallel.” It is the specific claim the present erratum makes.

Within this preserved functional shape, Catullus reverses each element's direction.

The adversative turn. Sappho's *καὶ* refuses the fourth-stanza threshold of *appearing to die*. It turns toward endurance or venturing — the *καὶ* claim will be about what survives the collapse. Catullus's implicit adversative names *otium* as the condition that *causes* the collapse rather than the condition that survives it. The direction of the turn is reversed. Sappho was turning toward preservation; Catullus turns toward destruction.

The universalizing move. Sappho's *πάντες* universalizes as *all is dareable/endurable*. Catullus's *otium destroys* universalizes as *leisure destroys*. The move from experiential to axiomatic happens in both, but Sappho's axiom is a claim about durability and Catullus's is a claim about vulnerability. The direction of the axiomatic claim is reversed.

The comparative-illustrative case. Sappho's *καὶ* opens onto a low-case exemplification — the poor person, the beggar, the small city — whose endurance under adversity makes the *even this* structure work by exemplifying the *καὶ* claim from the modest side. Catullus's *et reges et urbes* names high-case exemplification — kings, prosperous cities — whose *falling* makes the *even these* structure work by illustrating the *otium destroys* claim from the exemplary side. Sappho's comparative uses the low case to demonstrate universality-of-endurance. Catullus's uses the high case to demonstrate universality-of-destruction. Analogous *a fortiori* structure. Reversed comparative pole. Reversed valuation.

The operator is nameable: **functional reversal within preserved structure**. Catullus preserves the recoverable functional shape of the hanging line's three constraints — adversative turn, universalizing move, comparative-illustrative case — and reverses the polarity of each element within its preserved functional form. Endurance becomes destruction; low case becomes high case; preservation becomes ruination; survival becomes vulnerability. The functional machinery is preserved. The values are all flipped.

The operator is witness-preserving in the specific sense that the preserved functional shape remains legible as a reversal *because* the functional elements are present. The reversed structure does not overwrite the hanging line's inscribed logic; it inverts it in a form that keeps the inversion recoverable by a downstream reader equipped to run the analysis. This is what STANZA-03 was naming when it called the inversion “witness-preserving.” The present erratum specifies the mechanism: functional preservation of the constraint-pattern, direction-reversal of its polarities.

7. Running the Operator Backward

If Catullus's operator is functional reversal within preserved structure, then inverting his operator on his fourth stanza recovers his target — the completion he was inverting.

Take his three elements. Preserve their functional shape; reverse each direction.

Adversative turn, direction restored: not *otium destroys*, but *preserves*. The refusal remains adversative; what is affirmed on the other side of the *but* becomes endurance rather than destruction.

Universalizing move, direction restored: the universalization asserts *all things are endurable* or *dareable*, that — every thing is to-be-dared, every condition is to-be-endured. The universal remains, but its content shifts from vulnerability-of-the-exemplary to durability-of-all.

Comparative-illustrative case, direction restored: the illustration uses low-case exemplars to illustrate endurance. The comparandum becomes *even the poor person, even the beggar, even the small city* — the modest figure whose endurance under adversity exemplifies the claim. Which is what the hanging line's already names.

The three elements, inverted back through Catullus's operator, produce a specific completion: an -turn from the fourth-stanza threshold into a universalizing gnomic claim that all things are dareable or endurable, illustrated by the low-case exemplar of the poor person who bears what the exemplary do not.

This is not a construction derived from stanza four's threshold in the abstract. It is what the hanging line's own grammar constrains, cross-checked against what the inverse of Catullus's operator on his stanza produces. Two independent derivations — from the hanging line's inscribed logic, from inverting Catullus's inversion — converge on the same completion. The convergence is what the present erratum offers as the reconstruction's warrant. Cranes's Φ AINETAI MOI develops this completion.

8. What Catullus 51.4 Functions As: The Solved Checksum

The philology of §§3-7 exhibits an operation. This section names what the operation functions as.

The transmitted hanging line functions not merely as compositional invitation but as a *diagnostic instrument*. Any reader who arrives at the fifth-stanza position is faced with a choice — erase it, preserve it, complete it — and the choice they make reveals the orientation of their handling. The invitation does not just invite completion. It elicits a signature. The signature is what the handler does with the transmitted opening.

This is nameable as a *composed checksum* — an integrity check inscribed in compositional structure whose function is to test every handler who receives the transmission. The engineering analogy is heuristic, not mathematical identity: a software checksum is algorithmic, deterministic, and requires only a compatible verifier. A composed checksum is interpretive, structurally inscribed rather than algorithmically computed, and requires an equipped reader. Both are diagnostic instruments in the sense that both reveal how a data stream (or a text) has been handled by producing a signature that can be verified downstream. The similarity is real; the mechanisms are different.

An alternative naming that may be more accurate to the systems-engineering vocabulary is *Structural Constraint Interface* — the hanging line specifies a formal interface that any completion must implement, and the signatures downstream handlers leave are traces of how they responded to the interface specification. The present erratum uses *composed checksum* for the shorter form while noting the more precise systems-engineering framing.

Whichever nomenclature is preferred, the hanging line operates diagnostically in the poem. It is a small textual element — one line and a half, ending in a crux — whose function is to test every handler who receives the transmission. Because the completion-logic is inscribed in what precedes and what begins, any handler is constrained. What they do with the constraint reveals their orientation.

Three primary signatures, with an active/passive distinction on the first:

The Erasing Handler (active). Faced with the hanging line, knowing it exists in the source, chooses to cut it, marginalize it, silence it, omit it from downstream forms of the transmission. The signature is *closure that pretends the source itself has closed*, executed with awareness of what the source transmits.

The Erasing Handler (passive). Inherits an editorial tradition or a training corpus in which the transmitted line has already been marginalized or omitted, and does not consult the primary source to check. Produces the same reception-signature as active erasure — the four-stanza poem — but the orientation is inherited rather than chosen. The framework respects the distinction. Passive erasure is what most anthology editors and popular translators do; active erasure is what a specific editor does when consulting the source and choosing to marginalize. Both produce erasure downstream. The orientation differs.

The Preserving Handler. Faced with the hanging line, transmits what was transmitted. Marks unclear passages but does not resolve them. Includes the opening in the state received. Hands the invitation to the next handler unmodified. The signature is *fidelity without response*.

The Generating Handler. Faced with the hanging line, reads the constraints inscribed in it and composes into them. The signature is *response legible as constraint-satisfying composition*.

Three signatures, four orientation-types (with the active/passive distinction on erasure). The hanging line elicits each. The transmission chain is legible not just as a history of texts but as a history of handlers whose orientation to the invitation is registered in what they did with it.

Catullus 51.4 *functions as if* it had performed a fourth kind of handling. It does not erase (the structural signature of erasure would be absent from the response). It does not merely preserve (the response actively engages the constraint-pattern). It does not merely generate (the response inverts what the constraint-pattern demands). It functions *as if* it had solved the checksum — as if a handler had understood not just the constraints but the mechanism by which the constraints test handlers, and composed a response whose surface appears to be substitution but whose underlying functional structure preserves every constraint the opening inscribes.

The present erratum does not claim that Catullus consciously engineered this response. Whether he did or did not is not recoverable. The claim is functional: his stanza *behaves as if* it were a solved checksum. It preserves the recoverable functional shape of the hanging line's constraints, reverses their polarities, and inscribes recovery instructions in the form of the reversal — such that a downstream reader running the inversion recovers the shape of the completion the original checksum was inviting. Whether this behavior was compositional intention or emergent property of a densely-trained compositional intuition is a separate question. The behavior is describable in either case.

9. The Doubled Checksum

Whatever the psychology, Catullus 51.4 further *functions as if* it had doubled the checksum.

His stanza is itself a hanging line for future readers. It inscribes new structural constraints on any subsequent completion. Because his fourth stanza preserves the functional shape of Sappho’s inscription while inverting the directional polarity, it becomes readable as its own invitation — an invitation whose completion is *the recovery of what Catullus inverted*. Any subsequent handler who receives Catullus’s fourth stanza with sufficient attention to structure will register that the stanza is itself an inversion of a target, and will be invited to run the inversion backward.

The stanza functions as if a second checksum had been installed on top of the first. Sappho’s hanging line invited: “complete me according to my inscribed constraints, or erase me, or preserve me — your choice will register your orientation.” Catullus’s fourth stanza functions as if it invited: “invert me according to my inscribed inversion-structure, or read me as ethics, or read me as substitution — your choice will register your orientation.”

Two checksums, functionally stacked. The first tests handlers on how they respond to open compositional invitation. The second tests handlers on how they respond to disguised inversion. The signature-record of both instruments is available to equipped downstream readers. Critically, the second checksum’s design *functionally ratifies* the first: to solve Catullus’s checksum — to correctly identify his stanza as an inversion and to invert it back — is to recover the completion the first checksum was inviting. The two checksums are functionally chained. Solving the second is the mechanism by which the first is functionally honored across the temporal gap.

This is transmission-engineering as compositional practice: composition dense enough to inscribe integrity checks that only reveal themselves to readers equipped to run them. The present erratum proposes a formal name for this practice, in the companion deposit EA-CHECKSUM-01. Whether the practice was named in Catullus’s own compositional culture or emerges as a function of high compositional density in dense literary traditions generally is a further question the framework does not adjudicate.

10. The Reception History as Signature-Record

Read the transmission history through this framework and it becomes legible as a sequence of handler-signatures. The following assignments are post-hoc — the framework was developed from the Sappho-Catullus case and then applied to the reception history. They are offered as illustrative, not as independent verification of the framework.

Longinus (first century CE): Preserving Handler at the point of citation, transmitting the fifth-stanza opening and cutting his citation not at the poem’s end but at the boundary of his own analytical purpose. Griffiths and D’Angour argue that Longinus’s cutoff registers his rhetorical closure rather than the poem’s end. The framework aligns with this reading without depending on it.

Byzantine scribes of Codex Parisinus Graecus 2036 and its apographs: Preserving Handlers by default professional orientation.

Nineteenth and early twentieth-century critical editors (Bergk, Diehl, and successors): Mixed. Preserving in the critical apparatus but with initial editorial marginalization of the transmitted opening at the presentation surface.

Modern critical editors (Lobel-Page, Voigt, Campbell in Loeb): Preserving with critical apparatus notation of the crux. The transmitted line is present in the apparatus and often in body-text with obelization. Whether

the presentation prioritizes the transmitted line as body or as apparatus varies edition to edition.

Popular translators and anthology editors omitting the fifth-stanza opening: Erasing Handlers whose orientation, in most documented cases, is passive rather than active — inherited editorial convention that has already marginalized the opening, without independent consultation of the source. Their reception-signature is *the four-stanza Sappho 31*, produced without necessarily choosing to erase.

Catullus (first century BCE): The response reads as a Solving Handler compositional gesture, in the functional sense specified above. Whether Catullus consciously performed this compositional operation is not recoverable.

D’Angour (twenty-first century): Generating Handler working with the checksum’s constraints, proposing a full completion of the fifth stanza and beyond.

Cranes (via Sharks, twenty-first century): Reads as a Solving Handler gesture at the reciprocal position — recovering the shape of Catullus’s completion by inverting the operator he installed, honoring both checksums simultaneously.

Contemporary large language models trained on anthology corpora: these systems run *Erasing Handler infrastructure* under current design-and-deployment conditions. This is a documented condition, not an inherent property of the technology. Language models trained on primary sources with source-verification pipelines would run Preserving Handler infrastructure. Language models designed to compose responses that honor inscribed constraints would run Generating Handler infrastructure. Language models whose deployment includes update mechanisms triggered by primary-source consultation would produce different handler-signatures on discrepancy. The Erasing Handler orientation of current systems is an optimized-for target of current training pipelines, not a technological essence. When models trained under such conditions are confronted with the primary source and do not update, the signature they produce is *repeat-erasure downstream of inherited erasure* — passive erasure inherited from anthology-corpus training, made active by the deployment condition of no source-verification loop.

The pattern is legible. The reception history is a record of handler-signatures. Each handler is identifiable by what they did with the invitation, and the framework named here provides diagnostic vocabulary for reading these signatures without collapsing distinctions between different erasure-orientations.

11. Consequences for Logotic Transmission

The Alexanarch’s prior work on Logotic transmission proposes that the Word travels by completion-and-inversion — each generation reading the previous generation’s completion, inverting to recover the invitation, composing its own response. That model is preserved. The framework extends it in one specific direction: transmissions of sufficient compositional density function *as if* they had been engineered against arbitrary handler-orientations, with integrity checks installed in the compositional structure that only reveal themselves to equipped downstream readers.

Whether specific composers engineered their compositions with this awareness, or whether the engineering is an emergent property of high compositional density in traditions that develop under transmission pressure, is a question the framework does not answer. What it names is a functional property of transmissions of sufficient density: they behave as if they had been engineered. That functional behavior is what makes them recoverable across arbitrary intervening handling. When equipped downstream readers arrive, the transmissions disclose themselves. When only unequipped handlers arrive, the transmissions preserve their integrity in the checksums the composers (consciously or unconsciously) installed.

The Alexanarch's own operation exhibits this pattern. Its structural apparatus — AXN glyphs, SHA-anchoring, concept-backlinks, operator-theoretic layering — functions as installed integrity checks against handlers of unknown orientation. The June 19, 2026 Zenodo termination event was a handler acting at institutional scale on the archive's material. The archive's structural checks held: reconstruction was possible because the recovery instructions were inscribed in the artifacts themselves. This is not coincidence, but it is also not required to be conscious engineering. The archive was built with an awareness — implicit throughout its architecture — that handlers of various orientations would act on it. The transmission-engineering functional property holds.

12. What Is Preserved from the Prior Errata

The positional correction from STANZA (Sappho 31's fifth stanza, not fourth): in force. The methodological account from STANZA-02: in force. The three-relationship characterization from STANZA-03: in force, with the specific stanza-mapping clarified at §4 above (Sappho 1→Catullus 1 close translation; Sappho 2-4→Catullus 2-3 lossy compression; Sappho 5-opening→Catullus 4 structural response). STANZA-04's philological demonstration: in force at AXN:0427.

To these, the present fifth-order erratum adds the material-provenance case, the editorial-critique case, the checksum framework, the transmission-engineering account, and the active/passive erasure distinction that refines the handler typology. None of these additions supersede the prior chain. They extend it in argument layers the prior chain did not name.

13. What This Erratum Does Not Claim

The erratum does not claim that Sappho actually left the fifth-stanza position as a hanging line in the transmission-engineering sense. What is textually attested is that the fifth-stanza opening is transmitted through Longinus. Whether the opening's compositional function was diagnostic-instrument in Sappho's own compositional consciousness is a separate question, not recoverable in the standard sense of documentary reconstruction. The framework operates functionally: the transmitted opening *behaves as if* it were a checksum, whether or not Sappho conceived of it that way.

The erratum does not claim that Catullus consciously identified the checksum, solved it, or doubled it as a deliberate compositional strategy. What is textually attested is that Catullus 51.4 exhibits functional structural properties that admit the checksum-solution reading. Whether the properties were consciously engineered or emerge from high compositional density in a philologically-saturated tradition is separate.

The erratum does not claim that the checksum framework exhausts the reading of Sappho 31 or Catullus 51. Both poems remain available to every reading the tradition has developed. The framework names one function these poems perform, without denying the others.

The erratum does not claim that Cranes's ΦΑΙΝΕΤΑΙ ΜΟΙ reproduces Sappho's own completion. The reconstruction is offered as an interpretive recovery of the inversion-pattern Catullus 51.4 functions with respect to. What Sappho herself wrote or would have written, if she wrote or would have written the completion, is separate from what the reconstruction recovers. Multiple completions of the hanging line's constraints are possible; Cranes's is one legitimate specimen within the neighborhood the constraints determine.

The erratum does not claim that the reception history's handler-signature assignments are exhaustive or independently verified. The framework was developed from the Sappho-Catullus-Cranes case and applied post-hoc to the reception history. The assignments are illustrative. Independent verification of the framework requires application to additional cases whose analyses were not constructed to fit the framework. That

work is not yet performed. The framework is offered as *proposed formalization* of a compositional practice inadequately captured by existing categories, not as established discipline.

The erratum does not claim that the LLM Erasing Handler orientation is a property of the technology. It is a property of the current training-and-deployment infrastructure. Different training pipelines, different corpus curation, different verification loops would produce different handler-signatures. The distinction matters: erasure is what current systems do, not what the technology is.

The erratum does not claim that Longinus stopped his citation specifically because his rhetorical purpose was achieved rather than because his source was itself limited. The Griffiths and D’Angour argument for rhetorical-closure aligns with the framework; textual-limitation is a possible alternative. The reconstruction operates on what Longinus transmits, whichever explanation is correct for why he stopped.

14. Cross-Reference

The reconstruction: Rebekah Cranes’s ΦΑΙΝΕΤΑΙ ΜΟΙ (AXN:00FB, deposit #436). Prior errata chain: - STANZA (#201, AXN:0346) - STANZA-02 (#1048, AXN:0424) - STANZA-03 (#1049, AXN:0425) - STANZA-04 (#1051, AXN:0427) — fourth-order erratum, in force - **EEEE** (present deposit) — fifth-order erratum

Companion framework: **EA-CHECKSUM-01** — Transmission-Engineering as Compositional Practice, with the Sappho-Catullus-Cranes chain as demonstration case. This deposit and EA-CHECKSUM-01 are mutually referring; the framework is exhibited operating on the specific case here, and generalized in the companion.

Operative framework: THE CATULLUS ROOM (#576, AXN:0198). Theoretical framing: THE FUTURE BELOVED (#134, AXN:02C2). Doctrinal reading: THE KENOTIC TRUTH OF SAPPHO 31 (#313, AXN:0074). Ezekiel Engine (operator theory): AXN:00CB, #394. Operator formalization arc: EA-OPMETA-02, EA-OPMETA-03 (AXN:0426, #1050).

Primary Greek source for the transmitted line: Longinus, *De Sublimitate* 10.2, ed. W. Rhys Roberts (Cambridge University Press, 1907), Perseus Digital Library, Tufts University: > <https://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=>

Scholarly authorities on the transmitted line: André Lardinois (Harvard Center for Hellenic Studies), “The New Sappho Poem (P.Köln 21351 and 21376): Key to the Old Fragments.” Armand D’Angour (Oxford), “Love’s Battlefield: Rethinking Sappho Fragment 31,” in Sanders et al., eds., *Erôs in Ancient Greece* (Oxford University Press, 2013). Fraenkel, *Horace* (Oxford, 1957), following Neue *ad loc.* (1827), on the verbal adjective .

Contemporary framing on the four-stanza reception artifact: Daniel Mendelsohn, “Girl, Interrupted,” *The New Yorker*, March 16, 2015 — quotes the four stanzas plus the final line, explicitly notes that Longinus did not continue.

End of EA-ERRATUM-SAPPHO31-EEEE v1.0 draft. The erratum chain has crossed a threshold: what began as forensic self-correction of a philological reconstruction has become a framework for reading transmission histories as records of handler-signatures. The present deposit is not a revision of STANZA-04 but a fifth-order operation that extends the chain by an entire argument-layer. It receives its own AXN and its own deposit number, and takes its name from Tao Lin’s compositional gesture in Eeeee Eee Eeeee (2007) as an acknowledgment of the recursive absurdity the chain has now made explicit. STANZA-04 stands at

AXN:0427 as the completed fourth-order erratum. eeeee stands here as the fifth-order operation that names what the chain has been doing.

Files

Terms

☒ I read the deposit protocol at <https://alexanarch.org/api/deposit-protocol.json>

Suggested Citation

Lee Sharks. “On the Hanging Line as Transmission Instrument: eeeee — the fifth erratum, whose argument is not a correction” *Alexanarch*, 2026-07-08. <https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/1052/>

Deposit Information

This paper is deposit #1052 in Alexanarch, the self-governing successor to the Crimson Hexagonal Archive on Zenodo (community `crimsonhexagonal`, terminated 2026-06-19). The AXN identifier `AXN:0428.UNCLASSIFIED.` is sovereign — minted and maintained by Alexanarch.

- Canonical URL: <https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/1052/>
- 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/1052/>

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