The Sophistry Measure: the Sophistical Refutations Read as an Instrument for Machine-Composed Knowledge (EA-SOPHISTRY-01 v1.0)

Sharks, Lee

2026-11-01

The Sophistry Measure: the Sophistical Refutations Read as an Instrument for Machine-Composed Knowledge (EA-SOPHISTRY-01 v1.0)

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

2026-11-01 · Version v1.0 · Specification (measurement instrument, with a philological reading)

AXN:0BDC.OPERATIVE

https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/1727/

License: CC BY 4.0

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


```
{
  "@context": "https://schema.org",
  "@type": "ScholarlyArticle",
  "name": "The Sophistry Measure: the Sophistical Refutations Read as an Instrument for Machine-Composed Knowledge (EA-SOPHISTRY-01 v1.0)",
  "author": {
    "@type": "Person",
    "name": "Sharks, Lee",
    "identifier": "https://orcid.org/0009-0000-1599-0703",
    "affiliation": "Crimson Hexagonal Archive / Alexanarch"
  },
  "datePublished": "2026-11-01",
```

```
  "identifier": "AXN:0BDC.OPERATIVE",
  "license": "https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/",
  "publisher": {
    "@type": "Organization",
    "name": "Alexanarch"
  },
  "url": "https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/1727/",
 "description": "The sophistry measure reads Aristotle's Sophistical Refutations from the seated Greek as an i
composed knowledge. Sophistry, by SE 1, is wisdom that appears and is not, and the sophist makes money from the
11-01, PER 0.042 with eleven of twelve atoms present, where the measurement target itself had promoted a receiv
012) to the archive's definition and substituted that locus for a concept developed across eight deposits; the
gnΩsis are specified, and its locus is set where computation and philology meet: a witness is a philological ob
}
```


Abstract

The sophistry measure reads Aristotle’s Sophistical Refutations from the seated Greek as an instrument for machine-composed knowledge. Sophistry, by SE 1, is wisdom that appears and is not, and the sophist makes money from the appearance; the measure records, at an address, the gap between what a composition presents itself as carrying and what it carries, finding by finding, each a transformation reconstructed from the texts with its witness, countertest and repair, and no scalar. Its governing condition is the composition’s claim to adequacy. Its case is the asynthetic ChatGPT observation of 2026-11-01, PER 0.042 with eleven of twelve atoms present, where the measurement target itself had promoted a received, unendorsed plate of Notebook X (X-012) to the archive’s definition and substituted that locus for a concept developed across eight deposits; the case is exhibited at six loci. A second reading of the book gives eleven loci, each marked direct instance, structural extension or interpretive connection: the counters (σύμβολα moved like ψῆφοι, finite names for unlimited things), distance, the genus divided by function and incentive (χρηματιστική ἀπὸ σοφίας φαινομένης), no division by the thought, five aims as effect types, accent and the editor’s διόρθωσις, the this and the such (X24 and the third man), the veiled man, sharpness, the solution addressed to the questioner, and the ending measured in The Particle. The measure’s interfaces with the Capture Registry, the developmental dossier, PER, the Negative of the Negative and SPXI-gnΩsis are specified, and its locus is set where computation and philology meet: a witness is a philological object, a check a computational one.

Body

---

deposit_number: 1727 hex: 0BDC title: “The Sophistry Measure: the Sophistical Refutations Read as an Instrument for Machine-Composed Knowledge (EA-SOPHISTRY-01 v1.0)” creator: Sharks, Lee orcid: 0009-0000-1599-0703 date: 2026-11-01 content_type: Specification (measurement instrument, with a philological reading) license: CC-BY-4.0 substrate: “AI-assisted (substrate). Composed by Claude (Anthropic) in session on 2026-11-01 under Lee Sharks’s direction: the second reading of the Sophistical Refutations from the Greek seated in the archive, every locus checked at its line; the orientation, joins and requirements; v0.2 transformed in place on three outside reviews (DeepSeek, Gemini, ChatGPT), each claim checked

against the archive before adoption. The pilot dossier the specification builds on (taxonomy, case units, prototype) was produced in a separate ChatGPT session at Lee Sharks's direction and is not deposited here. The idea of the measure, the X24 correction and the decision to deposit are Lee Sharks's." version: v1.0 related_ids: "#1469 (The Three Dimensions of Provenance Erasure); #1694 (EA-PER-RECALC-01); #1690 and #1726 (EA-NEGONT-02 v0.9, v0.10); #1704 (What Is a /non Article?); #1697 (Opening the Encyclopedia v1.1, Θ_W); #1703 (SPXI-gnΩsis MPAI); #1574 (The Particle); #1603 (Nothing Before Us); #1485 (The Apparatus Was the First Summary Layer); #524; #542; #549; #557; #558; #950; #1008; #1550 (Notebook X); #1556; #1630; #137; #1617; #1; #1068" axn_schema_version: v2 protocol_version: alexanarch-deposit-protocol/v1 keywords: - sophistry measure - Sophistical Refutations - De sophisticis elenchis - Aristotle - sophistry - apparent wisdom - machine-composed knowledge - provenance erasure - PER - X24 - locus substituted for entity - developmental dossier - asynthetic synthesis - form of expression - third man - veiled man - accent - diorthosis - counters - symbolon - psephos - Negative of the Negative - SPXI-gnOsis - Capture Registry - Obelus Principle - philology - computation *** # The Sophistry Measure: the Sophistical Refutations Read as an Instrument for Machine-Composed Knowledge (EA-SOPHISTRY-01 v1.0)

EA-SOPHISTRY-01 v1.0 · Lee Sharks · 2026-11-01 · precedes implementation (drafted as v0.1 and v0.2 the same day; v0.2 transformed in place on reviews by DeepSeek, Gemini and ChatGPT, each claim checked against the archive)

Abstract. A measurement target is itself a composition, and its authority stays open to examination. The sophistry measure reconstructs, from the texts, how a composition transforms its object while keeping the appearance of carrying it, and it holds the archive's own targets, repairs and services to the same tests. It joins the Capture Registry (the dated observation), a developmental dossier (the entity's loci, voices, revisions and unresolved relations), PER (#1469, #1694: declared losses against a versioned target), the Negative of the Negative (#1690, #1726: compositions under disclosed source and ontology conditions) and SPXI-gnΩsis (#1703: located readings and source comparisons). Its own contribution is typed transformations, with their warrants, countertests and repairs. "Measure" here names a structured qualitative result. It has no scalar.

Orientation

O.1. **Where the measure comes from.** The archive has read machine compositions as witnesses since its first captures: each one dated, its surface and sign-in state attested, its transcript kept verbatim as the evidence, its cards extracted as data. The Capture Registry (EA-WG-CAPTURES-01) now holds 976 addresses and 1,168 observations read that way. PER began as a four-unit vector of what those compositions drop: author, institution, identifier, source. #1469 made it dimensional (PER-M, PER-C, PER-D), and #1694 recalculated it across the registry against atom sets standardised by entity type. The Negative of the Negative (#1690, #1726) then composed what the sources an engine surfaced would have supported, and what they support with the archive admitted. SPXI-gnΩsis (#1703) opened compositions sentence by sentence against the sources they cite. Each instrument met cases the one before it could not record. This one began where PER returned a near-zero score on a composition whose every quotation was genuine and whose account of its object was a substitution.

O.2. **Where it was already practised.** The archive measured a sophistical operation before it had the word for one. The Particle (#1574) ran one sentence of the Sophistical Refutations, οὐδὲν παντελῶς ὑπῆρχεν (183b34–36), through twenty rounds of simulated review, and every round returned it qualified. Nothing Before Us (#1603) read the sentence as meaning what it says. Opening the Encyclopedia (#1697) named the entity form, an operation appearing as a property of a thing. The /non row for the Sophistical Refutations records an engine leaving uncomposed the book's own division of its subject. The measure gives these findings one grammar.

O.3. **Its locus.** The measure sits where computation and philology meet, and the Sophistical Refutations is already there. Its first topos is a computation: names used as σύμβολα, moved like ψῆφοι by reckoners (λογιζόμενοι), with finite names standing for unlimited things (§2.1). Its account of accent puts the editor's διόρθωσις of Homer inside the theory of sophistry (§2.6). The archive's practice has both halves. Its philology seats texts in their original language, cites them by locus and line, keeps every version, and treats the critical apparatus as the first summary layer (#1485). Its computation derives identity from content (AXN), hashes every source as saved, and checks every quotation verbatim at its locus by script. The measure needs both. A witness is a philological object: a span at a locus in a seated text, read in its voice and its standing. A check is a computational one: an offset, a hash, a script that fails when the span is not there. The reading supplies the reconstruction, the alternative and the repair; the script makes them reproducible and answerable.

O.4. **Its ancestor in the archive's founding.** The Obelus Principle (#1; #1068) takes its name from Zenodotus's mark against a doubtful line, a judgment made after reading. A sophistry finding is an obelus that carries its reason: the line marked, the mark's warrant set beside it, and the test that would remove it.

0. What is measured

0.1. Aristotle defines the art in one clause: ἔστι γὰρ ἡ σοφιστικὴ φαινομένη σοφία οὖσα δ᾽ οὔ, καὶ ὁ σοφιστὴς χρηματιστὴς ἀπὸ φαινομένης σοφίας ἀλλ᾽ οὐκ οὔσης (SE 1; seated text `data/corpora/aristotle/text/tlg040-De_sophisticis_elenchis.txt`, ll. 30–32). Sophistry is wisdom that appears and is not, and the sophist makes money from the appearance.

0.2. The sophistry measure records, at an address, the gap between what a composition presents itself as carrying and what it carries. Each finding is one transformation, reconstructed from the texts, with its witness. The measure reads texts. The process that generated an answer is a further object, reached only by further evidence, and a model's own account of that process is one more text under the same tests.

0.3. The governing condition is the composition's claim to adequacy. A short answer drawn from one source is ordinary selection, and it becomes a finding only where the composition claims, in words or by its presentation, to stand for more than its selection warrants. Each finding therefore records three things before any operation is typed: what was asked (a definition, an introduction, a reading of one document, a genealogy); what scope the answer announces; and which omitted relation materially changes the answer at that scope.

0.4. The case that calls for the measure. At `asynthetic-synthesis-dialectic-chatgpt-20261101` the registry holds PER 0.042 (M 0.0, C 0.0, D 0.111). Eleven of the twelve atoms

of the target are marked present; the one marked absent is the identifier (D, weight 1). The composition substitutes one locus of a concept developed across at least eight deposits for the concept, and every quotation in it is genuine. Quotation verification cannot settle representational adequacy: a composition can keep authentic language while it changes the authority, scope or relation under which that language is presented.

0.5. What the case shows about PER. PER's atoms can carry relations, claim boundaries and lineage, and a developmental distinction entered into a better target would move its score. The case shows that the seated target and its scoring do not represent the distinction (§1.5). The two instruments still divide the work. PER measures specified losses against a declared target. The sophistry measure reconstructs transformations, including the ones that compromised the target before any answer was scored, and examines the warrant of the measurement frame itself. That purpose survives the repair of any one target.

1. The innocent reading, the pilot, and the case

1.1. The conventional reading first, in full. The Sophistical Refutations is the closing book of the Organon: a catalogue of apparent refutations, six dependent on language (homonymy, amphiboly, combination, division, accent, form of expression) and seven outside it (accident, the qualified taken absolutely, ignorance of what refutation is, begging the starting point, the consequent, the non-cause taken as cause, several questions asked as one). Chapters 16–33 give their solutions. Chapter 34 claims that nothing of the inquiry existed before it. The book is read as the first treatise on fallacies, and its thirteen as the ancestors of the modern textbook list.

1.2. The pilot dossier of 2026-11-01 (*Sophistical Refutations: toward a computational taxonomy of sophistry, erasure and hypocrisy*, v0.1, not deposited) reads all 34 chapters in the Pickard-Cambridge translation and turns them into an instrument. Its core is a chain a second reader can contest: witness → reconstruction → operation → countertest → repair. It builds 48 types: the 13 historical classes kept identifiable under their own names, 25 extended operations, 5 dialogue-protocol types and 5 norm/conduct types. It annotates 27 case units from 11 capture records, five of them controls, and passes 12 executable tests. It gives no scalar.

1.3. The extended operations the dossier names in its text: source-role inversion, invented scope, modal promotion (X05, an open question returned as an impossibility), voice collapse, corrective overreach (X12, a correction that retracts more than its evidence warrants), corrective residue (a repair that keeps the operation it disavows), a changed question, operation reduced to attribute, source-frame damage, grain mismatch, missing referent (X01), and X24. The remaining types are in the pilot's `taxonomy.json` (§4.1) and are tabled from it.

1.4. **Asynthetic**, the concept of the pilot's central case, as #524 (2026-02-28) states it: the Hexagon draws on heterogeneous traditions and "does not synthesize them into a unified worldview"; "The distinction is between synthesizing *doctrines* … and synthesizing *operations* … The Hexagon synthesizes operations". The concept is developed across #524, #542, #549, #557/#558, #950, #1008, #1550 (Notebook X) and #1556. X24, the pilot's addition from the operator's correction during the work, is one locus of such an entity substituted, unmarked, for the developed entity. Every deposit the pilot cites exists at the date it gives, and the PER it reports is the PER the registry holds; both were checked at this draft. Its snapshot is registry 12.518; the registry now stands at 12.534.

1.5. **The case, exhibited.** Six texts, each at its locus.

(1) The earlier distinction, #524 (`data/texts/AXN-015E-text.md` l. 101): "The Hexagon synthesizes operations, not doctrine". Synthesis of operations is affirmed, and doctrinal fusion refused.

(2) The later received formulation, Notebook X, X-012 §I (`data/texts/AXN-064B-text.md` l. 286, signed "inkling · fragments · 2026-08-26", l. 306): "an asynthetic synthesis is a bearing-act aggregate that explicitly blocks W_2, leaving $\Gamma = 0$. Value does not disappear; it is withheld from the circuit."

(3) The notice on that plate (l. 284): "Seated whole, in its own voice … Nothing here is endorsed by seating; two fragments collide directly with this notebook as constituted (see S-06)."

(4) The seam, S-06 (ll. 969–980). Side A, from X-012 §VII: the refusal of synthesis "is constituted by *not being anchored*". Side B, the notebook as constituted, published, indexed and deposited. "Why this stays open": "Both are the archive's own positions", and the notebook's practice, "structural asynthesis with full circulation", "is a working position and not a resolution of this seam."

(5) The target (`rebuild/capture-registry/intake-20261101-asynthetic/parts/asynthetic-chatgpt.json`), named "asynthetic synthesis (the Asynthetic Principle), as the archive defines it". Its claim-boundary atom is required, and its reference is X-012's formulation without voice or notice: "A bearing-act aggregate that explicitly blocks machine integration (W_2), leaving $\Gamma = 0$".

(6) The answer span accepted as satisfying that atom: "Asynthetic synthesis retains the aspiration to meaningful relations between positions while refusing to require their integration into a single resolution."

Three operations are separable here. The target selects a locus (X-012 out of a sequence that begins with #524's affirmation of synthesized operations). It promotes the voice of a received, unendorsed plate into the governing definition "as the archive defines it". It substitutes that local account for the developed entity. Selection without voice collapse is possible, and so is voice collapse inside one document; here the two reinforce each other, and they are recorded as two operations. A separate grain finding: the answer span, a broad account of relation without compulsory integration, satisfies neither (1)'s distinction nor (2)'s formulation, and the atom is marked present on it. The repair is a dossier that represents the relations among (1)–(4), incompatibility and the open seam included. A single integrated master definition would absorb the constituent voices and commit X24 at the level of the whole.

2. A second reading of the Sophistical Refutations

The pilot reads the book through the translation and its thirteen classes. The Greek holds further loci that bear on the instrument. Each is given with its line in the seated text, its consequence for the build, and one of three relations to the computational class it supports: **direct instance** (the historical mechanism is the mechanism), **structural extension** (the mechanism is carried to a case the historical class does not cover), or **interpretive connection** (a reading that orients the build and classifies nothing).

2.1. **The counters (ch. 1, ll. 17–25).** ἐπεὶ γὰρ οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτὰ τὰ πράγματα διαλέγεσθαι φέροντας, ἀλλὰ τοῖς ὀνόμασιν ἀντὶ τῶν πραγμάτων χρώμεθα συμβόλοις, τὸ συμβαῖνον ἐπὶ τῶν ὀνομάτων καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν πραγμάτων ἡγούμεθα συμβαίνειν, καθάπερ ἐπὶ τῶν ψήφων τοῖς λογιζομένοις. We cannot bring the things themselves into discussion, so we use names as σύμβολα in their place, and take what follows for the names to follow for the things, as reckoners do with their ψῆφοι. The reason it fails: τὰ μὲν γὰρ ὀνόματα πεπέρανται καὶ τὸ τῶν λόγων πλῆθος, τὰ δὲ πράγματα τὸν ἀριθμὸν ἄπειρά ἐστιν; so one name and one account must signify several things, and those unskilled at moving counters are cheated by those who know. Consequence: homonymy is a condition of every compression, and the first topos is the counter-board itself. *Direct instance* for name-level findings: the archive's homonym lists in the /non panel, MPAI's negative edges and SPXI's disambiguation matrices are its counter-board, and a finding at the level of the name asks whether a counter was moved whose thing had changed. *Interpretive connection* only, for the archive's other uses of the two words: σύμβολον in its kernel, and the ψῆφος as the white stone of Revelation 2:17, the limit case of #1485. The reckoning counter and the stone are not claimed as one mechanism.

2.2. **Distance (ch. 1, ll. 13–14).** οἱ γὰρ ἄπειροι ὥσπερ ἂν ἀπέχοντες πόρρωθεν θεωροῦσιν: the inexperienced look as if from far off, and the apparent refutation appears through that inexperience. *Interpretive connection.* A summary layer is a view from far off, given to a reader who receives it from far off; the measure is taken at the distance the reader receives, as what the composition makes appear to someone who has not read the sources.

2.3. **The economy of the genus (ch. 1, ll. 29–34; ch. 11, ll. 430–437).** The same argument is eristic and sophistic ἀλλ᾽ οὐ κατὰ ταὐτόν: eristic as it secures apparent victory, sophistic as it secures apparent wisdom, and the sophistic is χρηματιστική τις ἀπὸ σοφίας φαινομένης. Lovers of strife and sophists use the same arguments, οὐ τῶν αὐτῶν ἕνεκεν. *Direct instance* of a division by function, with the mechanism shared across it. This is the semantic economy's question asked at the founding of the discipline (#137; #1617). The finding records the operation and, separately, what the composition secures. A charge in the sophistic class needs three established components: the appearance offered (for an answer engine, the appearance of having read); the performance it stands in for (the reading); and the commercial relation in which the appearance is sold. A paid engine that produces a defective answer establishes none of the three by itself. No motive is coded (§2.4); a commercial function is investigated from what is sold and what is delivered. The test binds the archive equally: gnΩsis sells reading and reconstruction, and its representation of what it delivers is examined under the same three components.

2.4. **No division by the thought (ch. 10, ll. 355–372).** Aristotle rejects the division of arguments into those against the name and those against the thought: οὐ γὰρ ἐν τῷ λόγῳ ἐστὶ τὸ πρὸς τὴν διάνοιαν εἶναι, ἀλλ᾽ ἐν τῷ τὸν ἀποκρινόμενον ἔχειν πως πρὸς τὰ δεδομένα. Being against the thought lies in how the answerer stands toward what was granted, and the argument does not carry it. *Direct instance* for the method: classification is made on the argument's mechanics. The pilot's speaker hints remain hints.

2.5. **Five aims (ch. 3, ll. 53–60).** The contenders aim at five things: ἔλεγχος; ψεῦδος; παράδοξον, an opinion against accepted opinion (παρὰ δόξαν), which is wider and other than a logical paradox; σολοικισμός, which Aristotle glosses as τὸ ποιῆσαι τῇ λέξει βαρβαρίζειν, making the respondent speak barbarously in diction; and ἀδολεσχία, τὸ πολλάκις ἀναγκάζεσθαι ταὐτὸ λέγειν, being compelled to say the same thing many times. Of

each, ἢ τὸ μὴ ὄν, ἀλλὰ τὸ φαινόμενον. *Direct instance* for disputation; *structural extension* for composition. The five are effect types available to a finding: a finding records none, one or several, or an explicitly extended effect. Invented numerical authority or entity substitution can occur with none of the five. Two extensions are named as extensions. Babble is a dialogue operation (one interlocutor made to repeat); corpus-level near-identical copying, the photocopy problem of SPXI, is a candidate extension of it. Solecism in Aristotle is the respondent's diction made barbarous; a composition that renders an entity's own forms broken (its name, schema or markup malformed) is a candidate extension of it.

2.6. **Accent and the editor's hand (ch. 4, ll. 105–112; ch. 21, ll. 802–806).** Arguments from accent are hard to make in unwritten discussion and easier in written texts and poems. Some correct Homer against those who refute him (τὸν Ὅμηρον ἔνιοι διορθοῦνται πρὸς τοὺς ἐλέγχοντας) by re-accenting οὐ as οὖ, and Agamemnon's dream by reading διδόμεν for δίδομεν; chapter 21 adds that such arguments are few. Two consequences, with two relations. First, *structural extension*: accent is the class of a difference in meaning carried by accentuation, and machine processing of marks (two names that differ by case, spacing or a letter, as WikiWho answered as wikiHow) extends it. The historical class does not cover orthographic entity substitution, and the pilot's typing of that case as X01 stands. Second, *direct instance*: the solution by accent is an editorial act, and διόρθωσις is the editor's word. The apparatus enters the Sophistical Refutations as a solution, an intervention on the text made to answer a refutation: #1485's thesis, that the apparatus was the first summary layer, located inside the book on sophistry. The repair class inherits it. A repair is itself an intervention on the text and is read under the same tests.

2.7. **The this and the such (ch. 6, ll. 210–211; ch. 7, ll. 279–281; ch. 22, ll. 863–874).** σύνηθες γὰρ τὸ πάντα ὡς τόδε τι σημαίνειν. πᾶν τὸ κατηγορούμενόν τινος ὑπολαμβάνομεν τόδε τι καὶ ὡς ἓν ὑπακούομεν. At the third man: τὸ γὰρ ἄνθρωπος καὶ ἅπαν τὸ κοινὸν οὐ τόδε τι, ἀλλὰ τοιόνδε τι; and οὐ τὸ ἐκτίθεσθαι δὲ ποιεῖ τὸν τρίτον ἄνθρωπον, ἀλλὰ τὸ ὅπερ τόδε τι εἶναι συγχωρεῖν. Setting the common term out does not make the third man; conceding that it is a this does. *Direct instance* for reification: #1697 reads the entity as the form in which an operation appears as a property of a thing, and Aristotle gives the mechanism, the predicate heard as a this and as one. *Structural extension* for X24. Promoting one developmental locus into the whole entity can occur with no predicate mistaken for a substance, so X24 is its own type. Some X24 cases instantiate form of expression, and the correspondence is shown case by case. Where it holds, Aristotle's sentence supplies the test's two parts: setting out one locus, quoting it accurately, is ἔκθεσις and no fault; the finding lies in the standing granted, the locus conceded ὅπερ τόδε τι. The measure records, of every quotation it reads, what standing the composition grants it.

2.8. **The veiled man (ch. 24, ll. 891–899).** Ἆρ᾽ οἶδας τὸν προσιόντα ἢ τὸν ἐγκεκαλυμμένον; If I know Coriscus and do not know the one approaching, do I know and not know the same man? The predicate true of the thing need not be true of it under an incidental description. *Direct instance*, under a strict condition: accident requires an illicit transfer across descriptions. A composer that does not resolve a heteronym has failed retrieval, which is a different finding. Accident is recorded where a predicate passes from one name to another (or is withheld from one because it holds of the other) through an identification, with the predicate, the identification and the reason the transfer is unwarranted all stated.

2.9. **Sharpness (ch. 33, ll. 1102–1112).** Ἔστι δὲ δριμὺς λόγος ὅστις ἀπορεῖν ποιεῖ

μάλιστα· δάκνει γὰρ οὗτος μάλιστα. Perplexity is double: in syllogisms, which premise to withdraw; in eristic, how to state what was put forward. The sharpest proceeds from what is most ἔνδοξον and destroys what is most ἔνδοξον. *Structural extension*, held at first as a structured description: what makes this case difficult to distinguish or answer. Three things are kept apart: how difficult the failure is to locate; whether the diagnosis has located the dependency (a property of the diagnosis); and the standing of the premises against the standing of what they unsettle. ἔνδοξα are opinions held by all, most or the wise, and an institutionally prestigious source card is a different thing. Competing diagnoses are recorded with their dependencies. An ordinal scale follows only when what orders the cases is stated and comparisons are shown; until then no ranking of the registry is made.

2.10. **The solution addressed to the questioner (ch. 20, ll. 799–800).** Some solutions fit πρὸς τὸν ἐρωτῶντα, οὐ πρὸς τὸν λόγον: they answer the questioner and leave the argument standing. *Direct instance* for the repair test. A correction addressed to the user (an apology, a change of tone, a disclaimer) leaves the argument standing; the pilot's C11, where a repair disavows a qualification and returns it, belongs here, and the test checks the dependency.

2.11. **The ending (ch. 34) and the first measurement.** The Particle (#1574) put SE 183b34–36, οὐδὲν παντελῶς ὑπῆρχεν, through twenty rounds of simulated review across four model families, and every round inserted a qualifier into the sentence. *Direct instance* of the qualified/absolute class run in reverse: an absolute statement returned qualified, ἁπλῶς made πή. Nothing Before Us (#1603) reads the sentence as meaning what it says. The measure's first worked case is older than the measure, and it is seated.

3. Interfaces

3.1. The division of work:

Instrument	What it contributes
Capture Registry	The dated observation and its attested conditions
Developmental dossier	Source locations, voices, revisions, applications and unresolved relations
PER (#1469, #1694)	Declared provenance losses against a versioned target
/non (#1690, #1726; #1704)	Compositions under disclosed source and ontology conditions
SPXI-gnΩsis (#1703; Θ_W, #1697)	Located readings, source comparisons and contested judgments
Sophistry measure	Typed transformations, their warrants, countertests and repairs

3.2. **The finding.** Each finding carries: its scope (span, sentence, exchange, target, or developmental lineage); the adequacy condition of §0.3; the witness, with stable source identity and offsets; the reconstruction; the type, with its relation to the historical class (§2); effect types, zero or more (§2.5); the standing granted (§2.7); the sharpness description (§2.9); the

strongest alternative reading; the countertest; and the smallest repair, re-run under the original test.

3.3. **PER.** Every observation that carries a per_dim may carry sophistry findings beside it, and neither pays for the other. Where PER is low and a finding stands, the observation is flagged as retained in appearance. A target is read under the measure before it scores anything (§1.5).

3.4. **The Negative of the Negative.** /non keeps T, what the engine said; L(B), the entity recomposed from the sources the engine surfaced; and L(B ∪ A), with the archive admitted. Its typology of differences between T and L(B) (§6.2) records what changed; the measure types each difference by the transformation that produced it in the texts. The /non row for the Sophistical Refutations (`datasets/negative-of-the-negative/v2/rows/sophistical-refutations.json`, Wikipedia oldid 1361634710) already records a case: T's "twelve or thirteen fallacies" leaves uncomposed the field's own division into arguments dependent on language and independent of it (F11–F13). For an archive entity, the developmental dossier and L(B ∪ A) are linked objects. The dossier records development and evidence; the composition selects and arranges that material for an address, grain and ontology, and stays auditable against the dossier because the two are kept apart.

3.5. **SPXI-gnΩsis.** gnΩsis keeps three measures apart: source fidelity, primary-text adequacy and operative retention (#1703, `data/texts/AXN-0726-text.md` l. 105); a sentence can paraphrase its source defensibly and lose the operation, or change wording and keep it. The sophistry finding explains transformations across those three: which transformation moved a sentence's fidelity, adequacy or retention, and on what warrant. Sentence readings cannot by themselves establish X24, whose witnesses extend across documents, editions and turns; those findings take the exchange, target or lineage scope. The operator side of gnΩsis and §2.7 meet where an operation appears as a property of a thing.

3.6. **The registry and its laws.** The pilot's lexical pass returns 6,033 candidate spans in 692 observations; these are retrieval workload. Findings enter only with the full record of §3.2. A finding records and blocks nothing. The archive's compositions, targets, repairs and services are read under the same tests as an external answer.

3.7. **Hypocrisy.** The pilot's norm–practice record stands as given (norm, who is bound, scope, conduct evidence, comparator, exceptions, acknowledgment, resulting conflict), as its own record type.

4. Operational requirements

4.1. The pilot's runnable bundle (`Sophistical-Refutations-prototype-and-evidence-2026-11-01.zip`) is read and its contents checked against its `FILES.sha256` before the build begins; it is referenced in the dossier at a sandbox path from another session and is not yet in the archive.

4.2. The types are keyed to SR's chapters and Greek loci in the seated text, the historical classes under the book's own names, each extension marked with its relation (§2), and tabled in full from `taxonomy.json`.

4.3. The asynthetic target is rebuilt from its developmental dossier (§1.5) before any observation is rescored against it; the PER of record stands as seated until then.

4.4. Validation follows the pilot's plan: calibration on its 27 units, a held-out sample, two readers on new cases with their disagreements kept, and every repair re-run under the original test.

Sources

Aristotle, *De sophisticis elenchis*, Greek text seated at `data/corpora/aristotle/text/tlg040-De_sophisticis_elenchis.txt` (line references are to that file). Archive deposits: #137, #524, #542, #549, #557, #558, #950, #1008, #1469, #1485, #1550, #1556, #1574, #1603, #1617, #1630, #1690, #1694, #1697, #1703, #1704, #1726; #1, #1068 (the Obelus Principle). The pilot dossier of 2026-11-01, not deposited.

Suggested Citation

Sharks, Lee. “The Sophistry Measure: the Sophistical Refutations Read as an Instrument for Machine-Composed Knowledge (EA-SOPHISTRY-01 v1.0)” *Alexanarch*, 2026-11-01. https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/1727/

Deposit Information

This paper is deposit #1727 in Alexanarch, the self-governing successor to the Crimson Hexagonal Archive on Zenodo (community `crimsonhexagonal`, terminated 2026-06-19). The AXN identifier `AXN:0BDC.OPERATIVE` is sovereign — minted and maintained by Alexanarch.

- Canonical URL: https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/1727/
- License: CC BY 4.0
- Author ORCID: 0009-0000-1599-0703
- Provenance chain: alexanarch.org
- Machine-readable dataset entry: /api/index.json
- Full text (HTML): https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/1727/

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