

Preserving Claim Revisions in Records of AI-Assisted Philosophical Inquiry

Wanhong HUANG
huangwanhong@serendip.ngo

Abstract

Philosophical claims can change through dialogue, source encounters, objections, and editorial work. A final article presents the current argument, while leaving much of that development outside its scope. This paper develops a proposed documentary architecture for preserving consequential claim revisions in AI-assisted philosophical inquiry. It distinguishes inquiry events, available traces, chronological records, analytical commentary, and stabilized articles. The architecture retains three functions: preserving the documented course of inquiry, interpreting its development, and presenting the currently defended argument. Selected antecedents in Plato’s dialogue framing, scholarly text encoding, provenance representation, and oral-history ethics clarify the proposal’s scope. A minimal typed graph separates temporal order, documentary derivation, and argumentative relations. A finite construction shows how selective release can remove an indirect documentary connection even when its endpoints remain public; a separate counterexample distinguishes recorded sequence from intellectual causation. The analysis derives proportionate responsibilities for fidelity, disclosure, and correction from explicit normative premises, with privacy and legitimate limits on preservation included. Hashes, stable identifiers, and complete exports contribute through specific functions while leaving event truth, conceptual priority, and philosophical validity in need of separate warrants. The proposed architecture supports future scrutiny and continuation under declared limits. Its practical usability, costs, and institutional implementation remain open to investigation.

Keywords: AI-assisted philosophical inquiry; claim histories; editorial provenance; documentary architecture; selective release; research records

Research Purpose and Scope

This note states the purpose of circulation, the status of the argument, and the role of research assistance. The paper presents current insights for criticism and wider discussion in public and scholarly settings. It makes no claim to conceptual priority. Similar concepts and arguments may already exist in other disciplines, languages, and intellectual traditions; further comparison may alter the terminology, scope, or contribution.

Definitions organize a bounded inquiry. Conditional formal results carry their stated assumptions, and illustrative cases support conceptual analysis. Empirical validation, wider applicability, and the adequacy of proposed normative premises remain open where the main text identifies those obligations. Relational analysis supplies a method of investigation while stronger ontological questions remain suspended.

AI assistance contributed to source discovery and pre-use verification, argumentative development, formal checking, organization, and drafting. The accompanying project records distinguish retained research insights, newly proposed analysis, and verified literature. The manuscript is prepared for the author's review; circulation and submission decisions remain with the author. Critical responses concerning antecedents, assumptions, counterexamples, and alternative formulations are welcome.

DRAFT

1 Introduction

This paper develops a documentary architecture for philosophical claims that change through AI-assisted inquiry. It examines the relationship between recorded exchanges, later interpretation, and a current academic argument. The method combines conceptual distinctions, comparison with verified antecedents, a small graph construction, and a conditional normative argument about fidelity and access.

A philosophical article can explain a definition and defend a proposition without recounting the sequence through which they emerged. That organization serves the reader's assessment of the argument. A different question arises when a later reader needs to understand which objection changed the definition, whether a qualification was present in an earlier statement, or how an interpretation became attached to a source. The finished article may leave those documentary questions open even when its argument is clear.

AI assistance gives this familiar problem a particular setting. The same system can generate an objection, summarize a long exchange, reorganize an argument, and compose a plausible account of its development. These activities can make research easier to navigate. Their outputs also require distinguishable statuses. A readable discovery narrative can be an analytical reconstruction whose sequence was newly composed. A transcript-like format can therefore present either recorded interaction or invented dialogue, depending on its actual source relationship.

The retained research material proposes three functions: a chronological dialogical record, analytical commentary, and a stabilized article. The proposal is preserved here while its stronger wording is refined. Recorded sequence and documented dependencies provide evidence about an inquiry. Intellectual causation often needs additional information about reading, reflection, parallel activity, and unavailable exchanges. The architecture should preserve the available evidence while keeping those gaps visible.

Claim 1.1 (Accountable documentary relationships). For a project that preserves claim development for later scrutiny, documentary forms should have an intelligible relationship to their sources, editorial transformations, and current epistemic status, with access and correction proportionate to the purpose and legitimate interests involved.

The claim is a proposed norm. Its justification depends on the value of accurate scholarly representation, the kinds of reliance invited by a record, and the burdens of preserving or releasing it. The paper develops those premises explicitly. A useful architecture may include private material, a selective reading edition, or an article accompanied by only a short revision note. Its adequacy follows the task and circumstances.

The contribution has a bounded place among related inquiries. The conduct of philosophical revision concerns how researchers develop and assess reasons. The present paper concerns the records through which selected parts of that activity become available for later interpretation. Historical knowledge and archival justice raise wider questions about truth, authority, and future access. Those questions inform the discussion, while the main object remains a record of philosophical claim revision.

The argument proceeds from documentary objects and antecedents to chronology and the three functions. It then examines editorial transformations, a typed graph, and illustrative cases. The final sections consider technical assurance, ethical responsibilities, objections, and open research designs. Conceptual priority remains unclaimed; the proposed arrangement is offered for criticism and possible practical refinement.

2 Documentary Objects in Philosophical Inquiry

This section defines the objects that the architecture connects. It separates an activity from its trace, a trace from a transcript, and a source representation from later interpretation. The distinctions establish different standards of fidelity while preserving the possibility that several objects coexist in one file or interface.

2.1 Inquiry events and available traces

An inquiry event is an activity through which a question, distinction, objection, or claim is developed or assessed. An event can be an exchange, a source reading, a proof check, an observation, or a decision to revise a formulation. Its available traces may capture only part of what occurred.

Definition 2.1 (Inquiry trace). An inquiry trace is an available record produced through a specified capture or documentation process that bears on some part of an inquiry event. Its evidential scope depends on that process, its content, and the relevant omissions or uncertainty.

A platform export can preserve accessible messages, reported times, and selected tool outputs. A researcher's note can preserve a remembered objection. A saved manuscript can preserve the state of a definition at a particular version. Each trace has a different relation to the activity it documents. Calling one file raw identifies its relationship to a capture process; it leaves the completeness and accuracy of that process open to assessment.

The distinction matters for artificial and human contributions alike. An accessible assistant message is evidence of an output in the available record. It supplies no complete view of the system's internal computation. A participant's later explanation of their reasoning is likewise a further contribution whose historical accuracy needs assessment. The present paper records accessible material and explicitly labelled reports; it leaves unavailable private reasoning unavailable.

An event may also leave several traces with inconsistent details. A local note may use one time zone while an export uses another. A copied excerpt may omit a qualification present in the full message. The discrepancies invite comparison of capture conditions. They should remain visible until a warranted correction resolves them.

2.2 Transcripts and reading editions

A transcript represents recorded exchanges according to a stated fidelity policy. A reading edition transforms source material for a declared audience or purpose. The distinction allows both faithful preservation and useful editing.

Definition 2.2 (Declared documentary fidelity). Documentary fidelity is the adequacy of a representation relative to its declared source object and transformation policy. Assessment asks whether the representation preserves the features it undertakes to preserve and accurately identifies material changes or limits.

A verbatim transcription undertakes to preserve wording within a specified scope. A lightly edited edition might normalize spacing, remove interface labels, or consolidate repeated messages. A translation undertakes a further interpretive transformation. These undertakings differ. A reader should be able to identify which one applies before relying on a passage as evidence of what a participant originally said.

A changed definition requires particular care. An early phrase may have been deliberately broad or simply unclear. Replacing it with a later precise definition inside an earlier turn changes the evidence about the inquiry. The reading edition can retain the wording and attach an explanatory note, or visibly mark the revision. It can also present a reconstruction in a separate form. Each option preserves an intelligible relation between source and intervention.

Fidelity is compatible with selection when the scope is declared. An edition of a selected episode can accurately preserve that episode while leaving the rest of the conversation outside its coverage. A complete-transcript label would make a stronger undertaking. The architecture treats the scope statement as part of the document's meaning.

2.3 Commentary and the current article

Commentary interprets the significance of recorded material. An article presents the argument that a researcher currently offers for assessment. These functions can use the same source while organizing it

differently.

Commentary might identify a transition from a universal claim to a conditional one, explain a rejected alternative, or compare two uses of a concept. Its author should distinguish a change explicitly stated by participants from a significance inferred later. A dated interpretation can contribute something that the original exchange left implicit without attributing that later insight backward.

An article can begin with the current definition and arrange reasons in their strongest intelligible order. The reader need not reconstruct a history of mistakes to assess a valid proof. When the article makes a historical claim about discovery, influence, or authorship, however, it takes on a documentary obligation in addition to its argumentative one.

The separation also permits disagreement between layers. A source record can contain a claim that the current article rejects. Commentary can preserve two interpretations of a turning point. The article can remain undecided about the cause of a revision while defending the revised argument. These differences are useful when their relationships are clear.

2.4 Record status and research status

The final distinction concerns the status of the text and the status of its propositions. A faithful quotation and a supported claim answer different questions.

A record can faithfully quote a conjecture that later proves false. A newly composed example can illustrate a valid inference while supplying no historical evidence. A verified source excerpt can be interpreted incorrectly. A complete export can contain fabricated citations. Documentary and epistemic descriptions should therefore accompany one another where the distinction affects reliance.

The proposed vocabulary includes text statuses such as quotation, normalized transcription, translation, summary, and analytical reconstruction. Research statuses include question, working definition, conjecture, conditional result, objection, and unresolved tension. The categories remain revisable. Their purpose is to prevent a change in format from silently becoming a change in warrant.

3 Antecedents in Dialogue Editing and Provenance Practice

This section identifies selected antecedents for the documentary architecture. It examines a philosophical dialogue's literary frame, scholarly text-encoding guidance, a provenance standard, and oral-history ethics. Each comparison states its evidential scope and distinguishes inherited resources from the present normative application.

3.1 Mediated dialogue in the *Theaetetus*

Plato's *Theaetetus* provides a philosophical precedent for making editorial mediation visible within a dialogue. The comparison concerns its opening literary frame, with historical reconstruction of the represented encounter left open.

In Jowett's translation, Euclid describes making notes, elaborating them from memory, consulting Socrates about gaps, and correcting the written account. He also explains a change from reported narration to direct conversation and the omission of repeated reporting phrases [4]. The frame therefore presents the readable dialogue through a represented history of recording and editing. It makes the relationship between conversation and written form part of the text's own presentation.

The passage supports a limited comparison. A philosophical work can acknowledge mediation while offering a coherent exchange for readers. Its literary construction supplies no independent evidence that each represented historical event occurred exactly in that way. The present paper uses the framing device to clarify documentary questions, while leaving Plato's broader epistemology and the historical accuracy of the dialogue outside this comparison.

The contemporary application is to preserve the difference between an actual available exchange and a later arrangement that explains an argument. Both can have philosophical value. Their labels and source relationships determine which historical inferences they invite.

3.2 Textual revision and editorial interpretation

Scholarly editing already provides resources for representing changes within a text. The relevant question is how those resources inform a record of philosophical development.

The TEI primary-source guidelines discuss additions, deletions, substitutions, and uncertainty about their order. Their account of genetic editing includes grouping alterations into changes or revision campaigns. The guidelines also support partial ordering and dates of varying precision [5]. These provisions already recognize that an editor can infer relationships among revisions while preserving uncertainty about sequence.

The TEI header guidance separately provides for editorial-policy declarations concerning correction, normalization, segmentation, and added interpretation. It also addresses sampling and omitted material [6]. This makes a strong precedent for documenting the practices through which a source becomes a usable edition.

The proposed philosophical application adds a task-specific emphasis: whether a transformation changes a claim's scope, status, or available objections, and whether later interpretation is being projected into an earlier contribution. These concerns can be represented through existing editorial resources. The paper's contribution is a proposed division of functions and responsibilities; implementation in TEI would require a separate design and conformance assessment.

3.3 Provenance representation and asserted relationships

Technical provenance practice supplies another relevant comparison. It offers a vocabulary for connecting objects and activities while leaving the evidential assessment of a particular assertion to the application.

PROV-O distinguishes entities, activities, and agents, and represents relations including derivation and attribution. Its qualified relations permit additional information about a relationship. Quotation and revision are treated as particular forms of derivation [1]. These resources show that a provenance description can include more than a bare link between two files.

The graph proposed later in this paper uses a small, task-specific vocabulary and keeps documentary, temporal, and argumentative relations separate. It is an analytical construction, with conformance to PROV-O left unclaimed. The technical use of ontology in the source's title names a representational framework; the present comparison adds no commitment to a general philosophical ontology.

An asserted provenance link remains a claim about a relationship. A graph can faithfully store an editor's mistaken account of dependence. A well-formed file can describe an event that never occurred. The present architecture therefore records the warrant and responsibility for consequential links alongside the links themselves. This is an application-level epistemic requirement whose adequacy remains open to criticism.

3.4 Participation and stewardship in oral-history guidance

Oral-history practice supplies a normative antecedent for treating the recording process and later access as connected responsibilities. The comparison concerns selected professional guidance and its possible transfer to philosophical records.

The Oral History Association's 2018 principles emphasize participation, transparency, sensitivity to risk and power, and explicit permission for public release. Its ethics statement includes review opportunities where possible and cautions against promises that practitioners cannot keep [3]. The guidance treats preservation and use as parts of a continuing relationship with participants.

A philosophical discussion can contain personal experiences, provisional judgments, and remarks affecting other people. Those features make participation and release conditions relevant. The transfer remains a present proposal: philosophical inquiry and oral-history interviewing have different purposes and institutional settings. Their resemblance supports comparison, while the specific obligations require their own justification.

Together, the antecedents place the architecture within existing practices of mediated dialogue, scholarly editing, provenance, and stewardship. They leave room for the paper’s local contribution while discouraging claims to have invented those practices. Further comparison across languages and traditions may refine both the terminology and the proposed arrangement.

4 Chronology and the Limits of Intellectual Genealogy

This section distinguishes recorded order from claims about the causes of conceptual development. It refines the retained editorial principle, examines incomplete timing information, and gives a small counterexample to recovery of intellectual causation from a transcript alone. The argument preserves the value of chronology while specifying its evidential limits.

4.1 Sequence and documented dependencies

The retained instruction gives priority to temporal causality before thematic coherence. Its underlying concern is the preservation of a developing inquiry before later organization makes the final concepts appear to have been present from the beginning.

The present refinement states that concern through observable sequence and documented dependencies. A message can follow another message in an export. A participant can explicitly say that a counterexample prompted a revision. A draft can incorporate a phrase from a source. These observations support different claims. Order concerns recorded placement; a participant’s explanation is testimony about influence; textual overlap can support a hypothesis of dependence within further contextual evidence.

Definition 4.1 (Documented dependency). A documented dependency is a relation between identified research objects or activities for which the record supplies a stated basis, such as an explicit response, a version comparison, or an attributed source use. The description retains the basis, its author, and material uncertainty.

The definition permits levels of support. An explicit statement of influence is stronger evidence of a participant’s reported reason than an editor’s inference from proximity. Its historical accuracy remains assessable. A version comparison can establish that wording changed between two available versions while leaving the cause of that change open.

The distinction also preserves meaningful negative evidence. If the available source lacks a purported exchange, a complete-transcript claim may be contradicted by a reliable capture policy. If the capture policy is partial, absence has a weaker implication. The relevant comparison includes what the process was capable of recording.

4.2 Partial order and time uncertainty

Research activity can produce several sequences whose relation is only partly known. A record should preserve those limits and specify the ordering that the evidence supports.

A conversation may contain a source search and a drafting activity that occur in parallel. A later summary can use both results even when their relative completion order is unavailable. In such a case, the record may support that both preceded the summary while leaving their mutual order unspecified. Exact clock values are unnecessary for that limited relation.

Reported times also need an interpretation. Event time, capture time, file modification time, and later import time concern different occurrences. A file copied today can preserve an older text. An edited export can receive a new modification time without implying that its original conversation occurred then. Known time zones and clock uncertainty should accompany claims that depend on them.

TEI’s representation of partially ordered changes and imprecise dating provides a relevant precedent [5]. The present application uses those distinctions to avoid assigning invented dates or a false total order

to fragmentary philosophical records. Unknown values remain unknown, with later correction available when new evidence warrants it.

4.3 A counterexample concerning causal recovery

A simple construction identifies what a record alone can leave undetermined. Its purpose is logical: it specifies two candidate histories with the same accessible record and different causes of a revision.

Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a set of candidate inquiry histories and let O map each history to an accessible record. Let $c(h)$ indicate whether a specified objection caused a specified revision in history h . The meanings of caused and revision must be fixed for the particular investigation; the construction merely assumes that the two candidate histories differ on that target.

Stipulate that h_1 contains a revision prompted by a recorded objection. Stipulate that in h_2 the researcher had already reached the revision through an unrecorded source reading, while the same objection and revised wording subsequently appear in the same recorded order. The visible exchange contains no assertion settling which causal route operated. Thus

$$O(h_1) = O(h_2), \quad c(h_1) = 1, \quad c(h_2) = 0. \quad (4.1)$$

Equation 4.1 represents a stipulated ambiguity. It supplies no claim about the frequency of either history in actual research.

Proposition 4.2 (Record-relative causal ambiguity). *If two candidate histories have the same accessible record and different values of the specified causal target, a rule using only that record cannot correctly recover the target for both histories.*

Proof. Suppose a rule f recovers the target from the record in both cases. Since the records are equal, $f(O(h_1)) = f(O(h_2))$. Correctness in the first case requires this value to be 1; correctness in the second requires it to be 0. The requirements conflict. Therefore such a rule cannot recover both stipulated values from the common record alone. $\square$

Further evidence or justified restrictions on candidate histories can change the inference. A contemporaneous note, a reliable report, or information about the availability of the source might distinguish the cases. A probabilistic assessment can also be useful under explicit assumptions, while remaining different from certain recovery. The counterexample establishes the need to identify those additional grounds.

4.4 Logical order and retrospective interpretation

An article's logical order serves a different purpose from a chronology of inquiry. Keeping the distinction explicit permits substantial editorial improvement without creating a false genealogy.

The current definition can appear before the objection that originally helped form it. A proof can place assumptions before consequences even when the researcher discovered the conclusion first. Commentary can organize several episodes around a concept whose importance became clear only later. These arrangements can make the work more intelligible.

The historical claim changes when an arrangement is presented as the actual order of discovery. An editor should therefore identify whether a sequence is documented, inferred, or composed for exposition. The same principle applies to an AI-generated dialogue that explains a finished argument: its analytical value remains available under an accurate reconstruction label. Its historical status requires separate evidence.

5 The Dialogue, Commentary, and Article Architecture

This section develops the retained three-function architecture. It explains the purpose of each layer, the relations among them, and the conditions under which a smaller or more elaborate record is appropriate.

Table 1: Documentary functions and their principal fidelity demands

Documentary function	Principal content	Fidelity demand
Chronological record	Available exchanges, changes, objections and capture limits	Preserve declared wording and order; identify omissions and editorial intervention.
Analytical commentary	Interpretation of changes, dependencies and remaining tensions	Link interpretations to records and distinguish documented relations from later inference.
Stabilized article	Current definitions, reasons, objections and open obligations	Preserve the scope and status of the defended argument and accurately state historical attributions.

The analysis treats the layers as documentary functions that can be implemented through different file arrangements.

5.1 The retained formulation and its interpretation

The surviving research packet preserves the sentence “会话保存生成，注说保存解释，论文保存稳定化。” A close English rendering is: dialogue preserves generation, commentary preserves interpretation, and the paper preserves stabilization. The sentence is retained as a research formulation, with its stronger readings subjected to the distinctions developed here.

Generation refers in this application to the documented development of questions and claims. A dialogue preserves accessible parts of that process within its capture limits. Interpretation identifies significance, dependencies, and changes from a later standpoint. Stabilization presents a current argument in a form that an independent reader can examine. Each function can remain revisable.

The formulation leaves several possible confusions to resolve. A chronological record can already include interpretation by its participants. Commentary can generate a new insight. An article can provoke a new inquiry. The layers therefore identify principal documentary purposes, with overlap allowed. They do not divide thinking into isolated chronological stages.

Table 1 summarizes the proposed division and its principal checking demands. The comparison concerns the role of each representation, leaving its actual quality to assessment.

5.2 The chronological record and its editions

The first function preserves the accessible course of an inquiry. A source export and a reading edition can both serve it, with different transformation policies.

Where feasible and legitimate, the source export can be retained with a description of its origin, coverage, and available metadata. A reading edition can remove interface noise, improve navigation, or mark episodes. Its editorial note should explain which changes were made and how they affect the evidential use of the text.

Stable identifiers are especially useful when the edition changes. A source turn can retain its identifier even when its display position changes. An edition can point to the source span that it summarizes or normalizes. Identifiers support retrieval; they acquire evidential value through the records and policies attached to them.

The chronological record should preserve relevant uncertainty and rejected formulations. An objection may explain why a later definition became narrower. A failed derivation may show that a proposed result was abandoned. Retaining those materials can prevent a later reader from repeating a resolved mistake, while also leaving room for renewed criticism of the resolution.

Preservation remains purpose-sensitive. Repeated logistical messages may have little value for the target inquiry. A personal example may require restricted handling. A useful record states the scope of its selection and preserves consequential transitions in an appropriate form.

5.3 Commentary and interpretive accountability

The second function makes a record usable for conceptual inquiry. Commentary can identify relations that a chronological sequence leaves difficult to see.

A commentator might compare an early use of relation with a later functional definition. The commentary can identify the counterexample that appears between them, explain a plausible reason for the change, and note whether the original participants explicitly acknowledged that reason. The difference between direct statement and later interpretation should remain visible.

Commentary can also preserve alternatives. Two readers may disagree about whether a revision abandons a thesis or merely narrows its scope. Presenting both interpretations with their reasons can improve the research record. A single polished account would otherwise risk concealing the dispute through editorial authority.

The commentator's own contribution deserves accurate attribution. An explanatory distinction added later may become useful in the current article. Its usefulness supplies no reason to insert it silently into the original exchange. A dated commentary can preserve its actual place in the project's development.

5.4 The article and proportionate linkage

The third function presents a current argument for independent assessment. Its relation to the other layers should support relevant scrutiny without making the article an archive catalogue.

An article can link its major claims to a compact revision map or project note. It can indicate which examples are hypothetical, which distinctions are working definitions, and which results are conditional. Historical statements about a conversation can refer to appropriate source material where release is legitimate. Most conceptual reasoning can remain self-contained in the article itself.

The architecture permits several scales. A short paper might need a source record and a one-page commentary. A long project might need several chronological episodes and a cross-session concept index. A sensitive inquiry might preserve a private record while publishing an argument with explicit evidential limits. The relevant criterion is whether the arrangement serves its declared purposes under defensible conditions.

The functions can also be renewed. A later criticism can change the article, generate commentary on the revision, and create a new recorded exchange. This feedback preserves the evolving project while keeping each version's commitments intelligible. Stabilization marks a current state suitable for discussion, with further development remaining possible.

6 Editorial Transformations and Claim Continuity

This section specifies the transformations that connect documentary layers. It examines quotation, normalization, summary, reconstruction, and substantive revision, then develops a minimal account of claim continuity. The purpose is to make editorial judgment inspectable without requiring every character-level change to receive philosophical commentary.

6.1 Transformations and their declared scope

An editorial operation should be described at the level relevant to its use. Removing duplicate interface labels differs from changing a modal qualification in a philosophical proposition.

Quotation preserves selected source wording within a declared boundary. Normalization adjusts specified presentational features. Translation interprets content across languages. Summary selects and condenses. Analytical reconstruction composes an explanatory arrangement from available materials.

Substantive revision changes the current claim or its justification. Several operations can occur in one passage, in which case their combination needs an intelligible description.

TEI's editorial-policy guidance offers a precedent for describing correction, normalization, segmentation, and added interpretation [6]. The current application adds attention to epistemic status. A summary that turns a question into a conclusion changes more than length. A normalized formula that repairs an invalid derivation should preserve the original attempt separately and identify the repair.

The burden of description should follow the consequence of the transformation. A declared policy can cover routine spacing changes across an edition. A changed quantifier, removed objection, or altered attribution may require a local note. The goal is usable accountability, with meaningful differences easier to locate.

6.2 A record of substantive claim revision

A claim revision needs enough context for a later reader to identify what changed and why. The proposed record distinguishes the content of the change from the evidence for its historical explanation.

Definition 6.1 (Substantive revision record). A substantive revision record identifies an earlier formulation, a later formulation, the consequential difference between them, the stated or inferred reason for the change, the source basis for that account, and the unresolved obligations that remain.

Consider an early claim that social formation establishes a present interpersonal maintenance requirement. A later version might restrict the conclusion to a specified adult capacity and leave the maintenance mechanism open. The revision record should preserve the lost universal scope, identify the missing bridge, and state whether this interpretation comes from an actual recorded exchange or a later analytical reconstruction.

The record can also identify justified retention. A critic may propose a counterexample that falls outside the stated domain. Keeping the claim while clarifying the domain is a meaningful outcome. A system that recognizes only textual change would miss the intellectual work of examining and rejecting an objection.

The reason field should preserve uncertainty. A participant may explicitly explain one motivation while a commentator suspects another. The record can retain both with their different statuses. An empty field can honestly indicate that the reason is unavailable. Filling it with a plausible generated explanation would change the documentary claim.

6.3 Stable identifiers and changing formulations

Identifiers help connect revisions, but their meaning depends on a clear policy. A research object and a textual version are different things that may require different identifiers.

A stable research identifier can name the continuing question or claim under development. Version identifiers can name its successive formulations. The current file can preserve the active formulation and a concise revision history, while earlier source records remain available through links where legitimate. This arrangement supports continuity without treating the latest wording as timeless.

Some revisions change the research object so substantially that a new identifier is appropriate. A question about formation may become a separate question about maintenance. A universal claim may be withdrawn while a narrower conjecture survives. The decision should follow intellectual function, scope, and downstream use, with the relationship between objects recorded explicitly.

File duplication is a poor substitute for that judgment. Two files with slightly different names can silently become competing authorities for one claim. Conversely, forcing distinct questions into one file can obscure their different evidence and revision histories. The architecture favors one current canonical formulation per stable object and explicit links among separate objects.

6.4 Historical fidelity and improved arguments

Improving an argument can legitimately alter its presentation and commitments. Historical fidelity concerns how that alteration is represented in the record.

A repaired proof can be the version defended in the article. The earlier failed proof may remain in a restricted source record or a documented derivation history. Commentary can explain the failed step and the new assumption. This preserves a useful path for learning and criticism without asking the article to reproduce an error as though it remained accepted.

The same principle applies to philosophical language. An ambiguous term can be replaced with a narrower working definition. The change should be attributed to the current revision when its history matters. Earlier participants should retain the words and commitments that the evidence supports, including their uncertainty.

Editorial accountability therefore permits substantial intellectual development. It asks the project to preserve an inspectable relationship among source, interpretation, and current argument. The next section examines how a small graph can represent those relationships and how selective access can alter what later readers can trace.

7 A Typed Graph for Documentary Relationships

This section proposes a minimal graph for connecting records and derives a limited consequence of selective access. It defines separate relation types, proves a reachability result, and considers a qualified way to describe an indirect connection. The construction is an analytical aid; historical accuracy, privacy, and technical implementation require additional judgments.

7.1 Record units and relation types

Let V be a finite set of identified record units. A unit can be a source turn, a textual version, a commentary passage, a claim map, or a verification note. The unit boundaries should reflect the research task and the available capture process.

Three directed relations are kept separate. E_T records asserted strict temporal precedence. E_D records asserted documentary derivation, directed from source to derivative. E_A records an argumentative relation, such as a proposed premise supporting a claim or an objection challenging it. Each edge also carries a type, an author, and a stated basis where those details affect reliance.

The same pair of nodes can carry several relations. A source passage can precede a commentary and be used by it without supporting every claim that the commentary makes. A later objection can challenge an earlier proposition. Its argumentative direction therefore need not match the chronological direction. A reference back to an earlier version also differs from a derivation in the reverse direction.

PROV-O's qualification of provenance relationships supplies a technical comparison for attaching detail to an asserted relation [1]. The present graph uses an independent, task-specific convention. Its edges should not be read as an implementation of the full standard or as automatic confirmation of the relationships they encode.

7.2 Ordering constraints and their domains

A graph should impose a constraint only on the relation for which that constraint has been justified. Combining every link into one acyclic structure would confuse several different meanings.

For strict temporal precedence, a directed cycle would require an event to precede itself through the asserted chain. Such a cycle signals inconsistency in the ordering claims or their interpretation. A strict version-derivation relation can also be acyclic when each derivative is a newly identified version using an already available source. A current object that is repeatedly overwritten requires version distinctions before this condition becomes meaningful.

Argumentative and interpretive links can have different structures. Two concepts may be explained through reciprocal comparison. A commentary can criticize a claim that later responds to the commentary. The existence of a cycle in an untyped graph supplies no sufficient diagnosis of circular proof. To evaluate a proof, the researcher must inspect which premises actually depend on which conclusions and under what justification.

Unknown order should remain unspecified. A validator can detect that an asserted strict-order cycle exists. It cannot infer that an absent edge means independence or that an arbitrary ordering is historically correct. The distinction between a missing assertion and an assertion of absence belongs to the graph's interpretation.

7.3 Selective access and documentary reachability

The next result concerns the information a reader can trace through documentary links. It assumes that the links have been correctly represented for the purpose of the graph, while leaving their historical truth separate.

Let $U \subseteq V$ be the record units available to a particular reader. Write $E_D[U]$ for the documentary edges with both endpoints in U , and write a superscript $+$ for reachability through a path containing at least one edge. The reader's induced graph can trace only paths whose intermediate units are also available. Hence

$$(E_D[U])^+ \subseteq E_D^+ \cap (U \times U). \quad (7.1)$$

Equation 7.1 compares paths visible within the selected records with paths in the full graph between those same endpoints.

Proposition 7.1 (Preservation of documentary reachability). *For the finite record graph and available set U , equality in Equation 7.1 holds exactly when each pair of available endpoints connected by a documentary path in the full graph is also connected by a documentary path entirely within U .*

Proof. Every path in the induced graph uses edges from E_D and has endpoints in U . It is therefore a path in the full graph between available endpoints, establishing the inclusion. Suppose the stated condition holds. Every pair in the right-hand relation then has a path entirely within U , so it belongs to the left-hand relation and equality follows. Conversely, suppose equality holds. Any full-graph reachable pair with endpoints in U belongs to the right-hand relation, hence to the left-hand relation. By the definition of the left-hand relation, that pair has a path entirely within U . $\square$

The characterization is elementary. Its value is to identify precisely what endpoint preservation leaves open. It is a graph result, with interpretive accessibility, source reliability, and ethical adequacy outside the proof.

For a concrete counterexample, let $V = \{a, h, b\}$ and let the only documentary edges be $a \rightarrow h$ and $h \rightarrow b$. Suppose h is a restricted commentary and the reader can access $U = \{a, b\}$. The full graph connects a to b , but the induced graph contains no edge and therefore no path. Both endpoints survive while the visible documentary connection disappears. Conversely, if a separate visible path connects them, withholding h need not destroy that endpoint-level reachability.

7.4 Qualified summaries of restricted paths

An editor may sometimes preserve a limited connection without releasing the intermediate material. The appropriate representation must state the weaker relation that is actually being asserted.

Suppose a responsible editor has checked the restricted path and has a legitimate basis to disclose its existence. The public record can contain a new assertion that b indirectly derives from a through material whose access is restricted. This assertion should have its own author, scope, verification basis, and access decision. It is a new documentary contribution.

The added assertion does not show the actual intermediate reasoning to the public reader. It also does not establish that b quotes a verbatim, that the full argument is valid, or that every step is acceptable.

A path can combine quotation, interpretation, and substantial revision. Compressing that path into a direct-quotation label would misstate the transformation.

Disclosure of the connection can itself be sensitive. The existence of a restricted intermediate record might reveal a person's participation or a protected topic. A project may therefore legitimately leave the public graph incomplete and state a limit on traceability. The graph result identifies a documentary consequence; a normative assessment determines whether preserving, summarizing, or withholding the connection is appropriate.

8 Illustrative Editorial Cases and a Minimal Record Schema

This section applies the architecture to five documentary situations and proposes a compact schema. The cases are constructed illustrations, with the partial recovery of the present research material identified separately. Their purpose is to test distinctions and reveal implementation obligations, leaving empirical usability open.

8.1 A changing definition and a generated history

The first pair of cases concerns substantive revision and retrospective reconstruction. It shows how similar readable outputs can have different documentary statuses.

In a hypothetical inquiry, an early turn uses relation broadly to include any association. A later counterexample leads to a working definition restricted to a specified functional dependence. The chronological edition preserves both formulations. Commentary explains the change and identifies the source turns that support its account. The article begins with the narrower definition. The arrangement makes current reasoning clear while retaining evidence that the concept changed.

Now suppose an assistant composes a dialogue in which a researcher proposes the broad term, a critic supplies the counterexample, and the researcher immediately recognizes the repair. If those exchanges were newly written, the dialogue is an analytical reconstruction. It can be useful for teaching the distinction. Its polished sequence supplies no evidence that the historical conversation followed that route.

The appropriate labels therefore differ even if the final article contains the same definition. A reconstruction can point to retained source concepts without claiming exact source turns. A transcript can undertake fidelity to available exchanges. The record should make that difference available before a reader uses the text to attribute an insight or reconstruct a participant's intellectual development.

8.2 Fragmentary recovery and oversized archives

The second pair concerns missing material and excessive material. Both can limit later inquiry through different mechanisms.

The present research packet preserves an architecture, several commitments, and references to an earlier master record, while the full original conversation remains unavailable in the current project. The responsible use is to preserve the surviving wording and identify new development. The paper's graph construction and editorial analysis are current additions. They supply no recovered timestamp, original speaker sequence, or complete causal genealogy.

An oversized archive presents the opposite practical difficulty. Thousands of turns may survive while a later reader remains unable to locate the consequential change. A concept index and commentary can provide access to that transition. Their value depends on selection quality and usable links, with the possibility of editorial error retained.

The two cases suggest distinct remedies. Missing evidence calls for explicit limits and careful reconstruction. Difficult retrieval calls for navigation, interpretive summaries, and tested access routes. Keeping more files can help the latter only when the relevant material and its relationships remain usable.

Table 2: Editorial situations and the records needed for proportionate scrutiny

Editorial situation	Useful documentary response	Remaining limit
Changed definition	Preserve versions and explain the consequential difference	The cause of change may remain uncertain.
Generated discovery dialogue	Label reconstruction and identify retained source concepts	Historical exchange remains unestablished.
Fragmentary recovery	Preserve surviving wording and mark new development	Missing chronology remains unavailable.
Oversized archive	Provide indexes and source-linked commentary	Selection can overlook important transitions.
Sensitive personal example	Assess abstraction, restrictions and correction routes	Public scrutiny and privacy may remain in tension.

8.3 A privacy-sensitive transition

The fifth case examines a conceptual revision prompted by a personal example. It separates the argumentative structure from the public disclosure of the example's details.

Suppose a participant's account of a family conflict reveals a weakness in a proposed definition. The article can explain a suitably abstracted counterexample, with the abstraction labelled and its limits stated. A restricted record can preserve the source relationship where legitimate. Commentary may indicate that an actual personal account informed the revision if that disclosure has an appropriate basis.

The adequacy of the abstraction requires review. Removing details can change the example's logic, and retaining an unusual combination of features can make a person identifiable. The choice therefore concerns both philosophical fidelity and participant interests. A public claim may need narrower scope when the supporting material remains unavailable for scrutiny.

Table 2 compares the documentary task in these cases. The table organizes possible responses and leaves their practical adequacy open.

8.4 A minimal schema and unknown values

A minimal record should support the distinctions that matter to its use. The proposed fields identify the unit, its source relationship, status, timing, responsibility, and access conditions.

Useful fields include a stable record identifier, record kind, source identifiers, content, text status, epistemic status, author or editor, known event time, capture time, transformation note, relation assertions, access level, and correction route. A project can store those fields in human-readable prose, a table, or a structured format. The choice should follow actual retrieval and preservation needs.

Unknown values should remain distinguishable from withheld values and inapplicable fields. An unavailable event time is different from a time deliberately restricted for privacy. A reconstruction can have a known composition date while the represented event time is inapplicable. An unknown model label should remain unknown; writing style supplies no reliable platform identification.

A schema can enforce the presence of a field while leaving its content mistaken. Its function is to make relevant questions visible and facilitate checking. A practical implementation should therefore combine structural checks with editorial judgment and proportionate participant review.

9 Record Integrity, Completeness, and Philosophical Warrant

This section distinguishes technical assurance from the historical and philosophical claims that a record can support. It examines identifiers and digests, capture completeness, and the relation between a faithful record and a sound argument. The analysis supplies limits for the proposed architecture without reducing its value to technical verification alone.

9.1 Identifiers, digests, and change detection

Stable identifiers support reference to a record. A digest can assist comparison of a recorded object across copies or times. Their functions differ from verifying the truth of the object's content.

NIST's publication abstract for the Secure Hash Standard describes message digests as a means of detecting changes to messages [2]. That limited function is useful when a project preserves a source export and later needs to compare it with a stored reference. The relevant comparison includes the exact object and representation to which the digest applies.

For example, a byte-level comparison can be affected by line endings or character encoding. A project that normalizes these features before computing a digest should record the normalization policy. The resulting digest concerns that normalized representation. It leaves changes outside the declared comparison target in need of another check.

An unchanged file can contain a false attribution or an invented conversation. A digest calculated after an error was introduced can accurately accompany the erroneous file. A trusted reference and an appropriate comparison procedure are therefore part of the practical assurance claim. The mere presence of a long identifier or hash-like string supplies no general certificate of accuracy.

The paper uses no security estimate or algorithm-specific guarantee. Its conceptual point is that an integrity check concerns a specified recorded object. Content truth, completeness, and discovery priority concern additional targets whose evidence cannot be supplied by that comparison alone.

9.2 Capture completeness and declared coverage

Completeness needs a domain. A record can be complete relative to a stated export while leaving important parts of the inquiry outside that export.

A project might preserve every message made available by a particular interface during a selected episode. That is a meaningful undertaking if the interface, episode boundaries, and available fields are specified. It differs from preserving every relevant conversation, source encounter, private reflection, or external action. Those broader claims require further evidence.

The same distinction applies within an exported exchange. Tool outputs may be included, summarized, or absent. Earlier edits may be visible in one capture and lost in another. A record should state known limitations where they affect interpretation. An unavailable field should remain unresolved until adequate evidence supports its completion.

Preserving more context can improve interpretation, but the relationship has costs and limits. Irrelevant material can make a central revision difficult to find. Sensitive details can make release inappropriate. A useful design identifies the target inquiry and provides enough context to assess relevant transitions under legitimate constraints.

9.3 Faithful records and independent argumentative assessment

Documentary fidelity can improve scrutiny without determining the truth of a philosophical conclusion. The distinction is especially important when a well-documented process gives a claim an appearance of authority.

A transcript can faithfully preserve an invalid argument. A commentary can accurately identify the moment at which participants accepted that argument. An article can then repeat the same error with excellent provenance. The record enables a critic to locate the error, while the inferential problem remains until the reasoning is corrected.

Conversely, a valid elementary proof can survive with uncertain discovery history. Its derivation can be assessed directly even when the original conversation is lost. A historical claim that one participant first discovered the proof would still require evidence. The evaluation should follow the specific target: validity, attribution, integration, or historical influence.

A source-linked article also remains open to interpretive error. The cited passage may have been read but misunderstood, or its qualification may have been dropped during summary. Verification before first

attributed use is therefore a necessary discipline for this project, with later source criticism remaining available. A later check cannot retroactively replace a missing pre-use verification step.

9.4 Priority and the available record

Attribution should reflect the scope of the evidence. A record may identify the first occurrence of a phrase within the available material while leaving its wider history open.

Earlier use may exist in another language, discipline, private note, or unavailable conversation. Independent development may also occur. A claim of global conceptual priority would require a substantially broader investigation than the preservation of one exchange. The manuscript therefore presents retained insights for discussion and makes no claim to exclusive conceptual priority.

The normative orientation can recognize a documented contribution while leaving proprietorship separate. A person's role in an inquiry can deserve accurate acknowledgement without establishing an exclusive entitlement to a concept. Specific legal questions would require their own analysis. The present architecture supplies documentary distinctions and a proposed practice of responsible attribution.

10 Participant Interests and Documentary Responsibility

This section derives a limited responsibility for preserving and presenting philosophical records. It states the normative premises, connects them to particular documentary choices, and examines consent, privacy, correction, and institutional labor. The argument remains conditional and permits different outcomes under different purposes and constraints.

10.1 Normative premises and the relevant relationship

The architecture becomes ethically significant when a record invites reliance or affects people through its preservation and use. The existence of an available export alone leaves the appropriate action open.

Assumption 10.1 (Accuracy in invited documentary reliance). An actor who presents a record for reliance has a defeasible responsibility to represent its source relationship, scope, and consequential transformations accurately, within the actor's role and practical control.

Assumption 10.2 (Participant standing and proportionate burden). Legitimate interests in privacy, contextual interpretation, access, and correction should inform documentary decisions, with preservation and disclosure assessed against feasible alternatives and proportionate burdens.

These are proposed normative premises. They express a commitment to answerable scholarly communication and respect for affected people. Their interpretation can be contested, and they require additional role-specific judgments before yielding a final duty.

The relevant relationship can vary. A private researcher may preserve a note for future self-review. A collaborator may share a reading edition with another participant. An institution may publish an archive and invite public reliance on it. The latter arrangement can create different responsibilities because the audience, control, expected use, and potential consequences differ.

10.2 A conditional derivation of documentary duties

The derivation connects a particular decision to the stated premises. It avoids inferring a duty of total preservation from the general value of future knowledge.

First, identify the legitimate purpose and the reliance or participation at stake. A reader may need to assess whether a definition changed, while a participant may need to correct a misleading attribution. Second, identify the mechanism by which the proposed record or transformation affects that interest. Removing a qualification can misrepresent a conjecture; publishing an identifiable personal example can expose information beyond its original context.

Third, locate an actor with a relevant role and control. The editor who changes the text, the researcher who presents the attribution, and the institution that controls access can have different responsibilities. Fourth, compare feasible responses. These may include retaining the qualification, publishing a correction, restricting a source, supplying a labelled abstraction, or narrowing a historical claim. Fifth, assess competing interests and burdens. A response that exposes protected information may be inferior to an adequate restricted or summarized alternative.

Under the premises, this sequence yields a defeasible reason for the proportionate response that addresses the identified problem. A final obligation requires the competing claims to be resolved. The conclusion can support preservation, selective disclosure, restriction, or justified non-retention, depending on the circumstances. The graph's loss of reachability is one relevant consequence among others.

10.3 Consent, restricted material, and public interpretation

Participation in an exploratory exchange differs from agreement to every later use of its record. The proposed architecture treats release conditions as part of the documentary relationship.

The Oral History Association's guidance supplies a relevant precedent for explicit release permission, sensitivity to risk, and review opportunities where possible [3]. Applying that orientation here means clarifying the intended use and respecting legitimate limits on disclosure. The proposal remains a philosophical and methodological application, with specific legal and institutional requirements requiring separate assessment.

An exploratory statement can acquire a different practical significance when detached from its context and circulated publicly. A conjecture may be read as a settled belief; a hypothetical personal example may be treated as autobiography. Accurate status labels and contextual notes can reduce these errors, while some cases warrant restricted access or omission.

Redaction also requires judgment. A marker can disclose that material was removed without revealing its content. Sometimes even the existence or placement of the removal can identify a sensitive relationship. A project may need a more general scope statement. The adequacy of the public account then depends partly on the limitations it acknowledges.

10.4 Correction, retention, and institutional labor

Correction is a practical capacity supported by people, procedures, and maintained records. A visible contact address alone leaves the effectiveness of that capacity open.

A correction route should identify how a participant or reader can challenge an attribution, source transcription, or status assignment. A response can amend the current edition, attach a note, preserve a dispute, or explain why the challenge leaves the record unchanged. The record of correction should distinguish a repaired transcription from a changed interpretation.

Public distribution limits control over later copies. An institution can update its own edition and communicate a correction while remaining unable to guarantee that every copy is recalled. Promises should reflect that practical limit. This gives an additional reason to assess release conditions before circulation.

The architecture also requires labor: reading, indexing, maintaining links, managing access, and evaluating corrections. A design that makes those tasks invisible can transfer burdens to participants or future stewards. Responsibilities should therefore include resources and realistic retention policies. The proposed model supports future inquiry through maintained relationships, with its feasibility and fairness open to review.

11 Objections and Conditions for Limited Adoption

This section tests the architecture against objections concerning redundancy, selectivity, inhibition, and cost. The responses identify cases in which the proposed layers add value and cases in which a lighter arrangement is appropriate. The aim is a defensible scope of adoption with task-sensitive limits.

11.1 The sufficiency of an article

An article can already state definitions, reasons, objections, and open questions. If the only task is to assess that argument, additional records may add little.

The objection identifies an important boundary. The architecture is most relevant when later inquiry also concerns conceptual development, editorial transformation, attribution, or reuse of abandoned possibilities. A short proof with a transparent derivation may need little discovery documentation. A disputed interpretation whose qualifiers changed through several summaries may benefit substantially from a traceable revision record.

The appropriate response is to identify the additional documentary question. If none is sufficiently important, a concise article and ordinary project notes can be adequate. The three functions remain a way of distinguishing purposes when those purposes arise, with their implementation scaled to the task.

11.2 The selectivity of every record

Every capture process selects, and every edition involves judgment. This can seem to undermine the distinction between faithful recording and reconstruction.

The objection is persuasive about the absence of a complete unmediated record. It leaves meaningful comparisons among declared undertakings intact. A quotation can be checked against an available source. An editor can disclose a normalization policy. A newly composed dialogue can be labelled accordingly. These practices permit assessment of fidelity within a stated scope even when the broader event remains only partly known.

The distinction also supports correction. If a reading edition claims to preserve every qualification but removes a modal term, the source can reveal the discrepancy. If the edition openly presents a summary, the question becomes whether the summary adequately preserves the relevant commitments. The evaluative criteria change with the undertaking; they remain capable of being met or violated.

11.3 Preservation and exploratory freedom

Persistent records can inhibit experimentation or expose people through statements they later reject. This objection challenges any simple equation of preservation with epistemic benefit.

The architecture permits private exploration, selective capture, restricted preservation, delayed release, and justified ending of retention. The normative argument assesses a particular purpose and relationship. Future interpretive value is one consideration alongside present participation, privacy, safety, and burden.

The same concern applies to internal research cultures. A process that treats every tentative statement as a permanent commitment can punish the revisions it purports to preserve. Status labels help only when participants and institutions actually respect their meaning. A record of a conjecture should remain evidence that the conjecture was considered, with endorsement and later acceptance separately assessed.

11.4 Metadata authority and administrative overhead

A detailed schema can create an appearance of rigor while imposing substantial work. A graph can also give an editor's interpretation more authority than its evidence warrants.

The response is to keep the schema small enough for its purpose and attach status to consequential assertions. A source link can be direct evidence of textual dependence, a participant report, or an editor's hypothesis. A single unqualified arrow conceals those differences. The system should help a reader find the relevant basis, with uncertainty visible where appropriate.

Maintenance costs can justify a simpler record. A compact change note may serve better than a complex graph that becomes stale. A project can prioritize claims with substantial consequences, repeated reuse, or disputed development. The proposed graph identifies relationships worth considering; it supplies no presumption that a particular software system is necessary.

11.5 The independence of philosophical validity

The final objection observes that a complete documentary architecture can accompany a poor argument. The paper accepts this distinction and uses it to limit the architecture's claim.

Documentary accountability can make errors easier to locate and contributions easier to interpret. Validity still depends on the argument, and truth on the relevant world and evidence. A well-preserved mistake remains a mistake. The architecture's proposed value lies in the conditions it creates for scrutiny and continuation.

This boundary also supports legitimate reliance. A researcher can use a valid result without personally reproducing its entire discovery history. Appropriate attribution and source checking can coexist with a concise presentation. The architecture should serve the philosophical work and the interests implicated by its records, with adoption revisable in light of actual use.

12 Open Questions and Practical Evaluation

This section identifies the work needed to evaluate the architecture in actual research settings. It separates retrieval and interpretive usability, epistemic-status preservation, ethical access, and long-term maintenance. The suggested studies are prospective designs, with their measurement limits and possible costs made explicit.

12.1 Retrieval and interpretation of claim changes

A first evaluation could examine whether readers can locate and correctly interpret a consequential revision. The target should include the relevant reason and remaining uncertainty, extending beyond the speed of finding a phrase.

Researchers could prepare matched records of a bounded philosophical episode in several forms: a chronological export, an export with a compact revision note, and the proposed three-function arrangement. Participants could be asked to identify an earlier formulation, explain a change in scope, distinguish a source statement from commentary, and locate an unresolved objection. The materials would need a documented reference account against which answers could be assessed.

Assignment, prior expertise, reading time, accessibility, and task difficulty would need attention. An arrangement that improves retrieval for experts may confuse occasional readers. A format that produces faster answers may also encourage unwarranted certainty. Evaluation should therefore preserve accuracy, uncertainty recognition, and burden as separate outcomes.

Open Problem 12.1 (Interpretive usability). Under which conditions does a layered record improve readers' ability to trace and assess a claim revision, and which parts of that improvement come from indexing, commentary, source access, or prior expertise?

The question calls for comparison of mechanisms. A positive result for the whole package would leave the contribution of each component open. A small pilot could first identify confusing labels or excessive documentation before a larger study attempts a causal comparison.

12.2 Status preservation across transformations

A second inquiry concerns whether editorial operations preserve epistemic distinctions. A summary can retain the main topic while losing the difference between a conjecture and a supported result.

One proposed audit could track selected claims through quotation, summary, commentary, and article versions. Reviewers would identify changes in modality, domain, source attribution, and represented disagreement. They would then assess which changes were declared and which altered the claim's apparent warrant. Disagreement among reviewers could reveal ambiguity in the source or in the status categories themselves.

This audit should include cases of legitimate repair. A current article can defend a stronger claim if additional evidence was obtained and the transition is accurately recorded. The target is accountable change, including the reasons that support a new epistemic status.

AI assistance could be assessed within that design. Generated summaries might be compared under different instructions or source structures, with evaluation tied to the actual texts. A finding for one model, language, or episode would require further evidence before generalization.

12.3 Selective access and participant interests

A third inquiry concerns the relationship between usable provenance and legitimate restrictions. The graph result identifies loss of paths, while practical decisions also involve privacy, trust, and interpretation.

Open Problem 12.2 (Proportionate public traceability). Which limited descriptions of restricted documentary relationships preserve useful scrutiny without revealing protected information or overstating what public readers can verify?

Possible designs include restricted-source notices, editor attestations, labelled abstractions, and narrower public claims. Evaluation would need participation by relevant contributors and stewards, with appropriate safeguards and permission. A study should assess both what a reader can infer and what information about a participant becomes exposed.

An editor's attestation may be useful while creating dependence on that editor. Its adequacy depends on the purpose, competence, accountability, and available alternatives. The architecture should make that dependence visible and distinguish a qualified summary from direct public access.

12.4 Maintenance, interoperability, and ending

Long-term usefulness depends on whether records and their relationships remain accessible and interpretable. A technically elegant initial arrangement can fail through broken links, undocumented migrations, or unavailable stewards.

A practical project should test whether another person can retrieve the sources, understand the editorial policy, and continue a correction process after the original researcher steps away. Interoperability with established encoding and provenance practices may help, but its benefits require implementation and testing. The present paper supplies a conceptual architecture whose technical realization remains open.

Ending also needs a place in the design. Retention can cease when a legitimate purpose expires, burdens become disproportionate, or participant interests justify another outcome. A record of the decision may preserve an appropriate account of the project's limits without preserving the protected content itself. The appropriate balance remains context-dependent and open to criticism.

Further literature work can identify closer antecedents and better practices. The architecture welcomes revision of its vocabulary, layers, and normative premises. Its proposed value lies in enabling warranted continuation of inquiry under actual conditions, with conceptual priority and universal applicability left unclaimed.

13 Conclusion

This section brings together the proposed architecture, its formal limits, and the responsibilities that govern its use. Philosophical records can preserve different aspects of an inquiry when their source relationships and editorial purposes remain intelligible.

The retained formulation distinguishes dialogue, commentary, and article through generation, interpretation, and stabilization. The paper refines the first function to the documented course of inquiry,

since available records leave some events and causal influences unknown. A source export and a reading edition can both contribute to that function, while commentary interprets changes and the article presents current reasons.

The architecture permits substantial editorial development. A current definition can replace an earlier one in the article, a proof can be repaired, and commentary can identify a previously implicit distinction. The documentary obligation is to preserve the relevant relationship between source and intervention. Later formulations should acquire their actual place in the research history, with rejected alternatives and uncertainty retained where consequential.

The formal analysis gives two limited results. Identical accessible records can be compatible with different causal histories of a revision. Selective access can also remove a documentary path between records whose endpoints remain available. These results clarify the limits of inference and retrieval. Qualified summaries can sometimes preserve a restricted connection, while their evidential strength and ethical adequacy require further assessment.

Normative responsibilities follow explicit premises about accurate invited reliance, participant standing, and proportionate burdens. They can support preservation, correction, restricted access, selective release, or justified non-retention. Technical identifiers and digests contribute through specific assurance functions; the truth of a historical claim and the validity of an argument remain separately assessable.

The proposal is offered for public and scholarly discussion without a claim to conceptual priority. Its antecedents already provide resources for mediated dialogue, editorial interpretation, provenance, and stewardship. Future work can test whether the proposed arrangement improves the intelligibility and corrigibility of actual philosophical projects, while preserving the freedom, privacy, and practical support through which inquiry can continue.

References

- [1] Timothy Lebo, Satya Sahoo, and Deborah McGuinness. PROV-O: The PROV ontology. Technical report, World Wide Web Consortium, 2013. Editors. W3C Recommendation, 30 April 2013; official errata consulted. <https://www.w3.org/TR/2013/REC-prov-o-20130430/>.
- [2] National Institute of Standards and Technology. Secure hash standard (SHS). Technical Report FIPS 180-4, National Institute of Standards and Technology, 2015. Publication abstract consulted. <https://csrc.nist.gov/pubs/fips/180-4/upd1/final>.
- [3] Oral History Association. Principles and best practices, 2018. Core Principles and Statement on Ethics, pp.4–6 in the 2022 print compilation. <https://oralhistory.org/principles-and-best-practices-revised-2018/>.
- [4] Plato. Theaetetus. Translated by Benjamin Jowett. Internet Classics Archive. Opening frame consulted. <https://classics.mit.edu/Plato/theatu.html>.
- [5] TEI Consortium. TEI P5 Guidelines: Representation of primary sources, 2026. Version 4.12.0, 28 July 2026, chapter 12, selected sections 12.3 and 12.7. <https://tei-c.org/release/doc/tei-p5-doc/en/html/PH.html>.
- [6] TEI Consortium. TEI P5 Guidelines: The TEI header, 2026. Version 4.12.0, 28 July 2026, sections 2.3.2–2.3.3. <https://tei-c.org/release/doc/tei-p5-doc/en/html/HD.html>.