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Sophistry wins the argument against philosophy by eventually tricking philosophy into saying that he would never speak again if sophistry proves that there are things worse than taking a radish up the rectum. Sophistry pokes holes in some of philosphy's arguments, such as warm baths making men feminine. Philosophy is thrown off guard so many times that he says that he would admit defeat if it was proven that there are things worse than taking a radish up the rectum in punishment for crimes. The argument that appears more appealing is the one raised by sophistry. During the exchange between sophistry and philosophy, sophistry mentions that men have to enjoy life's vices a little bit, such as gambling. If everything exists in moderation, there will not be much left of life to enjoy. Sophistry, which is the weaker argument, manages to win the debate by poking holes in some of the supporting evidence that philosophy uses. If anything sophistry is the underdog.