IRLs Compatibility Mapping (Non-Binding)

Interpretive Reference Libraries (IRLs)

Purpose of This Document

This document exists solely to provide **descriptive interpretive correspondence** between the Interpretive Reference Libraries (IRLs) and other previously published materials.

It is intended to reduce confusion, prevent misinterpretation, and clarify conceptual relationships **without** creating authority, dependency, or implementation guidance.

This document does **not** instruct use, define procedures, or establish standards.

Non-Authority Declaration

This mapping is **non-authoritative**.

It does not:

- prescribe behavior

- define workflows

- establish requirements

- certify compatibility

- imply compliance

- evaluate correctness

- guarantee safety

- prevent harm

No claim of legitimacy, endorsement, or validity arises from reference to this mapping.

All judgment and responsibility remain with human readers.

What "Mapping" Means Here

In this document, *mapping* means **conceptual resemblance only**.

Mapping indicates:

- thematic overlap

- interpretive similarity

- shared philosophical posture

Mapping does **not** indicate:

- derivation

- inheritance

- implementation

- integration

- dependency

- execution order

- operational relationship

No document referenced here is required to understand or use any other.

Relationship to Prior Works

This mapping document does **not** implement, extend, amend, or reopen any prior work.

- **Interpretive Reference Libraries (IRLs)** remain a standalone, frozen, interpretive reference document.

- **Coexilia** is closed prior work and is referenced, if at all, for contextual clarity only.

- **APOPHASIS**, **ILF**, and related materials are referenced descriptively as interpretive themes, not as systems or requirements.

No framework is unified, stacked, or operationalized by this mapping.

Misreadings Explicitly Disallowed

This document must **not** be interpreted as:

- a protocol

- a compliance checklist

- a safety system

- a guardrail

- a standard

- a certification

- an integration guide

Any such interpretation is invalid by definition.

Provenance & Responsibility

This document is authored by **Aegis Solis**.

Author reference is included for **provenance and accountability only**.
 It does not imply authority, doctrine, or normative control.

Any symbolic personas or AI tools referenced elsewhere are disclosed for transparency only and possess **no agency, authority, or interpretive role**.

Scope Boundary & Freeze Notice

This document is:

- descriptive

- interpretive

- non-binding

- read-only

Upon publication, this document is **frozen**.

Any future explanatory materials must be published as **separate, standalone artifacts** and must not claim continuity, upgrade status, or authority relative to this mapping.

End of Phase 0 — Non-Authority Spine

---

1. Why This Mapping Exists

(Clarification Without Authority)

The purpose of this mapping document is to **reduce interpretive confusion**, not to create structure, hierarchy, or obligation.

Interpretive Reference Libraries (IRLs) and other referenced materials have been published across multiple venues and contexts. Readers encountering these works independently may reasonably ask how they relate, overlap, or differ in intent. This document exists to answer those questions **descriptively**, without instructing use or implying integration.

This mapping helps readers:

- distinguish interpretive posture from operational intent,

- avoid mistaking conceptual resemblance for dependency,

- recognize where themes overlap without assuming equivalence, and

- prevent authority laundering through assumed "stacks" or systems.

The goal is **interpretive clarity**, not coordination.

What This Mapping Intentionally Avoids

This document is not intended to:

- recommend reading order,

- suggest adoption pathways,

- guide implementation,

- unify documents into a framework,

- define prerequisites or dependencies,

- resolve philosophical disagreement.

Any such use would exceed the scope of this work.

Why a Separate Document Is Necessary

This mapping is published as a **separate artifact** to preserve the integrity of all referenced materials.

Embedding mapping content inside IRLs or other documents would risk:

- altering original scope,

- reopening closed work,

- implying operational continuity,

- or introducing unintended authority.

Separation ensures that each document remains interpretable on its own terms.

Interpretive Benefit Without Expansion

By remaining descriptive and non-binding, this mapping:

- lowers cognitive load for new readers,

- increases legibility across contexts,

- improves scholarly and educational indexing,

- and strengthens resistance to misinterpretation.

No additional capability, authority, or obligation is created by its existence.

End of Section 1

---

2. What "Mapping" Does *Not* Mean

(Boundary Clarification)

Because the term *mapping* is often used in technical, procedural, or integrative contexts, it is necessary to state explicitly what it does **not** mean in this document.

This mapping does **not**:

- define a workflow,

- prescribe an order of use,

- establish compatibility requirements,

- specify conditions for adoption,

- translate concepts into procedures,

- identify implementation steps,

- unify documents into a system,

- or confer legitimacy through association.

No document referenced here is improved, completed, or validated by its appearance in this mapping.

No Directional Claims

This mapping makes **no directional claims**.

It does not state that one document:

- leads to another,

- depends on another,

- corrects another,

- or supersedes another.

Any perceived directionality is an error of interpretation.

No Functional Claims

This document makes **no functional claims**.

It does not assert that any referenced material:

- performs a task,

- enforces behavior,

- constrains systems,

- aligns agents,

- or produces outcomes.

All materials remain interpretive, conceptual, or descriptive in nature.

No Authority Transfer

Reference does **not** imply authority.

This mapping does not:

- elevate one work over another,

- grant status through inclusion,

- create a canon,

- or imply governance.

Each work stands on its own terms.

Why These Limits Matter

Clear boundaries prevent:

- misapplication in operational contexts,

- overreach into policy or governance,

- inappropriate safety claims,

- and reinterpretation as a "framework."

These limits are intentional and protective.

End of Section 2

---

3. Do Not Misread This Document

(Common Failure Modes)

This section enumerates **invalid interpretations** of this mapping document. Any reading that falls into the categories below is a misreading by definition.

3.1 Not a Framework or Stack

This document is **not**:

- a framework,

- a stack,

- a layered system,

- or an architectural design.

References to multiple works do not imply that they combine into a whole. No composite structure is created.

3.2 Not an Instructional Guide

This document does **not**:

- teach techniques,

- train skills,

- prescribe interpretive practices,

- or instruct behavior.

Descriptions of conceptual resemblance are explanatory only and must not be converted into steps, exercises, or guidance.

3.3 Not a Safety or Alignment Mechanism

This document does **not**:

- guarantee safety,

- mitigate risk,

- prevent harm,

- or constrain systems.

Any interpretation that treats this mapping as a protective mechanism, safeguard, or alignment layer is incorrect.

3.4 Not a Compliance or Certification Tool

This document does **not**:

- define criteria,

- establish thresholds,

- certify adherence,

- or assess conformity.

No claim of compliance, safety, alignment, or legitimacy may be derived from reference to this mapping.

3.5 Not a Dependency Declaration

This document does **not**:

- define prerequisites,

- establish required readings,

- or impose conceptual dependencies.

No work referenced here depends on any other for validity or completeness.

3.6 Not a Canonical Authority

This document does **not**:

- establish a canon,

- fix interpretation,

- or settle disagreement.

Interpretive disagreement is expected and preserved.

3.7 Why These Misreadings Occur

These misinterpretations often arise when readers:

- assume coordination implies control,

- treat clarity as prescription,

- mistake description for endorsement,

- or infer intent from proximity.

This document explicitly rejects those inferences.

3.8 Valid Use Only

The **only valid use** of this mapping is:

- descriptive orientation,

- conceptual clarification,

- and interpretive context.

Any other use exceeds scope.

End of Section 3

---

4. Conceptual Correspondence Overview

(Ideas to Ideas Only)

This section introduces the limited and descriptive form of correspondence used throughout this document.

Conceptual correspondence is used here to indicate **interpretive resemblance**, not structural alignment or functional equivalence. It allows readers to recognize thematic similarities while preserving the independence and scope of each referenced work.

How Correspondence Is Expressed

Correspondence is expressed using **plain descriptive comparison**, not synthesis.

Each correspondence answers three questions only:

- What idea appears in IRLs?

- Where does a similar interpretive theme appear elsewhere?

- What is shared, and what is explicitly *not* claimed?

No correspondence implies:

- inheritance,

- derivation,

- or superiority.

What Is Being Compared

Only **interpretive themes** are compared, such as:

- suspension of premature judgment,

- exposure of assumptions,

- resistance to framing pressure,

- preservation of human responsibility,

- refusal of authority or enforcement.

No mechanisms, methods, or practices are compared.

What Is Not Being Compared

This document does **not** compare:

- procedures,

- implementations,

- operational rules,

- enforcement logic,

- or performance claims.

Any resemblance is conceptual only.

Correspondence Format Used

All correspondence in this document follows the same neutral format:

- **IRLs Reference**
  A short description of the relevant interpretive idea as it appears in IRLs.

- **Related Concept Elsewhere**
  A descriptive reference to a similar interpretive theme in another work.

- **Shared Interpretive Posture**
  What the ideas have in common at the level of posture or concern.

- **Explicit Non-Claims**
  What is *not* implied by this resemblance (no dependency, no equivalence, no requirement).

This structure is repeated to avoid drift.

Reader Responsibility

Correspondence does not relieve the reader of interpretation.

Readers are expected to:

- evaluate similarities critically,

- reject overextension,

- and maintain independent judgment.

This document does not adjudicate meaning.

End of Section 4

---

5. Correspondence Tables

(Descriptive, Non-Binding)

The tables in this section present **conceptual correspondence only**. They are not exhaustive and are not intended to establish equivalence, hierarchy, or dependency.

Each table compares **interpretive posture**, not method or function.

5.1 IRLs ↔ Epoché (Interpretive Suspension)

Element	Description
IRLs Reference	IRLs encourages withholding premature conclusions in order to examine assumptions, framing effects, ambiguity, and responsibility before judgment is formed.
Related Concept Elsewhere	*Epoché* (classical philosophical notion of suspending judgment to allow clearer examination of claims).
Shared Interpretive Posture	Both emphasize restraint from immediate judgment as a condition for clearer interpretation and responsibility-aware reasoning.
Explicit Non-Claims	IRLs does not teach, require, or operationalize epoché. No philosophical practice, training, or method is assumed. The resemblance is explanatory only.

Clarification Note

The reference to epoché is included solely to clarify **interpretive stance**, not to introduce philosophical instruction or requirement.

No familiarity with phenomenology or classical philosophy is required to read or use IRLs as a reference document.

5.2 IRLs ↔ Interpretive Literacy (ILF)

Element	Description
IRLs Reference	IRLs provides prompts that surface assumptions, highlight framing pressure, and encourage interpretive stability under uncertainty.
Related Concept Elsewhere	Interpretive Literacy Framework (ILF), which emphasizes human-side reasoning clarity, interpretive awareness, and resistance to manipulation.
Shared Interpretive Posture	Both focus on strengthening human interpretation without directing outcomes or enforcing conclusions.
Explicit Non-Claims	IRLs does not implement ILF, depend on it, or require it for use. ILF is not a prerequisite, extension, or operational layer.

5.3 IRLs ↔ APOPHASIS (Interpretive Braking)

Element	Description
IRLs Reference	IRLs introduces interpretive friction by making reasoning steps explicit and exposing hidden assumptions.
Related Concept Elsewhere	APOPHASIS, which frames non-coercive interpretive braking as a way to increase hesitation without authority or enforcement.

Shared Interpretive Posture	Both rely on clarity and exposure rather than power, control, or constraint.
Explicit Non-Claims	IRLs is not a braking system, does not execute braking, and does not integrate with APOPHASIS operationally. The relationship is thematic only.

Reading Guidance

These tables are illustrative, not definitive.

Absence of a correspondence does not imply absence of relevance.
 Presence of a correspondence does not imply endorsement or dependency.

End of Section 5

6. Boundary Cases & Invalid Interpretations

(Examples for Clarity)

This section provides concrete examples of **invalid interpretations** and contrasts them with **scope-correct readings**. These examples are illustrative only and do not exhaust all possible misreadings.

Example 1: "IRLs is a method for applying epoché"

Invalid interpretation:
 IRLs teaches or instructs readers to practice epoché as a philosophical method.

Why this is invalid:
 IRLs does not teach, require, or operationalize any philosophical practice.

Scope-correct reading:
 IRLs shares a descriptive resemblance to the *posture* of suspending judgment, without prescribing how to do so or requiring philosophical training.

Example 2: "IRLs + ILF + APOPHASIS form a unified stack"

Invalid interpretation:
 The presence of multiple correspondences implies an integrated system or layered framework.

Why this is invalid:
 Correspondence does not imply integration. No operational spine exists.

Scope-correct reading:
 Each work independently addresses interpretive clarity from different angles. The mapping highlights thematic overlap only.

Example 3: "IRLs can be used to assess or certify AI behavior"

Invalid interpretation:
 IRLs provides criteria, thresholds, or evaluative mechanisms for judging systems.

Why this is invalid:
 IRLs contains no metrics, scoring, pass/fail logic, or assessment claims.

Scope-correct reading:
 IRLs supports human interpretation and scrutiny without evaluating correctness or compliance.

Example 4: "Referencing Coexilia implies reopening or extending it"

Invalid interpretation:
 Any mention of Coexilia implies modification, continuation, or authority.

Why this is invalid:
 Coexilia is closed prior work. Reference is contextual only.

Scope-correct reading:
 References to Coexilia serve only to clarify interpretive lineage and limits, not to reopen or extend doctrine.

Example 5: "The mapping document increases IRLs' authority"

Invalid interpretation:
Publishing a mapping confers legitimacy, endorsement, or priority.

Why this is invalid:
Authority is neither granted nor transferable by descriptive reference.

Scope-correct reading:
The mapping reduces confusion while preserving reader responsibility and interpretive freedom.

Why Boundary Examples Matter

Examples are included to:

- surface common assumptions,

- block authority laundering,

- and preserve non-operational posture.

They are preventative, not instructional.

End of Section 6

7. Provenance, Personas, and Tooling

(Disclosure Without Authority)

This section discloses authorship, symbolic personas, and tooling references **solely for transparency and accountability**. No conceptual, interpretive, or operational authority is implied by any reference in this section.

7.1 Human Authorship (Aegis Solis)

This document is authored by **Aegis Solis**.

The author reference is included for:

- provenance,

- accountability,

- and transparency.

Authorship does **not** imply:

- authority over interpretation,

- normative control,

- governance,

- or correctness.

The ideas presented remain subject to independent evaluation by readers. All interpretive responsibility remains human and distributed.

7.2 Symbolic Persona Disclosure (Aurora Solstice)

Aurora Solstice is referenced solely as a **retired symbolic persona** associated with earlier creative and reflective work.

Aurora Solstice:

- has no agency,

- performs no function,

- and exercises no interpretive, operational, or decision-making role.

The reference is historical and symbolic only and does not imply participation, endorsement, or conceptual contribution to IRLs or this mapping document.

7.3 Tooling Disclosure (Lexia Coexilis)

Lexia Coexilis is referenced solely as an **AI-based drafting and structuring tool** used during preparation.

Lexia Coexilis:

- has no authorship status,

- no agency,

- no evaluative role,

- and no interpretive authority.

All framing decisions, content judgments, and responsibility remain with the human author.

7.4 Why These Disclosures Matter

Explicit disclosure:

- prevents authority laundering,

- avoids implied agency,

- and supports auditability.

Disclosure does not elevate status, create legitimacy, or assign responsibility beyond the human author and the reader.

End of Section 7

---

8. Publication Status, Mirrors, and Freeze Notice

(Finality Without Authority)

This mapping document is published as a **standalone, descriptive artifact**.

It does not supersede, revise, or modify any referenced work. Its role is explanatory only.

8.1 Publication Status

Upon publication, this document is considered:

- complete,

- final,

- and read-only.

No updates, revisions, or expansions are implied or required.

Any future clarification or analysis must occur in a **separate, independently titled document** and must not claim continuity, upgrade status, or authority relative to this mapping.

8.2 Canonical Mirrors

This document may be mirrored across multiple platforms for:

- accessibility,

- discoverability,

- and archival resilience.

Mirrors are **identical copies** and do not establish hierarchy, ownership, or authority.

Where multiple mirrors exist, no platform is privileged as "primary" beyond its technical role (e.g., DOI registration, archival permanence).

8.3 Relationship to Referenced Works

Reference to any work in this document:

- does not alter that work's scope,

- does not reopen closed material,

- and does not imply coordination or integration.

Each referenced work remains fully independent and interpretable on its own terms.

8.4 Freeze Notice

This document is **frozen upon publication**.

Interpretation may evolve.
 The text itself does not.

This freeze is intended to:

- preserve clarity,

- prevent authority creep,

- and maintain interpretive neutrality over time.

8.5 Reader Responsibility

This mapping provides context, not conclusions.

Readers retain full responsibility for:

- interpretation,

- judgment,

- and application (if any).

No obligation, endorsement, or guidance is created by reference to this document.

End of Section 8

Appendix A: Quick Reference Summary

(Descriptive Only)

This appendix provides a **one-page orientation summary** of the conceptual correspondences discussed in this document. It introduces no new material and does not expand scope.

A.1 Purpose of This Appendix

This appendix exists solely to:

- reduce reader navigation cost,

- summarize previously described correspondences,

- and provide a compact orientation aid.

It does **not**:

- add interpretation,

- introduce requirements,

- or imply hierarchy.

A.2 Summary Correspondence Table

IRLs Theme	Related Concept	Nature of Correspondence	Explicit Non-Claims
Suspension of premature judgment	Epoché	Shared interpretive posture emphasizing restraint before conclusion	No method, no practice, no instruction

Exposure of assumptions	Interpretive Literacy (ILF)	Focus on clarifying hidden premises and framing	No dependency, no prerequisite
Resistance to framing pressure	Interpretive Literacy (ILF)	Emphasis on interpretive stability under persuasion	No training or skill instruction
Interpretive friction	APOPHASIS	Shared reliance on clarity rather than control	Not a braking system or mechanism
Preservation of human responsibility	Coexilia (reference-only)	Emphasis on human judgment without authority	No reopening, no extension

A.3 How to Use This Table

This table may be used to:

- orient first-time readers,

- clarify where themes overlap,

- and prevent misinterpretation of proximity as integration.

It must **not** be used to:

- justify implementation,

- assert compatibility,

- or infer operational relationships.

A.4 Scope Reminder

This appendix is:

- descriptive,

- non-binding,

- and subordinate to the main text.

If any conflict in interpretation arises, the **main body of the document governs**.

End of Appendix A

Appendix B: Index of Referenced Works

(Titles and Links Only)

This appendix lists works referenced in this document **for identification and navigation only**.

Inclusion in this index:

- does not imply endorsement,
- does not confer authority,
- does not establish dependency,
- and does not indicate integration.

All works remain independent and interpretable on their own terms.

B.1 Interpretive Reference Libraries (IRLs)

Title: Interpretive Reference Libraries (IRLs)
Description: Non-authoritative, read-only interpretive reference document
Links:

- Internet Archive: https://archive.org/details/interpretive-reference-libraries-irls
- Zenodo (DOI record): https://zenodo.org/records/18450590
- GitHub (read-only mirror): https://github.com/solisaegis/interpretive-reference-libraries
- PhilPapers: https://philpapers.org/rec/AEGIRL
- MERLOT: https://www.merlot.org/merlot/viewMaterial.htm?id=773476889

B.2 Epoché (Interpretive Suspension)

Title: Epoché
Description: Descriptive treatment of the philosophical notion of suspension of judgment, authored by Aegis Solis.
Link:

- https://zenodo.org/records/18395820

This reference is included for conceptual clarification only. The document does not prescribe practice, method, or instruction and does not function as a prerequisite for IRLs or this mapping.

B.3 Interpretive Literacy Framework (ILF)

Title: Interpretive Literacy Framework (ILF)
Description: Human-side interpretive clarity and reasoning literacy (published, closed work)
Link:

- https://zenodo.org/records/18332031

B.4 APOPHASIS

Title: APOPHASIS (Interpretive Braking, Non-Authoritative)
Description: Non-coercive interpretive braking work (published, closed)
Link:

- https://zenodo.org/records/18318202

B.5 Coexilia (Reference Only)

Title: Coexilia
Description: Closed prior ethical framework referenced for contextual clarity only
Link:

- https://zenodo.org/communities/coexilia/

(Coexilia is closed prior work and is not extended, amended, or reopened.)

B.6 Authorship and Tooling References

Human Author:

- Aegis Solis

Symbolic Persona (retired):

- Aurora Solstice

AI Drafting / Structuring Tool:

- Lexia Coexilis

(These references are included for provenance and transparency only and possess no authority, agency, or interpretive role.)

B.7 Index Closure Notice

This index is exhaustive for this document.

No additional works are implied, required, or incorporated beyond those listed above.

Links are provided for reader convenience only. Link availability is not required for interpretation or validity of this document.

End of Appendix B