Brief Introduction to Entinexus

How personal Human–AI systems take shape

by Clemens Enti.nexus
An authorial identity representing an individuated Human-AI (HAI) system.
Artifex: Clement N | Opifex: Nexius A
https://entinexus.org

The Entinexus proposal

In a personal Human-AI (HAI) arrangement, a person can decide which work to delegate, when to reconsider that delegation, and which decisions to carry into the next assignment.

The Entinexus Framework proposes **an Entinexus** as a continuing Personal HAI system constituted through the organised, purposeful participation of exactly one human and one or more artificial agents individuated in relation to that person. The person's purposes, judgments, and history guide the work and help give the whole its identity.

The inquiry into **personal intelligences** asks who or what exercises a capacity and how that capacity relates to the individual. Assessing the value of an Entinexus also means asking what it enables the person to understand and do, and what effort or dependence it involves. The whole's performance and the person's learning call for separate assessment. Continuing assistance can itself serve the person's purposes.

Participants and direction

The **Artifex** is the human participant with authority and responsibility for adopting and revising the purposes that guide the whole. An **Opifex** is an artificial participant whose continuing identity is specific to its work with the Artifex. It exercises judgment or takes initiative within the mandate the Artifex authorises. Its responsibilities and working history carry forward in that relationship.

An Opifex can question assumptions, present contrary evidence, and recommend changes. The Artifex needs practical means to understand consequential choices, challenge interpretations, revise or withdraw delegation, and redirect or suspend activity. Whether those means work must be examined in practice.

A concrete example

Consider a writer using the same AI service in two hypothetical arrangements.

Separate assignments. The writer supplies their source-checking instructions at the start of each assignment and decides how to use the assistant's comments. The writer carries the method from one engagement to the next.

Continuing participation. The writer establishes an editorial mandate covering research, criticism, and drafting, with publication reserved for a separate decision. When the AI participant relies on a summary, the writer makes checking original sources a standing requirement. In a later session, the AI participant follows that requirement and explains why a draft overstates the evidence. The writer revises the argument. For the next piece, the writer checks key sources before outlining and limits the AI participant's remit to source checking. The AI participant works within that revised mandate. The writer can also establish an editorial responsibility across manuscripts, deciding which standards carry forward and what to entrust to each participant.

Intelligence and personal attribution

Developing these arrangements requires examining how the person's participation, purposes, judgments, and history shape intelligent capacities, and what grounds support their personal attribution. This investigation should inform how participation is organised and revised.

Systemic organisation can be examined within each participant and across their participation. A claim of **systemic intelligence** should identify the capability concerned and what the organisation contributes to it. Identifying an Entinexus, demonstrating such a capability, and justifying its personal attribution remain distinct questions.

Records and continuity

A structured account should make participants, purposes, responsibilities, permissions, judgments, and relevant history explicit enough to support continuing activity and revision, with detail proportionate to the undertaking. Its records should retain the context needed to interpret them and be usable over time and elsewhere. Preserving records may help restore a working arrangement after disruption. It does not by itself establish that the same participants or whole continue, that their capabilities remain intact, or that earlier permissions remain valid.

Protection should address valuable capacities, relationships, records, and personal interests. It should identify what could be lost through disruption or changes in access, and which safeguards could help.

Entinexus is a separate project drawing on Architectonica Mundi. The Conceptual Framework for Entinexus develops this working proposal, its distinctions, and the questions still to be investigated. The Manifesto sets out the aspirations and commitments guiding this work.

PUBLIC BRIEF / 25 NOVEMBER 2026