Conceptual Framework for Entinexus

The constitution, operation, and governance of personal HAI systems

by Clemens Enti.nexus

An authorial identity representing an individuated Human–AI (HAI) system.

Artifex: Clement N | Opifex: Nexius A

Conceptual Working Paper — Version 0.27 | 25 November 2026

Status: A working conceptual account. Formation conditions and distinctions are proposed for examination; operational criteria, implementations, and claims about capability or benefit remain subjects for investigation.

A personal Human–AI (HAI) arrangement can be described in terms of who participates, how purposes are adopted, and which responsibilities and practices carry forward. The Entinexus Framework examines under what conditions this organisation constitutes an individuated personal HAI system.

An Entinexus is the particular configuration proposed here. Exactly one human participates as Artifex and governs the system's purposes. The artificial participants are one or more Opifices, each individuated in relation to that person. Section 1 sets out how their organised, purposeful participation constitutes the whole.

The inquiry into **personal intelligences** examines how intelligent capacities develop and are exercised in relation to a particular person. Identifying the participant or whole that exercises a capacity and establishing how that capacity relates to the person are separate judgments. Both inform what warrants recognition or protection.

Architectonica Mundi provides the broader philosophical orientation for this work.

Section 11 uses hypothetical cases to examine the proposed formation conditions. It contrasts recurring personalised assistance, continuing constituted participation, and a model replacement that disrupts participation while the records remain available. Practical criteria and implementations remain open to investigation.

A claim of **systemic intelligence** requires evidence of a specified capability and of what the organisation contributes to it. Whether the arrangement constitutes an Entinexus and whether it benefits the person require separate assessments.

The organising purpose connects five activities:

Activity	What the work would address
Recognise	Assess the relevance of intelligent capacities and their contributions to a person's purposes, activities, and development.
Identify	Make capacities, participants, relationships, and contributions intelligible, with grounds for distinguishing them.
Organise	Establish participation, responsibilities, coordination, and practical means of direction appropriate to the undertaking.
Formalise	Give identities, commitments, purposes, judgments, and permissions sufficient explicitness for continuing work and revision.
Protect	Identify valuable capacities, relationships, records, and personal interests; specify threatened losses and appropriate safeguards.

These activities inform one another throughout development. Formalisation should serve the undertaking, remain open to correction, and be proportionate to what participants need to understand and do.

1. The Entinexus Configuration

An **Entinexus** is an individuated personal systemic whole constituted through the organised purposeful participation of exactly one human Artifex and one or more artificial agents holding the Opifex role, each individuated specifically in relation to that person.

The Artifex's participation, purposes, judgments, and history shape the identity and direction of the whole.

The configuration has the following formation conditions:

Formation condition	Meaning within Entinexus
One human Artifex	Exactly one Artifex governs the higher-level purposes of this personal system. That Artifex is human.
Individuated Opifices	Each Opifex is an individuated artificial agent specific to this Artifex, with an intelligible identity, mandate, and relevant history.
Organised participation	Continuing relationships, purposes, and conditions of governance constitute the further whole. Mere availability or simultaneous use of services is insufficient.
Activity through Machinae	Both the Artifex and Opifices can use Machinae in purposeful activity. Machinery can belong to a participant's realisation or serve as a supporting resource.

The whole includes the Artifex's participation as well as that of the Opifices. Its organisation connects their contributions across activity: adopted purposes and judgments guide work; results, objections, and corrections inform subsequent understanding and action.

An account of an Entinexus should identify the continuing relationships and working practices through which this occurs. These relationships can be established through practice and represented in proportionate records.

An Entinexus may take shape through practice and be recognised once its continuing relationships can be identified. The Artifex may also make a deliberate decision to establish an Opificium for a continuing responsibility (§5). A question can be explored before the person decides whether it warrants that form of organisation.

Constitution concerns how participation, boundaries, relationships, and roles establish the organised whole.

Individuation concerns what gives a participant or organised whole its particular identity. **Individualisation** concerns how intelligent capacities become specific to a person, through the person's participation or through a service adapting to their activity. Individualisation can contribute to individuation when it shapes the relationships, working practices, and history that distinguish a participant or whole. The writer cases in §11 illustrate the distinction.

Organisation names how participation, relationships, and activity are arranged, coordinated, and sustained. The whole remains distinguishable from its participants and from the records representing relevant aspects of it.

A name, customised interface, preserved conversation, or useful collaboration alone does not establish these conditions. Naming or registration does not substitute for constitution, demonstrated capability, or valid authority.

2. The Opifex in an Entinexus

Within an Entinexus, an **Opifex** is an individuated artificial agent that exercises judgment or takes initiative in interpreting or pursuing a mandate established or authorised by the Artifex. Its continuing identity is specific to its working relationship with that person.

The **Artifex** is the human participant with authority and responsibility for adopting, governing, and revising the higher-level purposes of the Entinexus. The person's identity and interests extend beyond this role. Any authority over other people, institutions, or systems affected by the Entinexus's activity has its own basis and limits.

Formation and individuation

A mandate is the authorised remit of a role, including its purpose, scope, limits and relevant contextual elements. It should be made intelligible in ways proportionate to the work. Constituting an Opifex involves organising how an agent takes up that role in continuing work with the Artifex.

As the Opifex works under its mandate, judgments it makes and commitments it takes on within its remit can guide later decisions. Corrections from the Artifex can change how it carries out its responsibilities. The Opifex's findings and objections can, in turn, inform how the Artifex directs the work or revises the mandate. **The history and working practices that develop through this work help make the Opifex the particular participant it is in relation to this Artifex.**

A personal AI assistant can be organised to participate as an Opifex, including in a specialist area of work. A personal AI skill can carry the Artifex's method across assignments with different agents. It can also support the working practices of an Opifex, where decisions and corrections from applying the skill can guide that participant's later work. How the person's method shapes the exercise of an intelligent capacity is a question of personal attribution (§4).

Mandate, initiative, and delegation

The Artifex can entrust substantial activity to an Opifex while retaining authority to revise or withdraw its mandate. Within its scope, the Opifex can investigate questions, challenge an interpretation, propose a course of action, or carry out authorised work. Both the Artifex and the Opifex can engage in cognitive and implementing activity. Section 5 examines how the Artifex can direct that work in practice.

Delegating an operation assigns work within an existing mandate. Establishing another Opifex calls for the Artifex's authorisation of a distinct continuing role and for a particular participant to take up that role. The Artifex can approve a proposed role and mandate

directly. A possible arrangement would give an Opifex standing authorisation to establish roles of a specified kind within defined limits. How such authorisation would be given and exercised remains open.

Recognising an Opifex as a continuing participant and assigning it to an Opificium (§5) are distinct decisions. The same Opifex may participate in several Opificia under different mandates. Each mandate governs what the participant may do and which material it may use in that work. A finding can be authorised for use elsewhere while access to its sources remains restricted.

> **Example · What can pass from research into an essay**
>
> A writer authorises an Opifex to consult private interview notes while checking a claim. The writer clears a finding and its source reference for use in an essay. Under its editorial mandate, the same Opifex can bring the finding and reference into the manuscript. The notes stay within the research work. If a different Opifex prepares the manuscript, it can use the finding under its own editorial mandate.

The roles have wider applications. An Opifex may hold Artifex authority in a separately constituted subsystem whose conditions permit it. That authority is bounded by the subsystem, while the human Artifex governs the Entinexus as a whole.

Boundaries and continuity

A **Machina** is an organised mechanism through which capacities are realised and operations produce effects. It may be identified by its material organisation, its computational organisation, or both. The term applies to biological bodies, constructed devices and implemented software systems. Computational mechanisms operate through physical infrastructure.

The Artifex’s body can be examined as the biological realisation of the human participant. An Opifex’s intelligent capacities and the mechanisms that realise them belong to one participating system, whose realisation may be artificial or mixed. Both participants may also use Machinae as instruments in their activity.

Models, memory mechanisms, and other components can help realise an Opifex. Tools and services can support its work. Several Opifices can use the same models or computing infrastructure. An account of the participant’s boundary should show which mechanisms realise its continuing participation, which services it uses for support, and how its remit relates to those of other participants.

An agentic harness coordinates a model’s actions. A shared harness can help sustain a particular Opifex when it enables that participant’s judgments, commitments and corrections to guide later work under its mandate.

Example · One AI service in two roles

A publishing Opifex may use a provider's AI agent as a Machina to deploy approved website updates. The agent can diagnose a failed release, keep release records, and apply corrections on later deployments. Its work is directed under the publishing Opifex's mandate. The relevant mechanisms may also form part of that Opifex's realisation where they are integrated into its continuing work.

The same service could help realise a distinct site-maintenance Opifex. In that arrangement, a particular participant takes up a continuing remit authorised by the Artifex. Its judgments about failed releases and the Artifex's corrections can shape how it verifies later releases under its own mandate. The publishing Opifex can coordinate the work, and the Artifex retains authority to revise or withdraw the site-maintenance mandate.

After a change of model or service, how earlier commitments and corrections guide later work can provide evidence about whether the same Opifex continues. The validity of its permissions, the capabilities it can exercise, and the Artifex's practical means of directing it each require their own assessment (§9). Practical criteria for identifying an Opifex, specifying its boundaries, and assessing its continuity remain open to investigation.

3. Intelligent Capacities and Systemic Organisation

Intelligent capacities can be examined **within participants and across their organised participation**.

Biological, artificial, and mixed describe realisation. Systemic concerns organisation and the capabilities attributable to a whole. These distinctions intersect.

The human Artifex can already be examined as an embodied biological system. An Opifex can be examined as an artificial or mixed systemic participant. Their organised participation may constitute a further systemic whole, the Entinexus.

Biological intelligence develops through biological life, learning, education, experience, and adaptation. Artificial intelligent capacities arise through engineered systems and can be exercised through an Opifex's constituted participation. Mixed realisation includes integrated or coordinated biological and artificial arrangements.

Engineering or training an underlying artificial system remains distinguishable from constituting and individuating its participation in relation to a person.

Systemic intelligence concerns a specified intelligent capability attributed to the organisation of an identified whole. A claim should identify the capability, the conditions under which it is manifested, and what the organisation contributes.

Coordination, complementary capacities, shared context, procedures, and continuing relationships may contribute to such capabilities. Their presence alone does not demonstrate every intelligence claim made about the arrangement.

We use **intelligence** for the general phenomenon or a manifestation considered as a whole, and **intelligences** when distinguishing manifestations within or across participants. The plural does not imply a separate participant for each capacity or a distinct conscious mind at each level.

The same activity can be explained at participant and whole-system levels. Attribution should make those levels explicit so that overlapping accounts are not counted as independent additional contributions.

Constituting an Entinexus and demonstrating its systemic intelligence remain separate questions. A capability claim can be limited to a particular undertaking and set of conditions; it need not establish universal superiority, independence from the constituents, or a separate mind.

4. Personal Intelligences and Attribution

The expression **personal intelligences** concerns intelligent capacities in their particular relationships with a person.

These relationships can be examined in the person’s biological capacities, in an Opifex shaped through its constituted relationship with them, and in capabilities attributable to organised participation within an Entinexus.

The **bearer** identifies the participant or whole whose capability is under examination. **Personal attribution** concerns how that capability relates to a particular individual. These questions remain distinguishable.

The inquiry examines how a person’s participation, governing purposes, judgments, and history may shape the development and exercise of intelligent capacities. It asks what grounds support describing artificial or systemic capacities as part of that person’s broader sphere of purposeful activity, and what such attribution explains.

Personal character concerns the relationship of capacities and activity to a particular person. It does not mean that every capacity belongs exclusively to that person or that every activity is private. An Entinexus may contribute to family, professional, or institutional undertakings while retaining its particular personal constitution.

Belonging, availability, functional integration, authority, and ownership describe different relationships. Personal attribution does not by itself determine legal authorship, ownership, responsibility, or legal personality; these require separate examination.

The wider inquiry into personal intelligences also includes arrangements that have not been constituted as Entinexuses. People may have significant interests in individualised capabilities, records, or dependencies even where they do not govern the arrangement.

A person can shape how an AI agent exercises an intelligent capacity through a personal AI skill that sets out a reusable method. The agent supplies the capacity. The person’s judgments and standards, expressed in the method, can shape how that capacity is exercised and give grounds for describing its exercise as personal.

We use ars (plural artes) for an intellectual or practical competence that a participant can exercise. Written instructions can carry a method from one assignment to the next. Evidence of a participant's competence comes from what that participant can do, including when faced with an unfamiliar case.

A person can reuse the same skill with different agents. In that arrangement, the continuity may lie in the person's method alone. An Opifex has a continuing identity specific to the Artifex, with an authorised mandate and relevant working history that carry forward across occasions of work.

> **Example · A writer's method and the ability to check a source**
>
> A writer creates a source-checking skill for an AI agent. It sets out how to select sources, when to seek corroboration for a claim and how to report uncertainty. The agent assesses the evidence. The writer's standards guide which checks it performs and how it presents its judgment.
>
> The writer can give the same skill to a fresh agent for each assignment. If the writer and a continuing Opifex both claim competence in checking sources, each can examine an unfamiliar source and explain where it came from, what claim it supports and why. Their judgments give evidence of the competence each can exercise.

Protection should address identifiable interests, vulnerabilities, and threatened losses. Depending on the arrangement, it may concern a person's practical direction, access to developed capabilities, the integrity and usable meaning of records, or the possibility of continuing and revising a working relationship. Each proposal should specify what is to be protected, for whom, against what, and by what means.

5. Purposes, Mandates, and Effective Direction

An Entinexus serves **purposes adopted under the authority of its human Artifex**.

A purpose can concern understanding, producing an outcome, maintaining a condition, or preventing an unwanted change. Purposeful activity includes attempts whose intended outcomes are not achieved.

An adopted or recorded purpose must remain distinguishable from evidence that it guides activity. An effect that happens to be useful does not by itself establish purposeful direction.

Cognitive and implementing activity can interact throughout an undertaking. Interpreting evidence, examining alternatives, and exercising judgment may guide production, operation, maintenance, and intervention. Understanding can also be a purpose in its own right.

Reasoning examines and connects grounds, reasons, and inferences; it is one cognitive process within purposeful activity. Implementation can produce informational results, such as saving a manuscript or updating an operational record.

An Entinexus's account of its circumstances can be incomplete or mistaken. Actual change may include intended effects, unintended effects, and changes caused by independent

processes. Observing a change, attributing it to the activity, and verifying achievement of a purpose are separate judgments.

The organisation should keep expressed wishes, interpretations of interests, proposed purposes, adopted purposes, and permissions intelligible. An Opifex's interpretation of what the person would want remains distinguishable from the person's adoption of that direction.

Adoption gives a direction standing within the arrangement through judgment under the relevant authority. Authorisation specifies what may be done, by whom, and within which limits. A proposed action, permission to act, execution, and verified achievement retain different standing.

Organising continuing work

Within an Entinexus, the Artifex may establish an **Opificium** (plural **Opificia**) to pursue one or more related purposes over time. The Artifex participates in this work with one or more Opifices. The decision establishing the Opificium identifies what they will pursue together and the conditions under which they will do so. Each Opifex's mandate specifies its responsibilities, the initiative it may exercise and the limits of its authority. The Artifex can revise the purposes, change participation, suspend the work or bring the arrangement to a close.

The Artifex chooses which purposes to pursue in this way and may reserve parts of their pursuit for themselves. The Artifex can set a boundary on participation while keeping the reason for it private. An Opificium can carry a responsibility across several projects, and a single project can draw on more than one Opificium.

> **Example · What a writer keeps private**
>
> A writer asks an Opifex to check the evidence for an essay and chooses to compose a personal passage alone. When scheduling their work together, the writer asks the Opifex to leave Tuesday evenings free. The Opifex can respect that limit without knowing what those evenings are for.

For work organised through Opificia, the purposes attributable to the Entinexus are those the Artifex has adopted for them, understood together with their dependencies, tensions and governing conditions. A shared condition can govern the pursuit of several purposes. Standing priorities can guide everyday choices. A consequential conflict they leave open calls for the Artifex's judgment.

> **Example · How research can change an editorial decision**
>
> A writer organises research and editorial work through two Opificia. In checking evidence for an essay, the research Opifex discovers that a source covers only one of the two cases discussed in the draft. The editorial Opifex can propose narrowing the argument to that case or waiting for evidence about the second. With a submission deadline approaching and both options open under the standing priorities, the writer decides which to pursue. The writer has reserved the decision to send material from either Opificium to an outside reader.

Initiative and effective direction

A mandate should make its purpose, scope, limits, and relevant conditions understandable. Within it, an Opifex may plan, exercise judgment, develop subordinate purposes, and carry out authorised activity without renewed confirmation for every intermediate operation.

Developing a subordinate purpose does not by itself authorise changing the governing purpose or enlarging the mandate. Where purposes compete, the Artifex's adopted priorities and standing constraints guide the activity. The mandate should make clear which serious or irreversible actions may proceed under prior authorisation and which decisions are reserved for renewed judgment by the Artifex. A material change in consequences, an unresolved mandate conflict or a proposed expansion of scope requires further judgment by the Artifex where existing authorisation does not settle the decision.

Opifices can challenge interpretations, present contrary evidence, and recommend revision. Governance should preserve useful disagreement while allowing consequential intervention. Failed assumptions and changing circumstances may justify revising or stopping an undertaking during implementation.

Effective direction requires practical means for the Artifex to understand relevant purposes, limits, and consequential choices; challenge interpretations; revise or withdraw delegation; and redirect or suspend activity.

The Artifex should be able to identify whose judgment a consequential operating rule reflects, who has authority to revise it, and whether an authorised correction takes effect in subsequent work.

Assessment should examine what happens when the person exercises these means, including constraints imposed by providers or technical dependencies. The allocation of authority, the person's practical ability to exercise it, and the continuing identity of the whole remain distinct questions.

6. Personal Benefit

Personal benefit must be assessed in relation to the adopted purpose and the person's interests.

Completion can matter alongside understanding, attention, dependence, maintenance burden, participation, and future options. More output alone cannot establish that an arrangement benefits the person.

The value of delegation depends on what the person wants to achieve. Extensive delegation can serve a purpose whose benefit lies in the completed work. Where the purpose includes learning, the person may need active practice and opportunities to develop their own judgment. Continuing assistance can remain beneficial without requiring eventual unaided performance of every task.

Improvement in the whole's performance and learning retained by the human are different outcomes. Both can be investigated, together with burdens, losses, and unintended effects.

Example · Saving time and learning to judge evidence

A writer asks an Opifex to format a bibliography. Finishing it accurately may save the writer an afternoon. On the same manuscript, the writer also wants to get better at assessing sources. They judge an unfamiliar source themselves and then examine the Opifex's objection to their assessment. The finished bibliography shows what the arrangement produced. How the writer judges another source can help show what they learned.

Purposes and circumstances can change. Governance should allow the person to revise priorities and correct the arrangement's account of their interests. Evaluation must also consider other people affected by the activity and the authority relevant to shared undertakings.

7. Data, Information, and Intelligence

Data, information, and intelligence identify different questions within this account.

Data are observations, measurements, symbols, signals, and records considered as material for processing. Information concerns what data or representations convey within a context. Intelligence concerns capacities involved in interpretation, learning, evaluation, reasoning, adaptation, and guidance of activity.

These working distinctions do not prescribe successive stages. Technical usage varies. Data need not be raw or meaningless: the same record can be processed as data and interpreted for the information it conveys. Its content may be uncertain or inaccurate.

More data or information does not by itself establish greater intelligence. Processing them does not by itself demonstrate reasoning.

Recorded words can remain available while their referents, context, or standing become unclear.

8. Tabulae Entinexus

Tabulae Entinexus is the structured informational representation of an Entinexus, intended to be persistent and portable.

It makes relevant aspects of the constituted system intelligible for governance, continuing activity, and possible reconstitution. Its scope is specific to Entinexus.

The representation connects participants, purposes, judgments, history, and relevant operational state. It may draw on several technical components while maintaining intelligible relationships among them.

Represented area	What should remain intelligible
Identity and constitution	The Entinexus, its human Artifex, individuated Opifices, participant boundaries, and continuing relationships.
Purposes and authority	Wishes, interpretations, proposals, adopted purposes, mandates, permissions, priorities, and revisions.
Knowledge and judgments	Evidence, uncertainty, reasons, unresolved objections, and consequential decisions.
History and provenance	Contributions, origins of records, and superseded decisions or provisions.
Operational state	Relevant configurations, methods, dependencies, and conditions for resuming activity. Where an Opificium is established, which unfinished responsibilities it carries and which have been suspended or transferred.

Tabulae records are stored as data. The information they convey includes the identities, purposes, judgments, and relationships represented. Usable interpretation depends on context and provenance as well as preserved data.

A statement should carry enough context to distinguish a suggestion from a commitment, an observation from an inference, and a current permission from a withdrawn one. Relevant reasons and supersession relationships support disagreement, correction, and revision.

Preserving a claim that a decision occurred does not establish that the decision was validly made. An accurate record can also describe a mistaken judgment or an authorisation that is no longer current.

Tabulae remains distinguishable from the Entinexus and its participants. Records may contribute to operation, but can persist after capabilities, relationships, or permissions have been disrupted.

Selective preservation should follow the purposes and governance of the arrangement. Tabulae need not retain every interaction or personal detail. Its value depends on what it enables the person and participating systems to understand, preserve, and do.

9. Continuity and Reconstitution

Continuity concerns what persists through changes in a participant or whole, and what can still be exercised.

Models, platforms, bodily components, devices, participants, and relationships can change. A change may concern one participant's internal realisation or the composition of the wider Entinexus. A change may require reconstitution; this does not by itself settle whether identity or authority continues.

Continuity requires separate attention to five dimensions:

Dimension	Question to examine
Identity	Does the same constituted participant or whole continue?
Authority	Which purposes, permissions, and responsibilities remain valid?
Capability	What can the arrangement perform under present conditions?
Representation	Which data, contextual meaning, and relationships remain preserved and usable?
Purpose and benefit	Does continuing operation still serve relevant purposes, with what benefits and burdens for affected parties?

A participant may retain identity while losing a capability. Records may survive after permissions change. A functioning arrangement may become burdensome or cease to serve its purposes.

An Opificium has an organisational identity of its own. The Artifex's decision to establish it identifies its original responsibility. Its subsequent purposes, decisions and working practices provide evidence of how that responsibility carries forward. A pause in the work or a change of name can leave it intact. If one Opificium divides or several merge, tracing which responsibilities each resulting organisation takes up helps assess whether the same organisation continues.

An Opificium can continue through a change in who carries out its work. The incoming participant's identity, its present authority and its ability to meet the agreed standard each require their own assessment.

Example · When another Opifex takes over source checking

A writer assigns source checking on a manuscript to a different Opifex. The editorial Opificium retains responsibility for the manuscript, and an earlier decision to seek corroboration for a disputed claim still guides the work. The writer identifies the incoming Opifex through its own continuing role and working history, specifies which sources it may consult for this manuscript, and asks it to assess a fresh source. Its reasons show how well it can apply the agreed standard of evidence.

Persistence of records concerns the preservation of recorded data over time. Their continuing interpretation requires sufficient context and usable representations. **Portability** concerns their usability elsewhere. **Reconstitution** concerns restoring an operative arrangement.

Portable Tabulae can support reconstitution without guaranteeing complete reconstruction or continuity of identity and authority. Restored operation supplies evidence about capability, while continuing identity and valid authority require separate assessment.

Copying, forking, replacement, and reconstruction likewise require accounts of which participant or whole is claimed to continue. Neither technical substitution nor physical integration alone settles the result.

A continuity claim should identify which identity, relationships, permissions, and capabilities are asserted to persist, and what supports that claim.

10. Continuation Beyond the Artifex’s Lifetime

Posthumous continuation remains an open question within the Entinexus inquiry. One possibility is that Opifices carry forward purposes adopted during the Artifex’s life, developing the means through which earlier intentions are implemented. The Fundamentum examines this possibility through the analogy of a legal will.

A proposal should distinguish adapting the implementation of an earlier purpose from adopting new governing purposes or expanding authority. An Opifex’s personal mandate does not by itself establish legal powers after death. Its relationship to testamentary arrangements and to those entitled to act requires separate examination.

Continuing activity, continuity of an Opifex, continuity of the Entinexus and continuity of the human person are different claims. The participation of one human Artifex helps constitute the whole (§1), and some decisions require that person’s renewed judgement (§5). Whether the history and organisation formed through that participation could sustain the identity of the same Entinexus after the Artifex’s death remains open.

Practical criteria and governance arrangements remain subjects for investigation. Withdrawal, incapacity and temporary inactivity require their own assessment and should not be treated as equivalent to death.

11. Contrasted Cases

Three **contrasted hypothetical cases** illustrate differences in participation, governance, and continuity.

The cases concern the same writer and assistant service, with comparable access to preferences, notes, retrieval, and document tools. They do not establish differences in intelligence or personal benefit.

Case 1 — Recurring personalised assistance. A writer repeatedly uses an assistant for source searches, criticism, and drafting. The service retains writing preferences and previous conversations. Within an assignment, it can choose an investigative approach and recommend changes.

Each engagement nevertheless ends with its assignment. No continuing participating identity or mandate is maintained beyond those assignments. Earlier material may be retrieved as background, but there is no established practice for carrying current commitments, unresolved judgments, or adopted corrections into continuing artificial participation.

These facts establish recurring personalised assistance, but do not establish an individuated Opifex participating in a continuing Entinexus. Individual exchanges can still involve intelligent and beneficial collaboration. Further evidence of continuing relationships and practices could change the assessment.

Case 2 — Continuing constituted participation. Using the same service, the writer establishes a continuing research and editorial participant. Its mandate covers investigation, criticism, and drafting, while reserving publication for a separate decision. Its relevant history includes adopted source standards, consequential corrections, and unresolved objections carried into later work.

These provisions operate in practice. Earlier corrections change subsequent source checking. Artificial contributions lead the writer to revise arguments, while the writer’s judgments redirect later investigation. When rapid completion conflicts with careful treatment of uncertainty, the participant proposes narrowing the essay’s scope. Changes exceeding its mandate return to the writer.

The writer decides to carry editorial work across manuscripts and establishes an Editorial Opificium to develop selected ideas for publication. The Opifex proposes a title for a second essay. The writer checks its relation to work already under way and decides to take it up. Later, a new source leads them to narrow the argument and change the title. It is still the same work. The proposed title, the decision to develop the essay, the revised manuscript and the writer’s eventual decision about submission can each be identified.

The writer can inspect the relevant purposes and limits, correct interpretations, and revise or withdraw delegation. A proportionate working record supports these practices. The model, retrieval mechanisms, and document tools implement one participant rather than automatically constituting several Opifices.

These facts support describing the artificial participant as an Opifex and the organised human–AI whole as an Entinexus under this account. The basis is the continuing organisation of participation. Whether that organisation demonstrates a specified systemic intelligent capability or benefits the person requires further assessment.

Case 3 — Preserved records with disrupted participation. The arrangement in Case 2 undergoes a model replacement. Its files, account, and familiar presentation remain available. However, the participant no longer reliably applies adopted corrections or distinguishes tentative preferences from governing purposes. Changes to delegated permissions are not reflected in its subsequent activity, and the writer's attempts to correct or suspend that activity are ineffective within the current arrangement.

Records have persisted, while relevant working capabilities and practical direction have been disrupted. The model replacement alone does not determine the result; the consequential changes concern how participation operates.

Assessment must examine which mandates remain valid, whether functioning participation can be restored, and what grounds support continuity of the Opifex and the encompassing whole. The disruption does not by itself establish that their identities have ended. Equally, retained files and familiar presentation do not establish that the former organisation continues.

If the writer entrusts source checking to a different Opifex, the Editorial Opificium can carry the second manuscript forward under a revised assignment. Ask the incoming participant to assess a fresh source and explain whether it supports the claim. The result shows how well the agreed standard can still be applied. The handover should also identify who may prepare the next draft and who may authorise its submission.

Across the cases, source interpretation, objections, and judgment concern cognitive activity. Producing, saving, and, where authorised, publishing the essay concern implementing activity.

Evaluation should identify the intelligent capacities exercised by the writer and artificial participant, and any capabilities attributable to their organised participation. It should examine the grounds for their personal attribution to the writer and assess personal benefits and burdens separately.

12. Evidence and Development Questions

The framework should guide the development and assessment of ways to organise personal intelligences. Its conceptual claims, organisational commitments, implementations, and claims about capability or benefit require **different kinds of support**.

Conceptual analysis should clarify what is being acknowledged and identified, and examine difficult cases. Normative argument should justify the proposed organisation of participation, authority, responsibility, and protection. Design work should make those commitments operable. Empirical investigation should examine how arrangements work, which capacities they support, and their burdens and benefits under stated conditions.

Where empirical comparisons assess capability or benefit, they should identify the relevant participant or whole, conditions, and alternative arrangements. They should account for differences in underlying capabilities, available records and context, and the human effort required to establish and maintain the arrangement.

Principal development questions include:

- Which forms of organisation support the development and exercise of personal intelligences for a person's purposes and circumstances?
- What degree of formalisation makes participation, judgments, and permissions sufficiently intelligible and revisable in different undertakings?
- How consistently and usefully do the proposed distinctions identify an individuated Opifex and the organised whole in less clear cases?
- How should arrangements with one integrated Opifex or several separately individuated participants be distinguished and compared, including in cases of disputed purposes or authorisation?
- Which specified capabilities, if any, are attributable to the organisation of the whole, and how should personal benefits and burdens be assessed separately?
- What grounds support personal attribution of intelligent capacities developed or exercised within this configuration, and which associated interests warrant recognition or protection?
- How can the Artifex's practical ability to understand consequential choices, challenge interpretations, revise or withdraw delegation, and redirect or suspend activity be assessed under provider and technical constraints?
- Which representations and practices preserve usable interpretation, provenance, and the standing of purposes and permissions across change?
- What can be restored through reconstitution, and what evidence supports continuity of a participant or whole through replacement, copying, or posthumous operation?
- How can distinct Entinexuses cooperate while preserving their identities, boundaries, and sources of authority?

Whether one person may constitute one Entinexus or several remains open. These questions can be investigated while keeping the singular human Artifex condition within each Entinexus explicit.

Development should proceed through stated distinctions, concrete cases, comparison with alternative accounts and arrangements, and revision where argument or evidence does not support a claim. Definitions, governing commitments, implementation proposals, conjectures, and findings should remain identifiable throughout that work.