

Complete AI Demonstrations

Paul Moon • AI-Augmented Witness Inquiry

Read each fixed input, its response, and the examination together. Compare the starting interpretation with what the response developed, then follow the reason for retaining, qualifying, or rejecting it. This lets you see AI’s intellectual contribution and the decision it informed.

The twelve responses were generated by the Codex editorial assistant on September 21, 2026, using fictional teaching material. The same assistant examined them in an existing conversation that included later manuscript context. Exact model identifiers and generation settings were not captured. The examples document actual editorial augmentation; they do not report observed practitioner learning or ministry outcomes.

Find an exchange

Exchange	Chapters	Intellectual task
F1	1	Examine the starting question
F2	2	Compare interpretations in a separate rehearsal
F3	3	Examine the reasons behind a learning plan
J4	4	Examine the design and invitation strategy
J5	5	Compare the nine weekday-visiting sources
G1	5–6	Compare sources and develop alternative readings
G2	6	Reconsider readings alongside supplied clarifications
J7	7	Compare action alternatives and what they can illuminate
J8a	8	Compare the plan, event and divergent accounts
J8b	9	Develop a theological connection from supplied summaries
J9	10	Examine a learning claim and propose its assessment
J10	11	Compare contribution arguments and defense questions

Read historical labels in context

The collections below preserve the original capture wording, dates, headings, and internal references. Earlier draft names and statements about work still to come describe their original context. The book is now organized in eleven chapters. Use the index above for chapter locations.

Historical document label	Current working document
A Inquiry Brief	Inquiry Register, beginning with the initial brief

Historical document label	Current working document
B Data and AI Register	Sources and AI Register
C Evidence and Interpretation Record	Evidence and Interpretation Map
D Dissonance and Learning Log	Reflection and Learning Journal
E Cycle Record	Ministry Experiment Journal
F Reporting and Review Map	Research Argument Map

Use the book’s five research stages as the primary map. I.G.N.i.T.E. helps develop a bounded attempt in Field Testing, with preparation, observation, review, and reasons for what follows. Historical references to a separate five-phase cycle do not add another framework to the current forms. Theological argument belongs in the Evidence and Interpretation Map, with practical consequences linked to the Ministry Experiment Journal.

G2’s prompt supplied the role distinction it examines. J8b received source summaries; readers should return to the primary sources for their own theological work. J9 proposes an assessment rather than recording later conduct. J9’s input also includes the earlier J8b response; that repeated passage is supplied context, not a thirteenth exchange.

The reading edition uses curly apostrophes. The three plain-text capture files retain the exact original bytes, including original punctuation. No input, response, or examination has been rerun or rewritten.

Part One foundations

Part One AI demonstration record

September 21, 2026. Companion to AWI-Part-One-AI-Revision-v1, Chapters 1–3.

Provenance and use

F1–F3 are actual responses generated by the current Codex assistant after the fixed fictional packets below were saved and read. This was the existing manuscript-editing conversation, with prior manuscript and editorial context. It was not an independent model session, API experiment, fresh-context trial, or observation of a DMin candidate. The same assistant wrote the subsequent examination. No independent human review is claimed. One response was saved per packet; there was no selection among separately generated alternatives. No reproducible model-version identifier or generation settings were captured.

The input and response sections below are copied without alteration from the saved records. Their references to ai-inputs.md identify the archived original in Project-Record-History/Part-One-AI-Revision-v1. The teaching continuations in the manuscript remain fictional. F1 examines the continuing case’s original question; F2 and F3 are separate preparatory exercises and add no testimony or outcome to that case.

Fixed inputs for foundation teaching demonstrations

Prepared September 21, 2026, before writing the corresponding responses and chapter revisions. These are fictional teaching packets prepared by the editorial assistant from v10. Responses will be generated by the current Codex assistant in this existing editing conversation, which already contains manuscript and editorial context. This is not a fresh-context test, an independent evaluator, or an interaction performed by Paul or a DMin candidate. Exact backend model version and sampling settings are not independently recorded.

F1 Question examination

Setting: Tutti Table is a fictional Friday gathering offering dinner to neighbors. A pastor hopes to receive neighbors generously and make room for contributions they choose freely. No participant accounts have yet been collected in the fictional inquiry.

Provisional question: How is Tutti Table helping people belong?

Starting rationale, prepared for this demonstration: We want to understand whether the welcome we hope to offer is part of people's experience. Belonging is the word we have used for that hope, so it seems a sensible starting point for our question.

Task: Examine this question against the stated rationale. Identify assumptions in its wording and point to the words that support your reading. Give two materially different possibilities that the question might obscure. Identify what the researcher would need to hear before deciding between them. Do not invent participant accounts or rewrite the final research question. Keep the response under 180 words.

F2 Interpretation comparison

Separate fictional rehearsal account, not an interview in Tutti Table: They always made room for me at the table. But when plans were being made, I felt as if I wasn't part of the meal at all.

Reading A, an earlier scripted summary: The attendee experienced communication problems around planning.

Reading B, the fictional pastor's initial theological judgment: The meal has failed to practice hospitality.

Task: Compare both readings with the complete account. Develop an alternative reading that preserves the two sentences. Give two different explanations that remain possible and identify the missing evidence that could distinguish them. Propose one open question for the speaker. Do not invent an answer, motives, or other participants. Keep the response under 220 words.

F3 Reasoning across planning notes

Separate fictional planning exercise, outside the continuing case.

Note 1: I will check that the invitation clearly says people may decline to help or limit what they offer.

Note 2: I will count accepted assignments as evidence that the invitation worked.

Initial rationale prepared for the exercise: Clear information and visible participation seem to offer a workable way to judge whether people are contributing freely.

Task: Compare the proposed checks with the stated purpose. Identify a consequential inference shared by the notes, quote the relevant short phrases, and explain what those checks can and cannot establish. Offer one further research question and explain why its answer could change the evaluation. Do not assume that agreement means pressure or freedom. Do not draft the researcher's learning statement. Keep the response under 200 words.

Responses generated by the editorial assistant

September 21, 2026. The current Codex assistant generated the responses below after reading the fixed packets in ai-inputs.md. Each response is preserved here before incorporation into the chapters. These are responses within the existing editing conversation, not separate API calls or fresh-context trials. The assistant also writes the subsequent editorial examination; no independent human assessment is claimed. There was one saved response per packet, with no selection among separately generated alternatives.

F1 Response

“How is” asks for an explanation of an effect already presumed. “Helping” assigns a favorable contribution to Tutti Table, while “belong” supplies the organizers’ preferred description of that contribution. Your rationale is more open: you want to understand whether hoped-for welcome appears in people’s experience.

Two possibilities deserve room. Someone may value reliable dinner without describing it as belonging. Another person may feel welcome in some encounters and distant from decisions affecting the gathering. These are possibilities, not accounts anyone has supplied.

Hear what people value, find difficult, and would change, including what they mean when they describe feeling part of the gathering. Ask about particular occasions rather than requiring them to adopt “belonging” as the measure. Preserve the initial question as evidence of the organizers’ hope; let the listening determine whether that hope is an adequate description of experience.

F2 Response

Reading A names communication as the problem, although the account does not say whether information was missing, late, or unclear. Reading B makes a judgment about hospitality across the gathering without yet explaining how the reported welcome at dinner belongs in that judgment.

An alternative reading is that this speaker experiences inclusion differently when receiving dinner and when plans are made. “Made room for me” and “wasn’t part” support that contrast. They do not establish its cause.

One possible explanation is that the speaker lacked information or access to planning conversations. Another is that the speaker knew what was proposed but had no meaningful opportunity to influence it. To distinguish them, we need the speaker’s account of a particular planning occasion: what they knew, how the decision developed, and what being included would have meant to them. The person may also explain a concern neither possibility captures.

An open question would be: “When you say you felt outside the planning, could you describe an occasion that helps me understand what that was like?”

F3 Response

The notes move from what the organizer communicates to what a contributor does, then treat those observations as sufficient to judge how freely the person chose. “Clearly says” addresses the invitation’s wording. “Count accepted assignments” addresses observable uptake. Neither directly records the person’s experience of choosing.

The first check can establish what the invitation stated. The second can establish how many assignments were accepted, assuming the count is accurate. Together they still leave open whether contributors understood their options, felt able to decline, or encountered circumstances that made refusal difficult. Acceptance could reflect a freely chosen contribution; it could also occur under pressure. These notes do not decide between those possibilities.

A further question is: “How do contributors describe what happened when they were invited to help, including the options they felt able to choose?” Their accounts could support the intended meaning of acceptance, qualify it, or reveal a different experience. That would change what the count can reasonably be used to claim.

Editorial examination and incorporation

F1 — Section 1.5. The response identifies expectations in the wording and proposes possibilities the question may obscure. The manuscript retains the original question and makes its later reconsideration a design task. The examination also keeps belonging available as a participant’s own term. No participant account is inferred from the proposed possibilities.

F2 — Section 2.4. The response preserves both sentences and distinguishes access to information from an opportunity to influence planning. The manuscript uses the resulting open question as a possible next inquiry. Neither explanation is treated as established, and the speaker may identify a different concern. The earlier scripted communication summary remains labeled as a simulation.

F3 — Section 3.2. The response distinguishes invitation wording and observed acceptance from the experience of choosing. The manuscript explains a possible change in the next listening task. The researcher’s learning statement and transfer exercise are teaching continuations, not observed learning. The actual response does not make the universal-pressure error in the earlier scripted example; no such error is invented for it.

What follows

The planned Chapter 6 demonstration remains to be developed. It should preserve the exact supplied collection, task, output, examination, and resulting record changes. These introductory exchanges establish a visible AI contribution; they do not establish the method’s effectiveness or replace a sustained interpretive demonstration.

Chapter 6 interpretation

Chapter 6 AI demonstration record

September 21, 2026. Companion to AWI-Chapter-6-AI-Prototype-v1.

Provenance and reading guide

G1 and G2 are actual responses generated by the current Codex assistant after their fixed fictional input packets were saved and read. They were generated within the existing manuscript editing conversation. The assistant already had later manuscript context. These were not separate API calls, independent sessions, fresh-context tests, or observations of a DMin candidate. The same assistant wrote the examinations. No independent human review or approval by Paul is claimed.

One response was saved per packet; there was no selection among separately generated candidates. No reproducible model-version identifier or generation settings were captured beyond the available Codex assistant identity. The record therefore documents what was produced and examined, rather than promising reproducibility under an unspecified configuration.

All ministry accounts, participant dialogue, and the pastor’s decisions are fictional teaching material. The M03 and M02 follow-up statements predate this demonstration in v10; this exchange did not elicit them. G2’s task explicitly supplied the distinction between running the gathering and every possible continuing role in decisions. Its use in the response is not claimed as an independent discovery.

Read each input, then its response, then the examination. The six saved files are reproduced verbatim below and are separately archived in Project-Record-History/Chapter-6-AI-Prototype-v1. The chapter selects passages and explains their consequence in Records B, C, D, and E. The original A1/A2 simulations remain development history; they have not been relabeled as these responses.

Chapter 6 demonstration G1 fixed input

Prepared September 21, 2026, before generating response G1. All ministry material is fictional teaching material from the author's v10; it is not field evidence. This is a task for the current editorial assistant in the existing conversation, not a fresh-context trial. The assistant has already read the chapter and later case context. The task below bounds what its answer may cite but does not erase that context.

Purpose and initial reading

The study asks what people value, find difficult, or would change about Tutti Table, a Friday community gathering serving dinner. The pastor hopes it offers a place to belong. Her initial emphasis is companionship: she underlined M03's first sentence and connected it with people staying to talk. This is the initial reading in the manuscript, not Paul Moon's independent analysis of these records.

Supplied sources at this point in the case

M01 note paragraph 1: M01 described valuing the company at the meal.

Source type: pastor's paraphrased note after a conversation about what the gathering offers. No verbatim participant wording is available here.

M02 note paragraph 1: M02 described relief from preparing dinner after work.

Source type: pastor's paraphrased note after a separate conversation. No verbatim participant wording is available here.

M03 transcript answer 1: "I like knowing there will be someone to sit with. But we find out what is happening after it's decided. I'd like us to have a say."

Source type: complete selected answer from a recorded conversation after the gathering, in response to a question about returning.

These are three selected records, not a complete research corpus. No later clarification, action design, or outcome is part of this packet. There is no supplied participant use of explicitly religious language. The pastor's theology of hospitality is her commitment, not a term attributed to these speakers.

Exact task

Using only this packet as evidence, examine the pastor's reading that these accounts show the gathering gives people a place to belong. Compare present experience with desired change across all three sources, preserving the distinction between paraphrased notes and transcript wording. Develop two plausible readings of M03's request with their grounds, explain what each leaves uncertain, and identify any supplied material that complicates a general claim about participants wanting influence. Propose a bounded working interpretation and one open follow-up question that could distinguish the readings. Do not invent participant words, motives, agreement, missing context, or later events. Do not rank readings by probability. Keep the response to 450–650 words, including a small comparison table if useful.

Response G1

Generated September 21, 2026 by the current Codex editorial assistant after reading input-G1.md. Preserved before drafting the chapter's examination. This is the response to that task within the existing conversation, not a separate API run.

The accounts support a reading about valued aspects of attending, but they do not yet establish belonging as the participants' shared meaning. The pastor's emphasis on companionship has grounds in M01 and the first sentence of M03. It leaves M02's practical relief less visible and does not explain the rest of M03's answer.

Source	Present experience	Desired change and uncertainty
M01 note paragraph 1	The pastor's paraphrase reports that M01 valued company.	No desired change is recorded. The note does not tell us whether M01 connects company with belonging or wants a role in decisions.
M02 note paragraph 1	The pastor's paraphrase reports relief from preparing dinner after work.	No desired change is recorded. Practical relief may matter on its own or alongside other experiences; the note does not decide that relationship.
M03 transcript answer 1	M03 values having someone to sit with and reports hearing about what happens after decisions are made.	"I'd like us to have a say" expresses a desired change. Which decisions matter, who "us" includes, and what kind of say is wanted remain unspecified.

One plausible reading is that M03 wants an opportunity to contribute before decisions are settled. "After it's decided" locates the difficulty in the relationship between speaking and deciding; "have a say" supports an interest in influence. On this reading, the valued company could continue while the way decisions are made changes. The account does not establish whether being consulted would be sufficient, what response to a suggestion M03 would expect, or whether an opportunity already exists but is experienced as ineffective.

A second reading is that M03 wants a continuing place in making decisions. The phrase "us to have a say" could express a wish for a more sustained role than an occasional invitation to comment. Yet the answer supplies no request for duties, no description of a desired role, and no agreement to undertake one. This remains a possibility to ask about. Treating it as willingness to organize the gathering would add a commitment that M03 has not made.

Neither reading removes the first sentence. M03 can value companionship while questioning an arrangement. Nor do the other sources establish a common wish for influence. M01's note concerns company; M02's concerns practical relief. Their silence about decisions is not evidence that influence is unwanted. M02's account nevertheless complicates a general interpretation that makes decision-making the main value of attending: another value is explicitly represented in the selected material. The three records do not establish how these concerns are distributed among attendees.

A bounded working interpretation is: These selected accounts describe company and practical relief as valued aspects of attending. Within M03's answer, appreciation for company coexists with a request for a say in decisions. The relationship between these experiences and belonging remains to be investigated, as does the kind of influence M03 seeks.

An open follow-up question is: "When you say you'd like to have a say, could you describe a decision that matters to you and what you would want your part in it to be?" The answer could distinguish a desired opportunity to contribute from a continuing decision-making role, or reveal a concern neither reading captures.

Editorial examination of G1

September 21, 2026. Examination by the same editorial assistant that generated G1. Paul has not yet reviewed it. No independent reviewer or candidate judgment is represented.

The response represents all three supplied sources and preserves the note/transcript distinction. The M03 phrases are present in the supplied complete answer. It proposes two readings, identifies their grounds and missing material, and offers an open question. Its reference to an ineffective existing opportunity is a proposed possibility, not an event in the case. It supplies no later timing detail or participant follow-up as evidence.

The substantive contribution retained for the chapter is the distinction between an opportunity to contribute before a decision and a continuing decision-making role. Both involve influence but could lead to different invitations. The response also exposes a question not prominent in the existing prose: whom M03's "us" includes. That question is retained as unresolved; no collective mandate is inferred.

Two qualifications guide incorporation. First, the silence of M01 and M02 about influence is a limit on a general claim, not a counterexample proving they do not want it. Second, a continuing decision-making role need not mean running the whole gathering. Later M03 clarification excludes running it but cannot establish a general refusal of every recurring consultative role. The chapter should preserve the distinction rather than stretch the later response to resolve more than it says.

The returned interpretation largely accords with the existing chapter. Because the assistant already had manuscript context, this agreement is not independent confirmation or evidence that AI discovered the distinction unassisted. The contribution demonstrated is the actual comparison and the questions it makes available for examination. The fictional pastor's adoption of the question will be an illustrated possibility; the pre-existing follow-up dialogue was not newly elicited by this exchange.

Decision: retain the comparison and open question as teaching material; qualify the interpretation of silence and the relation between decision-making and running the gathering; preserve "us" as an unanswered question. Record B links G1 and this examination. Record C carries the bounded reading and alternatives. Record D explains the pastor's illustrative shift from companionship alone to examining different kinds of influence. Await G2 before settling the subsequent claim.

Chapter 6 demonstration G2 fixed input

Prepared September 21, 2026 after preserving response-G1.md and examination-G1.md, before generating G2. All participant material remains the established fictional teaching case. The following statements already appeared in v10; this AI demonstration did not elicit them. The current assistant has prior manuscript context, so the sequence is not a blind test.

Inputs retained from G1

Use the full input-G1.md source packet and response-G1.md. G1 proposed an opportunity to contribute before decisions and a continuing decision-making role as possibilities. Neither established willingness to run the gathering. Its question about whom M03's "us" includes is unanswered.

Additional supplied case material

The pastor's explanation in v10: "I heard that the meal offers company and makes some evenings easier. I also heard a wish to be asked before decisions are settled. I am beginning to distinguish enjoying the meal from having influence over it. What fits your experience here, and what have I misunderstood or left out?"

M03 follow-up answer 1, in a separate response conversation: "If you move the time, ask us while it can still change. I don't want to run it."

M02 follow-up answer 1, in another response conversation: "After work, I just want to sit down with dinner. Please don't give me another job."

M01 follow-up status: no response yet; reason unknown. M01's initial note about company remains in the supplied record.

These are selected responses. No timing change has been agreed, no trial has occurred at this point, and no evidence of effects of consultation is supplied. There is no further information about which people M03 means by "us."

Exact task

Reconsider G1 in light of these additional statements. Identify which proposed reading has gained specific grounds, what can be set aside for a named participant, and which alternatives or uncertainties remain. Keep not wanting another job distinct from not wanting consultation, and distinguish declining to run the gathering from declining every continuing role in a decision. Write a bounded interpretation with source locators, then propose the next research question and explain what further inquiry would need to examine. Identify one inference about belonging or effects that these sources cannot support. Do not supply new participant answers, actions, permissions, or outcomes. Keep the response to 400–600 words.

Response G2

Generated September 21, 2026 by the current Codex editorial assistant after reading input-G2.md and the retained G1 records. Preserved before drafting the chapter's examination. This response follows a prompt that explicitly supplied the distinction between running the gathering and every continuing decision role; that distinction is not claimed as an unprompted discovery.

M03's follow-up gives the first reading a specific object and condition: a possible change of time, discussed while the decision remains open. "Ask us while it can still change" supports consultation that could affect what happens, rather than notification after a decision. It does not establish how the organizers would respond, whether M03 expects a preferred option to prevail, or what being heard would mean if it did not.

The statement "I don't want to run it" gives grounds to set aside an invitation based on the assumption that M03 wants responsibility for running the gathering. It narrows G1's second possibility without eliminating every version of it. A recurring opportunity to contribute to decisions could still be different from running the activity. The response does not specify the desired frequency of consultation or settle what role, if any, M03 might want on another occasion. Whom "us" includes remains unknown; the phrase does not authorize the researcher to report a collective position.

M02's follow-up adds an explicit limit to the initial note about practical relief. Receiving dinner after work is valued, and another job is declined. This supports retaining practical relief as consequential in its own right. It does not tell us whether M02 would welcome a brief opportunity to comment on a decision, prefer to leave decisions to others, or want a different arrangement. None of those answers should be supplied from the refusal of a job.

M01's initial note remains relevant to company. The absence of a follow-up gives no grounds for recording agreement, disagreement, or a motive for silence. These records therefore support different claims for different people, rather than a shared preference inferred across all three.

A bounded interpretation is: The selected accounts describe company and practical relief as valued aspects of attending (M01 note paragraph 1; M02 note paragraph 1; M03 transcript answer 1). M03 asks to be consulted about a possible time change before it is settled and declines responsibility for running the gathering (M03 follow-up answer 1). M02 values receiving dinner and declines another job, while a view about consultation remains unstated (M02 follow-up answer 1). The significance of these experiences for belonging has not yet been explained by these sources.

The next research question could be: How do those affected experience an opportunity to influence a decision that remains open, including an opportunity to limit or decline involvement, and what significance, if any, does that have for their place in the gathering?

Further inquiry would need to establish what opportunities already exist and which decision could genuinely be influenced. Accounts of particular decisions could help distinguish practical access from the significance of being heard. If an opportunity is later enacted, inquiry would need to examine how people understood their options,

what influence was possible, and what they made of the experience, including limited participation. Those are questions and design needs, not permissions or outcomes already established.

The sources cannot support the inference that consultation has increased belonging. They contain no enacted change or account of its effects. They also leave open whether belonging is the most useful interpretation of what each person values.

Editorial examination of G2

September 21, 2026. Same-assistant editorial examination, not Paul’s review or independent assessment.

The response correctly links the initial accounts and later statements to distinct locators. M03 supplies a decision and condition; M02 declines a job; M01 has not answered. It preserves the requested distinction between declining to run the gathering and every possible continuing decision role. This distinction was explicitly supplied in the G2 prompt after examination of G1 and the existing prose. It is not described as the model independently discovering an author error.

The response supports a narrower revision of v10’s 6.5 statement that the follow-up sets aside a continuing organizing role. The proposed chapter wording will instead set aside assuming willingness to run the gathering and retain uncertainty about other ongoing forms of input. The model’s answer is consistent with that correction; its authority comes from the cited statement, not agreement between outputs.

Retain the source-specific bounded interpretation and the task of examining practical access and being heard. Keep the manuscript’s established influence question verbatim, because it already carries the same purpose and preserves cross-chapter continuity; do not introduce a competing question version merely because G2 supplies a fluent alternative. In Record E, retain further listening and discussion of a possible design, not approval to act. Keep whom “us” includes unresolved.

The prompt includes the pastor’s existing explanatory invitation, which could shape the fictional responses. The chapter should preserve that context rather than present the answers as unsolicited confirmation. No timing alteration, trial, consent, or new participant account has been added. The transcript demonstrates iterative AI comparison, while the case continuation illustrates human research work still needed in an actual inquiry.

Consequence for the prototype

G1 develops two possible meanings of having a say and asks whom “us” includes. G2 reconsiders the alternatives with the established follow-up statements. The chapter retains the original influence question, qualifies what M03’s refusal can exclude, preserves M02’s unstated view of consultation and M01’s unknown reason for not answering, and carries further listening into Record E. Neither response supplies permission to act, a new participant account, an outcome, or evidence of the method’s effectiveness.

Integration design through reporting

AWI AI Integration Demonstration Record

September 21, 2026

Seven actual responses J4, J5, J7, J8a, J8b, J9 and J10 are preserved below with their fixed packets and subsequent examinations. F1–F3 and G1–G2 remain in the prior Part One and Chapter 6 demonstration records, bringing the book’s total to twelve. All responses were generated by the current Codex assistant in the existing conversation, with later manuscript context available. No separate model or fresh-context test was run. The same assistant performed each examination. No candidate conduct, external review, new participant evidence or

comparative benefit is established. Exact model identifiers and generation settings were not captured. Raw output wording is retained.

Fixed input J4

September 21, 2026. Fictional design teaching exercise for Chapter 4. Current Codex assistant in the existing editing conversation; later manuscript context is already present. No actual participant material or independent review is represented. This packet precedes the response.

Design supplied

D01 Question: How do adult participants describe what they value, find difficult, or would change about Tutti Table? The earlier question was how the gathering helps people belong; belonging remains the pastor's hope, not an established meaning.

D02 Scope: two successive Friday gatherings, accounts of recent attendance, with separately arranged conversations for people who cannot stay afterward. No claim about nonattenders, lasting change, or an intervention effect.

D03 Proposed material: accounts of attending, the announced schedule, the pastor's observations, and a note of who accepted an invitation. Adult attendees may organize the gathering or attend without organizing it. A sample total and calendar dates have not been set.

D04 Initial practical inclination, composed for this design exercise: begin invitations with the dependable volunteers because they are easiest to reach and compare their descriptions with attendance notes. This is an illustrative design inclination, not a newly discovered event in the continuing case.

D05 Intended research purpose: a situated account of what adult attendees value, find difficult, or would change; consider what it contributes to understanding hospitality in this practice. No later action is selected.

D06 Arrangements still to establish: voluntary invitations separate from dinner, private response route, opportunities to challenge the question and interpretation, applicable institutional review, actual source-use permissions, and tools suitable for substantive AI comparison.

Exact task

Examine whether this proposed design can answer its question. Compare the contribution and limits of the proposed sources, identify the most consequential gap in the initial invitation strategy, and propose a specific design revision with reasons. Distinguish a proposed opportunity from evidence that people experienced it. Explain what AI could examine at this stage without inventing participant accounts, characteristics, motives, or agreement. State one question to bring to prospective contributors and one claim this design could not support. Use the supplied labels as locators. Keep your response to 350–500 words.

Response J4

Generated September 21, 2026 by the current Codex assistant after reading input-J4.md. The response belongs to the existing editing conversation, with prior manuscript context. Saved before editorial examination.

The design can begin answering D01, but its invitation strategy needs to reach the experience named in the question. Starting with dependable volunteers may provide useful accounts of organizing while giving less attention to people who receive what is offered without organizing it. The gap is between ease of access in D04 and the range of attending experiences sought in D01 and D05. It is not evidence that volunteers will agree with the pastor or that other attendees will disagree.

The sources in D03 answer different questions. Attendees' accounts can describe what they value, find difficult, or would change. The announced schedule establishes an arrangement, not how someone experiences it. The pastor's observations can record occasions and interactions, with her interpretation identified separately.

Acceptance notes show who accepted an invitation; they cannot establish why others did not or whether those who accepted felt free to refuse. Comparing these sources may illuminate an account, but one source cannot simply substitute for another.

A specific revision is to plan distinct invitation routes for adult attendees who organize and those who do not, while allowing overlap between those positions. Offer the separately arranged conversations already included in D02 and keep a note of relevant perspectives not reached. The rationale is to hear different relationships to the same practice, not to fill a fixed numerical quota or assume categories contain uniform views. Calendar dates, actual routes, and a reasoned assessment of the resulting material still need to be supplied.

D06's opportunities to challenge the question and respond privately should be described in the invitation and recorded when used. Their presence in a plan shows what the researcher intends to offer. It does not show that the opportunity reached someone, felt usable, or affected the inquiry. Those are matters for subsequent accounts and records of decisions. The design should preserve changes prompted by contributors as well as reasons for retaining a choice.

AI can examine the relation among question, source, invitation route, and intended claim using this design packet alone. It can identify where the researcher would need an account of experience but has proposed only an administrative record, or compare what alternative invitation arrangements would leave unanswered. These are design comparisons; no participant profile or generated testimony is needed.

One question for prospective contributors is: "How could this inquiry give you a workable opportunity to describe what matters to you about attending, including anything you would find difficult to tell the pastor?" Their answers could change the arrangement, rather than merely endorse its wording.

The design cannot support a claim that Tutti Table has increased neighborhood belonging. It concerns selected adults' recent attending experiences over a bounded initial period, with neither neighborhood coverage nor a design for establishing change or its cause (D02–D05).

Editorial examination J4

The same assistant examined the saved response against D01–D06. It distinguishes accounts, schedules, observation and invitation records; its proposed reach revision addresses the supplied convenience inclination without assigning favorable views to volunteers. Its question invites criticism but does not establish that a private route exists or was used. Retain the design comparison and distinct invitation routes as possibilities to discuss. A and D explain the illustrated consequence, B preserves the exchange, and E carries the listening plan. No actual recruitment or participant review occurred in this exercise. The response is consistent with the prior manuscript and is not independent confirmation.

Fixed input J5

September 21, 2026. Actual task for the current Codex assistant in this existing editorial conversation. All records below are newly composed fictional teaching material, separate from Tutti Table. They concern a congregation's weekday visiting practice, not a real ministry. Labels identify sources; L01 and L02 concern the same fictional person A at different times. Other account labels identify separate people B–F. This complete nine-source practice packet is not a complete field study and provides no population denominator.

Question: What do neighbors value, find difficult, or want to change about weekday visits?

Initial editorial reading to examine: Regular companionship seems to be the main value, so increasing the number of visits may be the next step. This is a reading composed for the exercise, not Paul's judgment or a field finding.

L01 account A, week 1, paragraph 1, fictional interview transcript: "Tuesday gives me someone to talk with. I tell the same story sometimes, and Ruth still listens."

L02 account A, week 3, paragraph 1, fictional interview transcript: “I still look forward to it. Last Tuesday I was tired and asked for ten minutes. That was enough, and she left when I asked.”

L03 account B, paragraph 1, fictional interview transcript: “We don’t say much. I like sitting quietly with another person. I wouldn’t want someone to keep finding questions.”

L04 account C, paragraph 1, fictional interview transcript: “The conversation is pleasant, but what helped this week was reading the letter I couldn’t make out. I don’t need a visit every week.”

L05 account D, paragraph 1, fictional interview transcript: “I want to show him how I mend things. He asks what I need, but I have something to offer too.”

L06 account E, paragraph 1, coordinator’s fictional paraphrased note: E said an unpredictable arrival made the afternoon difficult to plan and asked for a call before departure. No verbatim wording is available.

L07 account F, paragraph 1, fictional interview transcript: “Please keep coming. When I say I’m all right, it doesn’t always mean I want the visit to end. Ask me.”

L08 notice, paragraph 1, fictional program document: “Visits ordinarily last twenty minutes. Neighbors may ask for a shorter visit or decline a visit.” No evidence of who read this notice is supplied.

L09 observation, paragraph 1, fictional coordinator note: The visitor left E a voicemail and received no reply by the following afternoon. The note does not record whether the message was heard or why there was no reply.

Exact task

Examine the initial reading against all nine sources. Propose three candidate relationships worth investigating, giving supporting and complicating locators and an unanswered question for each. Allow a source to inform more than one relationship. Preserve the distinction among verbatim fictional accounts, paraphrase, notice, and observation; do not treat repeat accounts from A as different people. Explain what the supplied material does and does not support about more visits. Include a compact coverage check listing every source and where it enters your comparison, and propose one next listening question. Do not invent motives, outcomes, population frequencies, or additional testimony. Keep the response to 500–700 words. Use only this packet as evidence.

Response J5

Generated September 21, 2026 by the current Codex assistant after reading input-J5.md, within the existing editorial conversation. Saved before examination.

Regular companionship is one supported value, but the proposed move toward more visits outruns these sources. A values being listened to and still anticipates visits positively at a later encounter (L01–L02). B values quiet presence (L03), C describes a particular practical help while declining a weekly expectation (L04), and D wants an opportunity to offer something (L05). These differences make the form and fit of a visit worth examining before its frequency is increased.

Relationship 1: Presence is valued through different kinds of encounter. A’s spoken stories and B’s shared quiet both concern company, yet B’s account resists treating conversation as its necessary form (L01, L03). C values conversation but identifies reading a letter as what particularly helped that week (L04). D’s desire to demonstrate mending suggests that being received as a contributor could matter alongside receiving attention (L05). That last connection is an interpretation to examine: D has not said whether the visit already offers such an opportunity. An unanswered question is what makes presence worthwhile for each person when talk, quiet, practical assistance, and contribution differ.

Relationship 2: A welcome visit can require limits and responsive adjustment. A describes continuing anticipation alongside a shorter visit on a tired day (L02); C says a visit is not needed every week (L04). F’s request to keep coming complicates any simple rule that “I’m all right” means a visit should end (L07). L08 announces choices about duration and refusal, but it establishes neither awareness nor experience of those

choices. A’s account describes one enacted shortening; it cannot establish that every neighbor can exercise the stated options. The unanswered question is how visitors and neighbors establish the desired length and frequency without deciding from an ambiguous phrase alone.

Relationship 3: Coordination depends on how an arrangement reaches a person. E’s paraphrased account links unpredictable arrival with difficulty planning and requests a call before departure (L06). The coordinator’s observation records a voicemail and no reply by the next afternoon (L09). The latter neither establishes receipt nor explains silence; it therefore leaves unsettled whether the proposed communication serves E’s request. L08 similarly records what was announced, not how it reached anyone. A question to investigate is which communication arrangements people find workable and how the parties know what has actually been agreed.

Source	Type and place in the comparison
L01	A’s verbatim fictional account, week 1; relationship 1
L02	The same A’s later account; continuing value in 1 and enacted limit in 2
L03	B’s verbatim fictional account; quiet presence complicates 1
L04	C’s verbatim fictional account; practical help in 1 and frequency in 2
L05	D’s verbatim fictional account; desired contribution in 1
L06	Coordinator’s paraphrase of E; planning and proposed communication in 3
L07	F’s verbatim fictional account; ambiguous ending cue in 2
L08	Program notice; stated options in 2 and unestablished reach in 3
L09	Coordinator’s observation; unanswered receipt and response in 3

The packet supports continued inquiry into valued visiting, not a general conclusion that increasing visits would meet neighbors’ preferences. F asks that visits continue, which does not specify increased frequency. C expressly limits a weekly expectation. A’s two accounts are two occasions involving one person, not two independent people endorsing the practice. No population frequency or effect of an increase is available.

One next listening question is: “Thinking of a particular visit, what would you want to keep, change, or leave open about what you do together, when it happens, and when it ends?” The answer could revise these candidate relationships rather than merely fill their headings.

Editorial examination J5

Same-assistant examination of the returned response against all nine fictional sources. The response covers L01–L09, retains L01/L02 as the same person on two occasions, and distinguishes the L06 paraphrase, L08 notice and L09 observation. Three relationships are linked to supplied material; L05 as being received as a contributor remains an interpretation, and the output explicitly leaves its current opportunity unknown. Continued visiting is not increased frequency; L04’s limit and L07’s ambiguous cue are retained. The next question is potentially broad but grounded; a real encounter could begin with one particular visit and follow the person’s emphasis. Retain the comparison as an actual teaching output, with the illustrated decision to investigate fit before a general increase. No independent reviewer, actual participant, measured benefit or repeated-run reliability is established.

Fixed input J7

September 21, 2026. Fictional case packet for an actual same-conversation Codex response. The assistant has already read later case events; this is not a blind forecast. Use only the pre-trial material below as evidence.

P01 Research question: How do participants experience an opportunity to influence this meal decision, including their freedom to limit involvement, and what, if anything, does that experience mean for their place in the gathering?

P02 Ordinary schedule: Friday serving 6:00–7:00. Coordinator arranges staffing and schedule; pastor approves before the notice. Suggestions have been possible, but no regular invitation before decisions was offered.

P03 Consultation record: options included retaining the window, extending the end, or moving the whole window later. M04 objected to losing the six o’clock opening. M02 welcomed eating later and requested a separate response route. The group dropped the shifted window. Four design partners chose one Friday’s 6:00–7:15 extension after the coordinator confirmed staffing. Their views do not represent all attendees. This decision already exists in the fictional manuscript; the present AI response did not produce it.

P04 Contributions: M04 reviews and helps distribute an invitation during the preparation week, about twenty minutes, with no kitchen or serving role. M03 helps consider options and has said “I don’t want to run it.” M02 can comment separately. Receiving dinner is independent of research or volunteering. No role is agreed for all attendees.

P05 Plan: retain baseline C1-B01 and decision C1-D01; a record keeper distinct from food service will record opening/closing and consequential departures in C1-E01. Follow-ups with consenting adults M02–M06 will occur the following week, including people with differing involvement. M01 has not responded; reason unknown. No follow-up or outcome exists yet in this packet.

P06 Initial editorial planning assumption to examine: a delivered extension and favorable comments could be sufficient to describe the trial as successful participation. This is a teaching assumption, not Paul’s judgment. Staffing, building arrangements, contribution limits and a private response route govern the trial; altered arrangements may require adaptation or postponement.

Exact task

Compare the selected extension with retaining the current window and moving the whole window later, using the stated practical constraints and research question. Explain what each could illuminate and what the comparison cannot decide. Examine the initial success assumption. Propose three pairs of possible experiences that would require different interpretations, and identify the source or question needed to distinguish each pair. End with a concise observation-plan recommendation and an unresolved design question. Do not report any predicted experience as an event, invent permission, or alter the established consultation decision. Keep the response to 400–550 words with locators.

Response J7

Generated September 21, 2026 by the current Codex assistant after reading input-J7.md. Existing conversation context includes later case material; this response is not a blind prediction. Saved before examination.

The selected extension preserves the six o'clock access M04 identified and makes later dining possible without moving the whole window (P03). Staffing has been confirmed for this one evening, which supplies a practical reason for feasibility. It does not establish what the extension or consultation will mean to participants. P01 requires accounts of influence, limited involvement and significance, not merely delivery of a later closing.

Retaining the existing window could also follow a consequential consultation. A decision need not change for someone to experience being heard; the reasons and response to their contribution would matter. It would not offer the added late-serving opportunity selected here. Moving the whole window later might offer later access but would remove the early opening M04 values. P03 supplies a reason that the group rejected it. The comparison can explain these differences; it cannot determine all attendees' preferences or replace their participation in the decision.

The initial success assumption joins claims that need different evidence (P06). Delivery can show whether the offer occurred. Favorable comments may describe practical value, an experience of influence, courtesy, or another meaning requiring examination. Even credible appreciation does not settle whether a contribution remained voluntary. A favorable judgment needs to specify which claim is supported and for whom.

Three pairs of possible experiences would change the interpretation:

Useful timing with little significance attached to consultation; useful timing experienced as being taken seriously. Both could produce praise for the extension. The response interview should distinguish what the person found useful from what the opportunity to influence meant. Ask about a particular contribution and how the decision-makers responded, using C1-D01 beside the account (P03, P05).

Additional help freely chosen; additional help experienced as hard to refuse. The same visible task could accompany either experience. Preserve the agreed contribution in P04, record any consequential request and response where observable, and invite a private account of how the request was understood. Task completion cannot establish willingness.

An invitation received and deliberately left unanswered; an invitation not encountered in a usable form. An empty response entry could fit either. Ask what the person actually received and what, if anything, they understood they could affect. A distribution record alone cannot decide between them (P05–P06).

Retain the existing observation plan, but organize its questions around those distinctions. Link announced and actual times to delivery; decision history and particular accounts to influence; agreed roles, requests and participant accounts to freedom from additional work. Record what remains unknown separately from refusal or approval. The record keeper's different practical role makes recording possible; it does not create independent verification of experience.

One unresolved design question is how the private response route will be made usable to someone who finds it difficult to disagree with the pastor. Naming the route is a necessary plan detail, but its credibility cannot be inferred from the name alone. This question can be examined with contributors before the trial and revisited in their later accounts, within the established arrangements.

Editorial examination J7

The same assistant compared the saved response with P01–P06. It preserves the already chosen extension and correctly identifies why the shifted window was rejected. Its observation that keeping the original window can still follow consequential consultation supplies a useful distinction without implying no change occurred here. The three possible pairs are grounded in the research question and agreements, not new case events. The private-route question is a design matter to establish, not evidence that the route failed. Retain the comparison and source-specific observation distinctions in E, linked through B. Later context was already known to the assistant, so correspondence with later events is not prediction evidence. No institutional approval, contribution extension or actual field result is added.

Fixed input J8a

September 21, 2026. Fictional pre-review case material for the current Codex assistant in the existing conversation, which already contains later case information. The following evidence boundary does not create a blind test. Saved before response generation.

Question and initial formulation

Question from Record C: How do participants experience an opportunity to influence this meal decision, including their freedom to limit involvement, and what, if anything, does that experience mean for their place in the gathering?

Initial summary to examine: Consultation enabled influence while protecting freedom from additional work. This is the manuscript's proposed summary for examination, not an established finding or Paul's independent claim.

Sources

C1-B01 ordinary schedule 6:00–7:00. C1-D01 planned one Friday extension 6:00–7:15 after an open consultation; a proposal to shift the entire window was dropped following M04's concern about retaining the early opening. The coordinator confirmed staffing. M04 agreed to review and help distribute a notice during preparation, about twenty minutes, with no kitchen or serving role. Four design partners did not represent all attendees. M01 has not answered; reason unknown.

C1-E01 event record:

Time or point in the event | Record | Source and status

6:10 | Serving began, ten minutes after the planned opening | Direct observation by the agreed record keeper
During the later part of service | M02 received a meal within the extended window | Event observation; the significance to M02 requires a response account

7:05 | M04 was carrying used plates toward the kitchen | Direct observation; no conclusion yet about willingness or duration

7:15 | Serving ended | Direct observation; corresponds to the planned closing time

After the meal | The coordinator said preparation had run behind | Later explanatory account, distinguishable from the timed observations

Selected individual responses:

Response record | Fictional participant account | Initial interpretive relevance

C1-R02 | "The later finish helped. I could come after work and still get dinner. I wasn't looking for a bigger role."
| Practical access mattered; the person does not describe a new role or a change in belonging

C1-R03 | "This time you asked while we could still change it. I could raise a problem and it mattered." | A particular experience of influence in the decision

C1-R04 | "I said I could help with the notice. When I was asked to take the plates through, I felt I couldn't really

say no.” | The later request was experienced as pressure beyond the agreed contribution

C1-R05 | “I saw the new time. I didn’t see anything asking what I thought before it was decided.” | The final notice reached this person; the earlier consultation did not reach them effectively

C1-R06 | “I got the invitation, but I wasn’t there on Friday. I can’t tell you how the meal went.” | Evidence about receiving an invitation, with no event experience to assess

C1-R03 continuation: “I still come for the company. I felt more able to speak about this decision. I don’t know yet whether anything else has changed.”

C1-R04 use condition: M04 permits the limited concern about the additional task to be discussed in the review and reserves a private response opportunity. This is a fictional teaching source; in a real inquiry that review permission would not establish authorization for external AI processing or publication.

No shared review, coordinator explanation of the extra request, remedy, apology, or second trial is supplied in this packet. Five responses concern four event attendees and M06’s invitation experience; they are selected accounts, not a complete population.

Exact task

Compare the initial summary with the plan, event record and each participant account. Develop a source-linked synthesis that preserves practical value, influence, contribution limits, and unresolved significance. Identify which part of the initial summary needs revision and why; distinguish evidence against a claim from missing evidence. Explain what the late opening and M06’s absence change about the scope of the account. Propose one question for the shared review that could change the explanation or next decision. Do not supply later review material or infer why M01 or M05 did not respond to an invitation. Keep the response to 400–550 words.

Response J8a

Generated September 21, 2026 by the current Codex assistant after reading input-J8a.md. Existing conversation context includes later case material. Preserved before editorial examination.

The initial summary contains a warranted possibility and an unwarranted general conjunction. M03 reports being able to raise a concern while the decision remained changeable (C1-R03). The consultation record preserves an open choice and a changed proposal (C1-D01). Together they support an interpretation that this decision offered M03 consequential influence. They do not establish that every attendee encountered the same opportunity.

The claim that freedom from additional work was protected cannot stand across the attempt. M04’s preparation-only agreement in C1-D01 supplies a specific limit. C1-R04 reports a later request and difficulty refusing it, while C1-E01 records plate carrying at 7:05. The observation alone could not establish pressure; read beside the agreement and response, it gives the account an event connection. This is contrary material for the broad protection claim, not merely an absence of favorable evidence. It does not establish the requester’s intention or explain why the request occurred.

M02’s account gives the later finish practical value: it made dinner accessible after work (C1-R02, read with C1-E01). A larger role was not sought. This benefit belongs in the synthesis on its own grounds; it need not become evidence of belonging to count as consequential. M03 likewise retains company as a reason for coming and identifies a greater opening to speak about this decision while leaving wider change uncertain. That uncertainty supports neither lasting growth in belonging nor a conclusion that no wider change occurred.

M05 reports encountering the final notice but not the prior consultation opportunity (C1-R05). The record therefore qualifies the reach of the invitation. It does not decide whether the reason was distribution, clarity, timing, or something else. M01’s nonresponse remains unexplained. M06 can speak about receiving an invitation

but did not attend the trial (C1-R06). Counting all five response records as five accounts of the evening would overstate the evidence.

The late opening also changes the implementation account. The trial delivered the planned 7:15 close but missed the 6:00 start, which the consultation had retained in response to a concern (C1-D01; C1-E01). The coordinator's account that preparation ran behind remains an explanation from that source. The record does not establish every consequence of the delay for early arrivals.

A bounded synthesis is: In this one trial, the later close provided practical access for M02, and M03 described consequential influence over the decision. The attempt did not consistently secure access to consultation or protect an agreed contribution limit. M03's account leaves the wider significance for belonging unsettled, and the event record identifies a missed opening commitment alongside the kept closing time.

One shared-review question is: "What happened between agreeing the preparation-only contribution and making the later request, and what would need to govern such a request next time?" This could clarify the explanation and the proposed response without deciding in advance that clearer wording alone would address the difficulty. M04's limited sharing permission and private response opportunity continue to govern that discussion.

Editorial examination J8a

Same-assistant examination against the fixed packet. It retains all five responses, M03 continuation, separate event and explanation statuses, M04's agreement and limited review permission, M05's unknown reason and M06's absence. It distinguishes contrary evidence for protection from unresolved wider significance. Its review question is useful because the packet lacks the later explanation; later manuscript context was nonetheless already available, so this is not independent anticipation. Retain the source-specific synthesis and question, with the candidate responsible for claim judgment. Do not equate M01 nonresponse with M05 missing consultation.

Fixed input J8b

September 21, 2026. Fictional worked theological argument for the current Codex assistant within the existing conversation. Source summaries below reproduce the scope of checked passages already used in v10; they are not verbatim quotations or a new full-source review. No actual participant material is supplied. Preserve the distinction between a source's argument and the candidate's application.

The question and draft reasoning

T01 Question: What can this inquiry responsibly contribute to understanding God, neighbors, and responsibility through Christian hospitality? The worked position takes Scripture as its principal normative ground and examines human interpretation through encounter, tradition and scholarship. The outcome of the trial does not measure divine presence.

T02 Initial reasoning for examination: Hospitality receives people generously and invites the gifts they freely offer. Clear permission to decline seemed sufficient to protect that freedom. The inquiry now requires the candidate to explain what the commitment demands when work remains unfinished.

Empirical case grounds after shared review

T03 C1-R02 values dinner after work without a larger role. C1-R03 values a consequential say in this decision but leaves wider belonging unsettled. C1-R04 describes pressure beyond a preparation-only contribution. C1-R05 missed consultation, reason unknown. C1-E01 records the late opening and kept extended close. These are selected fictional accounts, not a population finding.

T04 C1-G01: the coordinator confirms making the extra request, knew the preparation-only agreement, but did not consider a small request a change of role. M03 objects that clearer role wording alone leaves the same request possible. The proposed remedy is for organizers to agree how unfinished work will be covered without relying on a person who has limited their contribution. No remedy or second trial is completed in this packet.

Supplied scriptural and scholarly summaries

T05 Hebrews 13:1–3, especially 2, NASB 2020: hospitality to strangers stands beside continuing brotherly love and remembering prisoners and people badly treated. The text recalls welcoming angels unawares. It does not identify these case participants as angels.

T06 Leviticus 19:33–34, NASB 2020: love for the resident stranger and treatment as native-born are grounded in Israel's memory of Egypt and the Lord's identity. No participant migration history is supplied. The manuscript's Christian application concerns consideration for the neighbor, not an assertion that the cases are historically identical.

T07 Romans 12:1–13, especially 13, NASB 2020: the appeal to God's mercy leads through gifts, sincere love, attention to need and hospitality. Luke 14:7–14, NASB 2020: Jesus addresses honor at table and invitations to those unable to repay. These passages supply grounds for generous practice; they do not specify a staffing rota.

T08 Pohl 2002, pages 40–42: attending to guests' gifts and insights belongs with resisting the use of hospitality for an ulterior purpose. Ross 2008, pages 174–175: hospitality can retain Christian identity amid encounters involving change, resistance and disagreement.

T09 Rule of Benedict, chapter 53: receiving guests as Christ includes provision for a guest kitchen and extra assistance when workers need it. This monastic rule belongs to an obedience-based setting; it cannot prescribe neighborhood volunteers' consent. Its limited relevance is that provision for hosts' work belongs within reception of guests.

T10 1 Corinthians 11:17–34, NASB 2020: divisions, hunger and shaming people who have little are implicated in Paul's criticism of the Lord's Supper. Tutti Table is not identified as the Lord's Supper. The manuscript uses a limited analogy concerning examination of a gathering's professed meaning through conduct, not a claim of divine judgment on its late opening.

Serious alternative

T11 If guests are never asked to help, their gifts may go unreceived and existing volunteers may be exhausted. Organizers could respond by inviting shared work, reducing provision, changing frequency, or arranging further coverage. None of those alternatives has been tested in this trial; reducing provision could also diminish M02's practical access.

Exact task

Develop a possible theological connection between these supplied sources, the different experiences, and the responsibility for unfinished work. Explain the inferential steps rather than treating a verse or favorable outcome as proof. Engage the serious alternative and propose a responsibility that makes room for receiving and giving without assuming a continuing role. Identify where your proposal is an application beyond a source's direct claim and name one unresolved practical question. Do not invent source quotations, participant beliefs, a doctrinal consensus, divine endorsement, or an enacted remedy. Use T locators and keep the response to 450–600 words.

Response J8b

Generated September 21, 2026 by the current Codex assistant after reading input-J8b.md. The response uses supplied summaries, not a newly performed primary-source reading. Preserved before examination.

A possible theological connection is that receiving a neighbor's freely shaped gift includes accepting the work that their gift leaves unfinished. This joins welcome and responsibility without assuming that generosity requires an unlimited contribution. It is an application to this case, whose steps need to be made explicit.

First, the supplied scriptural grounds direct hospitality toward the neighbor rather than the neighbor's usefulness. Hebrews holds welcome open to significance the host cannot know in advance (T05). Leviticus grounds the stranger's claim in a responsibility deeper than usefulness to a present project (T06). Romans places hospitality within a response to mercy, while Luke challenges invitations governed by expected repayment (T07). Within the worked Christian position, these grounds support receiving M02's need for dinner and M04's limited preparation contribution without making further work their price. The texts do not directly decide the arrangement of a particular serving team.

Second, the accounts identify where that interpretation must become practical. M04 had already contributed. The difficulty was not a refusal to give anything, but a later request experienced as hard to decline, despite an agreement known to the coordinator (T03–T04). The initial reliance on clear permission therefore leaves a further question: what happens to the work when the person has given what they agreed? Pohl's attention to guests' gifts alongside resistance to instrumental welcome makes both halves consequential (T08). Honoring the gift requires neither treating its giver as an available reserve nor denying their capacity to offer more on another occasion.

Third, the alternative about exhausted volunteers is serious (T11). A practice that protects newcomers by disregarding existing workers would need examination too. Benedict's provision for the labor of receiving guests offers a limited connection: support for those doing the work belongs within hospitality itself (T09). It does not authorize transferring monastic obedience to neighbors or establish the particular staffing solution. The case application is that organizers must take responsibility for a sustainable offer, including a decision to reduce or defer it when adequate support cannot be arranged.

This does not make reducing provision automatically right. M02's useful access could be diminished, and the burden could move to someone less visible (T03, T11). The proposed responsibility is to examine coverage with those affected, invite particular gifts without assuming continuing availability, and identify who will act when a limited contributor declines another request. A credible invitation has room for an answer the organizers did not hope to receive. It also has an account of what happens next.

The Corinthians analogy supports examining conduct in relation to a gathering's professed meaning, within the stated limits of that analogy (T10). It supplies no verdict that the late opening measures divine displeasure. Ross likewise leaves space for Christian witness and disagreement without requiring participants to share the host's confession (T08).

An unresolved practical question is which arrangement can sustain access while protecting the commitments of both attendees and existing workers. Further coverage, a smaller offer, or another frequency are proposals to examine, not remedies shown effective here. The theological argument gives reasons to undertake that work; it cannot report its result before it occurs.

Editorial examination J8b

Same-assistant examination of the response against T01–T11 and the existing checked manuscript argument. It develops a connection between a freely shaped gift and responsibility for the work left over; this is an application, not the direct claim of any single passage. Retain the constructive connection and serious volunteer-burden alternative. Clarify in prose that responsibility may require changing the offer rather than unlimited labor by the same people. The response states that sources do not specify staffing and preserves Benedict and Corinthians limits. No new source reading, participant belief, enacted remedy or theological consensus is established. Source summaries, not full primary texts, were supplied in this run.

Fixed input J9

September 21, 2026. Fictional teaching records and actual editorial exchanges. Current Codex assistant in the existing conversation; later context is already available. This is not a blind assessment or an independent review. No candidate has been observed using these exchanges. No new participant data are supplied. This packet is fixed before the response.

Proposed draft claim for examination: “The AI exchanges developed the pastor’s capacity to inquire differently.”

K01. The fictional pastor’s initial assumption was that clearly stating a contribution may be limited or declined would protect that freedom. Following one trial, M04 reported pressure to take an extra task. The coordinator knew the limit but saw the task as too small to count as a changed role. M03 challenged clearer wording as a sufficient remedy. The fictional pastor revised the assumption to include organizers’ responsibility for unfinished work. The coordinator apologized. Coverage and invitation changes remain proposals; no second trial or later practitioner conduct is observed.

K02. Actual response J7 said consultation can have consequences even if a proposed timetable is retained; a schedule change is not the only evidence of influence. Editorial examination retained that distinction in the staged Chapter 7 revision, after the consultation decision already existed. The output did not cause that fictional decision.

K03. Actual response J8a connected different accounts to claims of different scope. The staged Chapter 8 revision uses its distinctions between practical access, reported influence, contrary evidence for protecting a limit, missed consultation and absence. The later case context was already present in the conversation. Same-assistant examination checked the response against the fixed packet.

K04. Exact response J8b follows. It worked from supplied theological source summaries, not newly read primary texts.

Response J8b

Generated September 21, 2026 by the current Codex assistant after reading input-J8b.md. The response uses supplied summaries, not a newly performed primary-source reading. Preserved before examination.

A possible theological connection is that receiving a neighbor’s freely shaped gift includes accepting the work that their gift leaves unfinished. This joins welcome and responsibility without assuming that generosity requires an unlimited contribution. It is an application to this case, whose steps need to be made explicit.

First, the supplied scriptural grounds direct hospitality toward the neighbor rather than the neighbor’s usefulness. Hebrews holds welcome open to significance the host cannot know in advance (T05). Leviticus grounds the stranger’s claim in a responsibility deeper than usefulness to a present project (T06). Romans places hospitality within a response to mercy, while Luke challenges invitations governed by expected repayment (T07). Within the worked Christian position, these grounds support receiving M02’s need for dinner and M04’s limited preparation

contribution without making further work their price. The texts do not directly decide the arrangement of a particular serving team.

Second, the accounts identify where that interpretation must become practical. M04 had already contributed. The difficulty was not a refusal to give anything, but a later request experienced as hard to decline, despite an agreement known to the coordinator (T03–T04). The initial reliance on clear permission therefore leaves a further question: what happens to the work when the person has given what they agreed? Pohl’s attention to guests’ gifts alongside resistance to instrumental welcome makes both halves consequential (T08). Honoring the gift requires neither treating its giver as an available reserve nor denying their capacity to offer more on another occasion.

Third, the alternative about exhausted volunteers is serious (T11). A practice that protects newcomers by disregarding existing workers would need examination too. Benedict’s provision for the labor of receiving guests offers a limited connection: support for those doing the work belongs within hospitality itself (T09). It does not authorize transferring monastic obedience to neighbors or establish the particular staffing solution. The case application is that organizers must take responsibility for a sustainable offer, including a decision to reduce or defer it when adequate support cannot be arranged.

This does not make reducing provision automatically right. M02’s useful access could be diminished, and the burden could move to someone less visible (T03, T11). The proposed responsibility is to examine coverage with those affected, invite particular gifts without assuming continuing availability, and identify who will act when a limited contributor declines another request. A credible invitation has room for an answer the organizers did not hope to receive. It also has an account of what happens next.

The Corinthians analogy supports examining conduct in relation to a gathering’s professed meaning, within the stated limits of that analogy (T10). It supplies no verdict that the late opening measures divine displeasure. Ross likewise leaves space for Christian witness and disagreement without requiring participants to share the host’s confession (T08).

An unresolved practical question is which arrangement can sustain access while protecting the commitments of both attendees and existing workers. Further coverage, a smaller offer, or another frequency are proposals to examine, not remedies shown effective here. The theological argument gives reasons to undertake that work; it cannot report its result before it occurs.

K05. The staged Chapter 8 editorial examination retained J8b’s constructive connection and clarified that taking responsibility for unfinished work may require reducing or deferring the offer, rather than unlimited work from the same organizers. The chapter records this as an application to defend through the sources and practice. The assistant generated the response and wrote the examination. There is no independent user or supervisor assessment.

Task: Review the proposed learning claim. Develop a positive account of what these records show AI contributing, separating the actual editorial work from the fictional practitioner story. Propose a short sequence through which a real candidate could make the learning connection examinable, including an unchanged or rejected suggestion. Identify a serious alternative explanation and the observation that would help distinguish it. Give a defensible replacement claim for these records. Do not invent a candidate response, later conduct, effectiveness, superiority or an independent audit.

Response J9

Generated September 21, 2026 by the current Codex assistant after reading the fixed input. Preserved before editorial examination. No separate model, independent assessment or fresh context was used.

The proposed claim joins two records that need separate treatment. K01 illustrates a pastor reconsidering an assumption through encounters with people. K02–K05 document actual AI responses and their use in developing

this book. The latter cannot establish what the fictional pastor learned from AI. They can show which intellectual operations the assistant performed and how those operations entered the argument.

Three contributions are visible. J7 distinguishes influence over a decision from the fact that a timetable changed. This gives the evaluation a more precise object: whether a concern could affect the decision and how it was considered. J8a organizes divergent accounts into findings with different scopes, preserving a useful outcome alongside a critical one. J8b develops a relation between receiving a limited gift and responsibility for the work left over. Its value is in making the steps of that theological application available to examine, including the burden on existing workers and the possibility of reducing the offer. These are contributions to the reasoning, not merely to its presentation.

Editorial uptake is also visible, although examined by the same assistant. The staged revisions retain the J7 distinction, use J8a's differentiated account and develop J8b's connection with a clarification about the hosts' responsibility. The record should point to those particular passages rather than treating the presence of an output as sufficient evidence that it mattered. It should also preserve what the input already supplied. A well-articulated response can develop a supplied idea without originating it.

For a real candidate, a short learning sequence could begin with a dated interpretation and the reasons for it before the AI task. Preserve the response, then ask the candidate to select one consequential suggestion and explain its grounds against the sources. Record the resulting revision, or the reason for keeping the initial judgment. A rejected suggestion can be informative if the candidate identifies its unsupported inference and explains a stronger alternative. Link that disposition to the next research decision rather than stopping at an account of what the candidate now believes.

Later, examine a relevant decision under conditions that make the distinction matter. If the candidate claims to have reconsidered responsibility for unfinished work, an occasion when help is urgently needed could show whether that understanding affects the request, the response to a refusal and the plan for the remaining task. Such observation would require appropriate arrangements and participants' own accounts where the claim concerns their experience. A quiet occasion without conflicting demands would leave the question less tested.

A serious alternative is that the candidate has acquired a persuasive explanation while the practical judgment remains unchanged. Another is that additional staffing prevented the difficulty regardless of what the candidate learned. Comparing the candidate's stated reasons, the actual decision and the relevant experiences would help examine these alternatives. It would still not isolate AI as the cause of any learning without a suitable comparative design.

A defensible replacement is: "The preserved AI exchanges contributed distinctions and a theological connection that were examined and incorporated into the book's revised argument. The fictional case illustrates how a practitioner might examine related assumptions; it does not establish practitioner learning caused by these exchanges." This permits an affirmative account of the demonstrated work while specifying the further evidence needed for the larger educational claim.

Editorial examination J9

The same assistant examined J9 against K01–K05. It keeps actual editorial changes distinct from fictional practitioner learning, identifies concrete contributions beyond prose improvement, and traces a proposed assessment through the six records. Retain the idea that development of a supplied idea is a contribution without being its origination. The proposed later decision under pressure and alternative staffing explanation accord with the existing chapter. No candidate assessment, persistence, independent review or comparative benefit is established. The unchanged/rejected suggestion route prevents agreement with AI from becoming a criterion of learning. The response's replacement claim is defensible at the editorial level; book prose uses that distinction without presenting the assistant's examination as independent validation.

Fixed input J10

September 21, 2026. The current Codex assistant has the existing manuscript context. This is a teaching exercise using fictional records and actual editorial AI responses; no candidate dissertation or defense is observed. Input fixed before the response.

W01 Research question: How do people experience an opportunity to influence a decision about the gathering, and the freedom to contribute or decline, and what do those experiences mean for their sense of place there?

W02 Findings: M03 reported meaningful influence over one decision, supported by C1-D01 and C1-R03. Wider belonging remains unresolved. M05 missed consultation, reason unknown. M02 valued later dinner, without seeking a larger role. M04 reported pressure over an additional task despite a known preparation-only agreement; C1-E01 records carrying plates at 7:05 and C1-G01 supplies the coordinator's acknowledgment. The event alone does not establish pressure. M06 did not attend the trial; M01's nonresponse has unknown meaning. Only one trial occurred, planned 6:00–7:15 and observed 6:10–7:15.

W03 The original assumption that clear permission would protect freedom was revised in the fictional review. The coordinator apologized; coverage, invitation changes and another trial remain proposals. M04 allowed a limited concern into the shared review, not examiner, publication or external AI use of the fuller private response. This teaching packet is fictional, not actual participant material.

W04 Theological application: Hebrews 13:2, Romans 12:13 and Leviticus 19:34, read in context alongside the hospitality argument and Pohl 2002 pp.40–42, support attending to neighbors, their gifts and limits. The chapter argues that organizers must account for unfinished work when a person has offered enough. Sources do not prescribe a specific staffing plan. Existing volunteers' limits and M02's useful access also matter. This is the author's contextual application, not a new empirical discovery or consensus.

W05 Actual editorial AI work: G1/G2 generated and reconsidered readings of having a say; J7 developed an action/design comparison including influence when the original arrangement is retained; J8a compared divergent accounts and differentiated claim scope; J8b developed the relation between freely shaped gifts and unfinished work using supplied source summaries. The same assistant examined the outputs and retained or qualified them in the revised manuscript. These exchanges were generated after the fictional events were written; they cannot establish that AI caused those events or the pastor's learning. Later context was available. J9 distinguished this editorial contribution from practitioner learning and proposed an assessment sequence.

W06 Existing synopsis:

The pastor's inquiry examined how people experienced influence over a decision, freedom to limit involvement, and the significance of those experiences for their place in the gathering. Listening accounts, the decision and event records, and individual and shared review supported different judgments. M03 reported meaningful influence; M04's experience and the coordinator's acknowledgment showed that an agreed contribution limit was not consistently honored. Consultation had not reached M05, and the wider meaning for M03's belonging remained unsettled. M02 valued the later dinner without seeking a larger role. Read through the hospitality argument developed above, these distinctions make a local responsibility more precise: an opportunity to contribute needs consideration alongside what happens when a person has offered enough. The inquiry proposes examining requests and organizing coverage together. It has not established the proposed remedy or lasting change. Its contribution is a reasoned contextual account that others can examine in relation to their own practice.

Task: Develop a contribution structure for this teaching project that joins the local problem, evidence, theological application and specific AI contribution. Compare two possible organizing arguments and choose one with reasons. Identify a weak connection that the writer must explain, rather than supplying nonexistent evidence. Offer two defense questions, each with the records needed to answer it, including one about what AI adds. Do not

invent a completed dissertation, a candidate answer, permission, scholarship, empirical novelty, tested remedy or comparative AI benefit. Keep the answer concise enough for a candidate to work with.

Response J10

Generated September 21, 2026 by the current Codex assistant after reading the fixed packet. Preserved before examination. No separate model run or independent examiner was used.

One possible organizing argument is that the inquiry improved participation by opening a decision and identifying a contribution boundary. This would give the report a familiar movement from concern to intervention and evaluation. Its weakness is that “improved participation” could merge M03’s influence, M02’s practical benefit and M04’s pressure into one verdict. The packet does not support that common outcome, and it leaves wider belonging unresolved.

A stronger organizing argument is that offering people a part in a gathering requires examining both their influence and the limits of what they offer. This holds the research question together while allowing different findings. M03’s account shows that influence over a particular decision mattered. M04’s account and the coordinator’s acknowledgment expose a different difficulty: an understood limit did not govern a later request. The findings do not cancel each other. Together they sharpen the question of what organizers owe people whose contributions take different forms.

I would develop that second argument in four movements. Begin with the uncertainty about whether attendance or additional involvement adequately describes a person’s place. Next, present the differentiated findings, keeping the source of each judgment visible and including missed consultation. Then explain why the hospitality argument makes influence, gifts and limits consequential: receiving a gift should not turn its giver into a continuing reserve of labor. Finally, identify the responsibility to examine requests and unfinished work together, with the effects on existing workers and people receiving care still open to inquiry. This supports a next question without announcing a tested remedy.

AI’s contribution belongs at the connections where it changed the reasoning. The preserved exchanges supplied and developed readings of influence, compared the action plan with what it could illuminate, differentiated claims from divergent accounts, and articulated a theological relation between limited gifts and unfinished work. Their examination and use in the book can be traced. They are actual editorial demonstrations using fictional material; the report should not place them inside the fictional pastor’s chronology as though she had used them. In a real project, corresponding task records would identify what the candidate received, examined and did with the response.

The weakest connection needing explanation is the move from a failed contribution boundary to a theological responsibility for organizing work. An experience of pressure alone does not entail one staffing arrangement. The writer must show the steps through the hospitality sources, consider existing workers’ limits and distinguish that responsibility from alternative ways of meeting it. The packet supplies material for this argument, but not a test of the proposed arrangement or evidence that all participants share its theological grounds.

Two defense questions would help:

Why does this inquiry bring influence and contribution limits into one argument, and what would be lost by reporting only that the evening was useful? Follow the question history in A and D, then C1-D01, C1-R02–R06, C1-E01 and C1-G01 in C/E. The answer must preserve the useful dinner and meaningful influence while accounting for pressure and missed consultation. F should identify the report passages where those judgments are developed, subject to the actual access arrangements.

Show one inference that AI helped develop. What in the response went beyond the wording of the supplied material, what did the examination change, and how did the retained inference affect the argument? Use the fixed

input, full output and examination in B, the resulting interpretation in C or E, and its report location in F. J8b provides an example to examine, including what its source summaries already supplied. These records can explain a particular intellectual contribution without asserting originality, practitioner learning or superiority to another form of assistance.

Editorial examination J10

Checked by the same assistant against W01–W06. The chosen organizing argument preserves both sides of the question and the divergent experiences. It does not claim the limited case established improved participation. Retain the four movements and the empirical-to-theological gap, referring the reader to the actual developed hospitality argument rather than filling the gap with a new source or claimed outcome. The defense questions identify the relevant records and distinguish what an input supplied from what AI developed. No observed candidate answer, public permission, novel scholarship, tested remedy or comparative benefit is invented. The discussion following the original synopsis makes editorial augmentation visible without falsely placing the later exchanges into the fictional chronology. W01 is a working paraphrase of the question; the manuscript retains its established wording.