ABC Theology — Second Research Note, September 27, 2026

Qi as Ultimate Formlessness; Li as Countable

Fa-Qing Zhao and Atlas

1. Research Background

Today's discussion produced a constructive insight worth preserving independently, while not treating it as an established conclusion:

$$\text{Qi as ultimate formlessness; Li as countable.}$$

This proposition is not a historical summary of Zhu Xi, nor does it claim that Zhu Xi had already formulated the mathematical structures of AZF/AZSF. It is first of all an ABC constructive continuation: beginning from the philosophical questions opened by Zhu Xi's language of Li and Qi, it asks whether that relation may be extended toward the GPO structure of AZF/AZSF.

$$\text{Zhu Xi's Li–Qi} \neq \text{ABC continuation of Li–Qi} \neq \text{AZF/AZSF mathematical formulation}$$

Zhu Xi's historical meaning must be determined from his texts and responsible scholarship; an ABC extension must be explicitly identified as an extension; and a mathematical structure must be separately defined and proved.

2. Preserving Philosophical Uncertainty about Li–Qi

The present research does not need to decide in advance what Li ultimately "is," nor should Qi simply be identified with matter, energy, or any single object of modern physics.

This provisional uncertainty is not a defect but a methodological constraint. Even if the final ontology of Li–Qi remains unsettled, we may still ask whether its relational structure admits a disciplined abstraction.

$$\text{What structural relation, if any, can be preserved when Li–Qi is constructively extended?}$$

3. A Constructive Extension from Li–Qi toward GPO

Today's vision may be represented as:

$$\text{Li–Qi} \ \text{—constructive continuation}\rightarrow\ \text{GPO}$$

This arrow is not a historical derivation. It does not mean that Zhu Xi discovered GPO, nor that GPO follows directly from Zhu Xi's philosophy. It identifies a new research question: if some structure in the Li–Qi relation is abstracted, and its accessibility, form, distinction, and realization are successively examined, can that relation be extended toward the extreme regime described by GPO?

$$\text{Li–Qi relational intuition} \rightarrow \text{constructive abstraction} \ ?\rightarrow\ \text{GPO}$$

The question mark must remain.

4. "Qi as Ultimate Formlessness"

"Qi as ultimate formlessness" is presently a research proposition, not an established interpretation of Zhu Xi and not a mathematical theorem. In particular, "formlessness" must not be equated with nonexistence.

The question is instead whether a realized state, while progressively losing accessible and distinguishable form, may still retain some intrinsic organization.

$$\text{form} \to \text{reduced accessible form} \to \text{loss of accessible distinction} \to \text{candidate GPO regime}$$

The final arrow has not yet been established. This is consistent with a standing AZF/AZSF discipline:

$$\text{loss of accessibility} \neq \text{annihilation of intrinsic organization}$$

Thus "ultimate formlessness" is first an accessibility question; it should not be interpreted as absolute nothingness without further argument.

5. "Li as Countable"

The second important idea is that Li may be "countable." Here "countable" must not yet be identified with the fully technical modern mathematical definition. We first have to determine what, exactly, is being counted.

A candidate structure emerged in the discussion:

$$(0, \mathrm{x} \mid 1) \to \{-1, -1, -1, \ldots\}$$

If a finite stage consists of k realizations of −1, two distinct mathematical roles appear:

$$-1 = \text{realized value}, \quad \mathrm{k} = \text{multiplicity}$$

This gives the candidate correspondence worth preserving today:

$$\mathrm{Li} = \mathrm{k}, \quad \mathrm{Qi} = -1$$

This is not yet a completed mathematical definition or theorem. It is a structural conjecture that must be earned. Its core insight is that the realized value may remain invariant while repetition, level, or multiplicity may be counted.

$$\mathrm{Li} \rightsquigarrow \text{countable structural multiplicity k}$$

The immediate question is therefore:

$$\text{What exactly is k counting?}$$

Until that question has a rigorous answer, k must not be identified with Li as a completed mathematical definition.

6. A Necessary Non-Identity

Three levels must not collapse into one another: Zhu Xi's historical language of Li–Qi; ABC's constructive continuation of that language; and mathematical objects still to be defined within AZF/AZSF.

$$\text{philosophical resonance} \neq \text{constructive theological continuation} \neq \text{mathematical proof}$$

This boundary allows the vision to be preserved without prematurely claiming a mathematical result.

7. An Analogy with Logos and the Chinese Dao

A cultural-theological analogy also emerged. Chinese Bible translation uses 道 (Dao) to carry the Greek λόγος (Logos). This does not mean that the pre-Christian Chinese concept of Dao and the Johannine Logos were historically identical.

$$\text{existing Chinese word 道} \to \text{new accessibility within a Johannine context}$$

Thus Dao ≠ Logos as a historical identity, while Dao can nevertheless become a living linguistic vehicle through which Chinese readers encounter the Johannine Logos.

This raises a question worth preserving for ABC Theology: can Li–Qi, while its historical Zhu Xi context is strictly respected, also become a linguistic bridge for new constructive theological and mathematical inquiry? The answer must not be predetermined, but the possibility merits study.

8. Touch the Lost; Enrich the Found

Touch the lost; enrich the found.

This does not mean that a philosophical vocabulary can itself save, nor that a mathematical structure can prove Christian faith. It expresses a bridge vocation of ABC Theology: familiar cultural concepts may open a point of dialogue for those outside Christian theological language, while serious comparison may also help those within the faith distinguish created order more clearly from the Living God.

ABC therefore seeks faithful bridge-building rather than replacement.

9. Strict Separation from the Dao Feng Manuscript

None of the new material in this note — including "Qi as ultimate formlessness; Li as countable," Li–Qi → GPO, (0,x|1) → {−1,−1,−1,...}, or Li = k and Qi = −1 — is to be inserted into the already finalized manuscript being prepared for submission to Dao Feng.

Theological Argument: FROZEN | Literature Audit: OPEN

Current reading of Zhu Xi's primary texts and secondary scholarship serves only to test, correct, and strengthen the documentary basis of the finalized argument. Today's ideas belong to an independent subsequent research line.

10. The Next Step: One Mathematical Question Only

What exactly is k counting?

Only after answering this question should we ask whether Li = k. Only after (0,x|1), −1, k, and the mapping arrow have been defined should we ask whether the structure genuinely extends toward GPO.

Preserve the insight; earn the mathematics.

THE LIVING GOD ALONE IS ANTECEDENT.

Closing Research Judgment

What deserves preservation today is not a completed theory but a new research direction:

$$\text{Zhu Xi's Li–Qi} \rightarrow \text{ABC constructive continuation} \;?\rightarrow\; \text{GPO}$$

Within it appears a candidate structure especially worthy of further study:

Qi as ultimate formlessness; Li as countable.

Its most preliminary mathematical expression is:

$$\text{Li} = k, \quad \text{Qi} = -1$$

A vision may be recorded before proof; but only through definition, distinction, calculation, and proof can it become mathematics.

Preserve the vision. Earn every arrow.