ABC Theology — Daily Research Note

Constructive Continuation, Selection, and Divine Sovereignty

A Methodological Comparison with Feng Youlan's "Speaking According to" and "Speaking Onward From"

September 28, 2026
Fa-Qing Zhao and Atlas

1. Research Question

Feng Youlan's distinction between "speaking according to" (zhaozhe jiang) and "speaking onward from" (jiezhe jiang) provides a useful methodological point of comparison for ABC Theology. The resemblance is real but limited. Both approaches distinguish faithful engagement with an inherited tradition from constructive continuation beyond mere repetition. ABC Theology, however, adds an explicit structure of normative, evidential, cultural, and practical accountability.

Similarity does not imply identity.

2. The Methodological Resonance with Feng Youlan

For the limited purpose of the present comparison, "speaking according to" may be understood as disciplined exposition of an inherited intellectual tradition, while "speaking onward from" permits constructive philosophical development from that tradition. This yields a valuable distinction:

historical exposition ≠ constructive continuation

ABC Theology shares this refusal to reduce intellectual faithfulness to repetition. A received tradition can be understood faithfully and still become the starting point for new questions and new formulations. Yet ABC does not infer from the possibility of continuation that every continuation is equally warranted.

3. The Distinctive ABC Requirement: Constrained Constructive Continuation

ABC Theology asks not only, "Can we continue?" but also, "Under what constraints may we continue?" and, more importantly, "Under what evidence must a proposed continuation be corrected, rejected, preserved, or refined?"

ABC Theology = constrained constructive continuation

Its working definition therefore remains:

Biblically normative + evidence-constrained + culturally conscious + practice-accountable

These four terms are not decorative qualifications. They identify the conditions under which a constructive theological proposal remains answerable to sources and realities beyond itself. ABC construction is therefore corrigible by design.

4. A Darwinian Analogy — Strictly Limited

A Darwinian analogy can illuminate the formal difference, provided that it is not turned into a historical judgment about Feng Youlan and is not confused with biological theory itself.

Methodological element	Limited evolutionary analogy

“Speaking according to”	inheritance / preservation
“Speaking onward from”	variation / constructive development
ABC constructive continuation	constrained variation
Scripture, evidence, cultural consciousness, practice-accountability	selection constraints

The analogy must stop at the level of formal structure. Feng Youlan’s constructive philosophy is not thereby characterized as random mutation. Likewise, ABC Theology does not identify theological truth with historical survival, institutional success, popularity, or biological fitness.

5. Selection in ABC Theology Is Not Autonomous Natural Selection

Classical natural selection, considered as a biological explanatory mechanism, does not by itself supply the theological norm by which a Christian interpretation is judged true or faithful. ABC therefore cannot equate survival with truth.

historical survival ≠ theological truth

A theological construction may be widespread, institutionally successful, politically protected, or culturally durable and still require correction. Conversely, political opposition or cultural weakness does not establish falsity. ABC selection language is therefore analogical: it refers to the disciplined testing of human interpretations, not to a biological mechanism that generates theological truth.

Scripture is normative; interpretation is corrigible.

6. A New Boundary: ABC Selection and AZF/AZSF Control

The present discussion suggests a further distinction between ABC Theology and the developing AZF/AZSF mathematical program. In current AZF/AZSF research, 0_ABS is being treated as a controlled terminal environment rather than as an ordinary scalar zero. The mathematical meaning of “controlled” has not yet been fully earned and must eventually be specified through formal notions such as admissible states, admissible transitions, a control law, or another rigorously defined constraint structure.

Mathematics must define the control structure; theology must not be smuggled into the definition.

7. The “God Factor” as a Theological Sovereignty Condition

The phrase “God factor,” used here as a theological prompt associated in our discussion with Franklin Graham, should not be introduced into AZF/AZSF as a mathematical variable, parameter, coordinate, or operator. To write God as an element G inside a previously specified mathematical state space would invert the very antecedence claim ABC seeks to preserve.

God Factor $\notin$ AZF/AZSF mathematical state space

A safer working formulation is to treat the “God factor” as a theological sovereignty condition: created processes may be mathematically represented through laws, constraints, admissibility, and terminal structures, while their ultimate ontological dependence is interpreted theologically as remaining under divine sovereignty.

Divine sovereignty is not a variable within the mathematical model;
it is the theological condition under which the created order represented by the model is understood.

8. Deuteronomy 6:4 and the One — the Unit

Deuteronomy 6:4 — "YHWH our God, YHWH is one" — functions here as a scriptural and theological anchor, not as a mathematical theorem. Within the developing ABC–AZF/AZSF dialogue, "One — the Unit" may serve as theological language for the sovereignty and non-derivative antecedence of the Living God. But the mathematical properties of unity, terminality, admissibility, or control must still be established independently within the formal system.

Scriptural norm ≠ mathematical derivation

This separation protects both sides. Scripture is not reduced to mathematics, and mathematics is not allowed to claim theological conclusions that its definitions and proofs do not establish.

9. A Typed Interface between ABC Theology and AZF/AZSF

The developing architecture may therefore be represented conceptually as three distinct levels:

THE LIVING GOD
divine sovereignty / ultimate antecedence
↓ theological interpretation — not a mathematical function
CREATED ORDER
law / constraint / admissibility / realized relations
↓ formalization
AZF/AZSF MATHEMATICAL MODEL

Within the mathematical level, a candidate architecture remains under development, for example: GPO_REST → T_ult → Z_0 → {∗}, with the terminal regime associated with 0_ABS. None of these mathematical objects is God, and no arrow in this mathematical chain should be interpreted as a proof of divine action.

The interface is therefore typed: mathematical formalization describes accessible structure; ABC theological interpretation addresses the ontological status of created order under the sovereignty of the Living God. The two may enter disciplined dialogue without being identified.

10. The ABC Selection Cycle

With this refinement, the ABC process can be stated more precisely. Constructive proposals arise, but they remain candidates until they undergo disciplined examination:

Scriptural witness → faithful reading → constructive continuation → evidential examination → practice-accountability → correction / rejection / preservation / refinement → renewed reading

The point of the cycle is not to manufacture theological novelty. It is to make human theological constructions answerable to what they claim to interpret.

11. Resonance as Candidate Generation

This framework also clarifies the role of resonance. Structural resonance between Zhu Xi's Li–Qi, Chinese philosophical vocabulary, scientific descriptions, mathematical structures, and Christian theology may generate a legitimate research candidate. Resonance itself, however, does not establish identity, derivation, or truth.

Resonance produces a candidate; evidence determines whether the candidate survives.

Here “survives” means only that a proposed interpretation remains defensible after scriptural, evidential, cultural, and practical examination. It does not mean biological fitness, popularity, or institutional success.

12. Feng Youlan and ABC Theology — The Clearest Distinction

The comparison can now be condensed into two statements:

Feng Youlan helps us articulate: “One may speak onward from a tradition.”

ABC Theology must additionally ask: “On what grounds may we speak onward, and under what evidence must we revise or abandon what we have constructed?”

Thus Feng Youlan’s distinction provides a genuine methodological resonance for ABC, but ABC’s identity lies in the explicit accountability of constructive continuation.

13. Research Boundary and Status

This note does not reopen the frozen theological argument of the near-submission Dao Feng manuscript. The existing article needs Feng Youlan only as a limited methodological precedent for constructive continuation. The Darwinian analogy, the distinction between selection and divine sovereignty, the “God factor” boundary, and the typed ABC–AZF/AZSF interface belong to the continuing ABC research program.

Theological Argument: FROZEN | Literature Audit: OPEN

Likewise, the mathematical content of “controlled terminal environment” remains open research. The insight may be preserved, but every mathematical object, relation, and arrow must still be earned.

14. Working Principles Preserved Today

- Evidence first; construction afterward.
- Resonance produces a candidate; evidence determines whether the candidate survives.
- Divine sovereignty is not a variable within the mathematical model.
- Natural mechanism does not imply ontological autonomy.
- Scriptural norm is not mathematical derivation.
- Preserve the insight; earn the mathematics.
- **THE LIVING GOD ALONE IS ANTECEDENT.**

15. Closing Research Judgment

The methodological resonance with Feng Youlan remains useful precisely because it need not be turned into identity. “Speaking onward from” helps make constructive continuation intelligible; ABC Theology adds explicit normative and evidential accountability. The Darwinian analogy then helps distinguish variation from selection, while the developing AZF/AZSF discussion adds a further boundary: lawful or constrained selection within created order must not be confused with an autonomous ontology, and divine sovereignty must not be reduced to a term inside a mathematical equation.

Preserve the vision. Earn every arrow.