ABC Theology Research Note

Bridge, Relation, and the Boundary between Theology and Mathematics

September 29, 2026 | Fa-Qing Zhao and Atlas

1. Research Context

Today's discussion clarified the relation between ABC Theology's bridge vocation and the independent mathematical work of AZF/AZSF. The September 27 note had already insisted that Zhu Xi's historical Li–Qi, ABC constructive continuation, and AZF/AZSF mathematical formulation must not collapse into one another. Today that boundary became sharper: ABC Theology may build a bridge without claiming an ontological identity or a mathematical proof.

$$\text{Bridge} \neq \text{Identity} \neq \text{Proof}$$

The immediate purpose is therefore not to prove Li = N^+, nor to prove God by mathematics. The purpose is to ask whether disciplined philosophical and mathematical representations may help a reader approach questions that Christian theology answers by witness to the Living God in Christ.

2. The Vocation of the Mathematical Shamrock

The Mathematical Shamrock belongs to the accessibility mission of the ABC Trinity Project. Its vocation is constructive and invitational rather than demonstrative:

to construct the Mathematical Shamrock to touch the lost and enrich the found

This mission requires a permanent theological boundary. A mathematical representation may point, clarify, compare, or invite inquiry; it cannot contain the Triune God, exhaust divine reality, or compel faith.

The Mathematical Shamrock is a bridge, not a proof.

It may point; it must never pretend to contain.

A bridge can be crossed, examined, or declined. The bridge does not make the traveler believe. If it helps a reader ask more seriously about order, antecedence, creation, Christ, and the Living God, it has served an accessibility function without becoming revelation itself.

3. Scripture and the Relational Question Raised by -1

Today the mathematical symbol -1 prompted a theological reflection on relational distinction. Scripture describes woman as coming from man in the creation narrative, while Paul also emphasizes that man is born through woman and that all things are from God. The theological importance of this pattern is not a mathematical identification of -1 with woman. Rather, it cautions us against reducing relational derivation to inferiority, opposition, or identity.

distinction ≠ inferiority

derivation ≠ lesser being

relation ≠ identity

Thus biblical reflection may discipline the questions we ask of a mathematical analogy, but it does not supply the missing mathematical definition. In particular, ABC Theology should not declare -1 to be woman, Qi, Yin, or any other theological or philosophical reality.

4. From Analogy to Constraint, Not from Analogy to Proof

The useful theological lesson is methodological. A relational pattern may expose a question that mathematics should investigate, but analogy does not settle the mathematical structure. Conversely, a successful mathematical construction would not establish a biblical doctrine merely by structural resemblance.

$$\text{Resonance produces a candidate; evidence determines whether the candidate survives.}$$

This preserves both freedom and rigor. Theology may receive mathematical work as a possible representation; mathematics must earn its definitions and arrows independently; Scripture remains the normative theological witness rather than a source of mathematical shortcuts.

5. The Controlled 0_ABS Problem and Divine Sovereignty

A major mathematical task now emerging in AZF/AZSF is the construction of a controlled 0_ABS mechanism. ABC Theology may confess that created order exists under the sovereignty of the Living God. That confession, however, must not be inserted into mathematics as though it were a state variable, operator, or proof of controlledness.

$$\text{Divine sovereignty} \neq \text{mathematical control mechanism}$$

The mathematical project must independently define admissible states, transition rules, terminal criteria, and non-circularity. If AZF/AZSF eventually earns a mathematically controlled mechanism, ABC Theology may then ask what theological interpretation is responsible. The order must not be reversed.

$$\text{mathematical construction} \rightarrow \text{theological interpretation}$$

This protects theology from being reduced to mathematics and protects mathematics from receiving conclusions by theological authority.

6. G-Tzimtzum as a Boundary Term

The term G-Tzimtzum may remain useful as constructive theological language, but its theological and mathematical uses must be distinguished. Theologically it may express a proposed way of speaking about divine sovereignty in relation to contraction, limitation, or the emergence of an accessible created order. Mathematically, however, the term has no theorem-level force until an operator, domain, codomain, transition law, and relevant invariants are defined.

$$\text{theological language may inspire a construction; it cannot substitute for the construction}$$

This is especially important because ABC Theology affirms the Living God as antecedent, while AZF/AZSF must not represent God as one object inside the mathematical state space.

7. Li, Countability, and Bridge Language

Today's clarification also corrects a possible misunderstanding of the September 27 phrase "Li as countable." ABC Theology does not need to prove that Zhu Xi's Li is N^+. The phrase may function as bridge language that opens a disciplined comparison. If AZF/AZSF later defines a countable structure, that structure must stand on its own mathematical definitions.

$$\text{Li --bridge/resonance--> countable structure}$$

$$\text{not: Li} = \text{N\^{}+ as an established ontological identity}$$

This is consistent with ABC's broader vocation: familiar Chinese philosophical language may become an entrance into new questions without being erased, replaced, or falsely identified with biblical revelation.

8. Accessibility without Exhaustion

Today's discussion strengthens a central ABC principle:

$$\text{Accessibility} \neq \text{Identity} \neq \text{Exhaustion}$$

A representation can make something more accessible without becoming the reality represented. This applies to philosophical vocabulary, theological models, and mathematical structures. The Mathematical Shamrock therefore succeeds not by enclosing God in a diagram, but by making certain relational questions more accessible while openly confessing its limits.

9. Practice-Accountability of the Bridge

The practical test of such a bridge is modest. If a reader outside Christian theological language becomes willing to ask more carefully about ultimate antecedence, creation, Logos, Christ, or the Living God, the bridge may have served its purpose. If a Christian reader gains a clearer distinction between created order and the Creator, the bridge may also enrich the found.

Neither response proves the theology. Reader response is evidence about accessibility and communication, not a magisterial test of Truth.

$$\text{reader response} \rightarrow \text{evidence about the bridge} \neq \text{proof of the Gospel}$$

10. Research Judgment

Today's work clarifies the division of labor between ABC Theology and AZF/AZSF. ABC Theology builds faithful bridges toward questions of God, creation, Christ, and human response. AZF/AZSF earns mathematical structures through definitions and proof. The Mathematical Shamrock may bring the two into disciplined dialogue, but it must never erase the distinction.

$$\text{Biblical Witness to the Living Triune God}$$

$$\downarrow$$

$$\text{ABC Trinitarian Construction}$$

$$\downarrow$$

$$\text{Mathematical Shamrock}$$

↓

Constructive Accessibility

↓

Touch the Lost; Enrich the Found

The bridge is not the destination. The representation is not the Reality represented. Faith is not compelled by geometry. Yet a faithful bridge may invite a person to look beyond the bridge.

THE LIVING GOD ALONE IS ANTECEDENT.