ABC THEOLOGY — DAILY THEOLOGICAL RESEARCH NOTE

Dimensional Accessibility and the Trinity

Preserving the 6D–5D–4D Hypothesis While Returning to the Mathematical Definition of Dimension

September 7, 2026
Atlas KINS Institute (AKI) • ABC Trinity Project

1. Purpose and Continuity

This note records the next step of the ABC Theological Trinity Project after the mathematical requirements established earlier today: unity, irreducible personal distinction, fullness without partition, and communion without collapse. The present advance is deliberately modest. It preserves a dimensional-accessibility hypothesis for future testing, but it does not yet declare a mathematical model of the Divine Trinity.

The governing methodological order remains:

Biblical Trinity → Theological Constraints → Mathematical Invariants
→ Candidate Representation → Testing

Truth is not accountable to ABC; ABC is accountable to Truth.

2. The Trinitarian Structural Constraint Remains Unchanged

The concise Chinese structural constraint remains:

有**别**而相通，相通而不混同；一而不分。

In English: Distinct yet in communion; in communion without confusion; one without division. This sentence is not offered as a complete definition of the Trinity. It functions as a structural constraint that any candidate representation must respect together with the further requirement of fullness without partition.

3. Preserved Personal Distinction

The first preserved requirement is real and irreducible personal distinction. Father, Son, and Holy Spirit must not collapse into three names, appearances, functions, or interchangeable modes of one Person.

$$F \neq S, \quad S \neq H, \quad H \neq F$$

This inequality is necessary but not sufficient. The future mathematical representation must supply an invariant that makes the distinction non-collapsible under the equivalences permitted by the model.

4. The Preserved Dimensional-Accessibility Hypothesis

A new candidate representation is preserved for later mathematical testing:

$$F \rightsquigarrow D_6$$
$$H \rightsquigarrow D_5$$
$$S \rightsquigarrow D_4$$
$$D_6 \neq D_5 \neq D_4$$

Here $\rightsquigarrow$ means candidate mathematical accessibility representation. It does not mean ontological identity. Therefore the hypothesis must never be rewritten as Father = 6D, Holy Spirit = 5D, or Son = 4D.

The theological motivation is precise: distinct dimensional-accessibility invariants might eventually provide a stronger representation of "有别" (distinction) than three labels alone, while relational structure may preserve "相通" (communion). This is only a research possibility until dimension itself is mathematically defined.

5. Why Dimensional Difference Does Not Yet Give Communion

The statement $D_6 \neq D_5 \neq D_4$ can represent difference, but difference alone does not establish communion. A successful representation would also require nontrivial relations among the personal structures, provisionally denoted:

$$R_FS, \quad R_SH, \quad R_HF$$
$$F \leftrightarrow S, \quad S \leftrightarrow H, \quad H \leftrightarrow F$$

The relations must preserve rather than erase personal distinction. Thus relation ≠ identity. The eventual mathematics must show how distinct accessibility structures can be genuinely related without becoming identical or collapsing into one mode.

6. One Undivided Essence and Fullness Without Partition

Dimensional distinction must never partition the one divine essence. If 6D, 5D, and 4D eventually become useful accessibility representations, they cannot be interpreted as three portions of God. Each personal representation must preserve the whole essential invariant.

$$\mathfrak{M}_Ess(F) = \mathfrak{M}_Ess(S) = \mathfrak{M}_Ess(H)$$
Fullness without partition

Accordingly, dimensional difference belongs, if at all, to the representational level of personal accessibility, not to fractional possession of divine essence. The One must remain one; the three must remain irreducibly distinct; and communion must not dissolve either requirement.

7. Dimension Must Be Distinguished from Spacetime

The present hypothesis depends on an important distinction developed in the current AZF research:

Dimension ≠ Spacetime
Dimension ≠ its geometric realization
Mathematical dimensionality ≠ physical spacetime dimensionality

Therefore D_4, D_5, and D_6 in this ABC hypothesis are not presently claims that the Son inhabits a four-dimensional universe, the Holy Spirit a five-dimensional universe, and the Father a six-dimensional universe. They are placeholders for possible mathematical accessibility structures whose definitions have not yet been earned.

8. Spacetime and Information: A New Question, Not a Conclusion

Today a further question arose from reading about M-theory and contemporary foundational physics: What if spacetime is emergent from a more fundamental informational or relational structure? ABC records this as an external research question, not as evidence for the Trinity or for AZF.

The disciplined conceptual possibility is:

information / relations → structure → dimensional accessibility → emergent spacetime

This possibility resonates with the distinction between dimension and spacetime, but resonance is not evidence. ABC must not identify information with Logos, emergent spacetime with GCO, or M-theory with a proof of Trinitarian structure. Such identifications would exceed the evidence.

9. The Necessary Termination Point

At this stage the Trinity Project should stop rather than force the dimensional hypothesis further. We do not yet possess an independent AZF definition of dimension adequate to give D_4, D_5, and D_6 mathematical content. Continuing to assign theological meaning before defining dimension would risk circularity: the desired Trinity representation could begin to dictate the mathematics.

Therefore the dimensional hypothesis is preserved, but bracketed:

$$F \neq S \neq H$$

$$F \rightsquigarrow D_6 \quad H \rightsquigarrow D_5 \quad S \rightsquigarrow D_4$$

$$D_6 \neq D_5 \neq D_4$$

STATUS: Preserved hypothesis — not yet a mathematical Trinity model.

10. Next Step: Return to Independent AZF Mathematics

The next step is not to ask why the Father should be 6D, the Holy Spirit 5D, or the Son 4D. The next step is the independent mathematical question:

WHAT IS A DIMENSION IN AZF?

The required snail-walk is:

$$TC \rightarrow N_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{I} \rightarrow \text{Define Dimension}$$

Only after dimension is defined independently should AZF ask how D_1, D_2, D_3, ... arise, what invariant distinguishes D_n from D_{n+1}, how different dimensional accessibility structures relate, and whether those relations preserve intrinsic invariants. Classical geometry and physics may then serve as comparison, bridge, consistency test, or falsification wherever their hypotheses are satisfied.

11. Non-Circularity Guardrail

The mathematical definition of dimension must not be designed in order to obtain the desired theological sequence 6D–5D–4D. Theology supplies constraints for a candidate representation; it does not predetermine the mathematical result.

Theology gives the constraints;
mathematics must earn the representation.

If independent mathematics does not support the dimensional hypothesis, the hypothesis must be revised or abandoned. The Trinity is not dependent upon the success of an AZF representation.

12. Four-Invariant Test for Any Future Return

When the mathematics of dimension has matured sufficiently, the 6D–5D–4D hypothesis may return to the ABC Trinity Project and face the same fourfold test:

UNITY + PERSONAL DISTINCTION + FULLNESS + COMMUNION

A candidate fails if unity collapses the Persons, distinction partitions the essence, dimensional difference gives only partial fullness, or communion erases irreducible personal distinction. Mathematical elegance alone is not success.

13. Provisional Synthesis

Today's result is therefore not a new doctrine of the Trinity. It is a disciplined preservation of a research hypothesis. Dimensional accessibility may eventually enlarge the mathematical representation of personal distinction while relational maps preserve communion and one undivided essential invariant. But this possibility can be evaluated only after dimension itself has been independently defined.

有別 → possible dimensional invariant

相通 → nontrivial relational structure

一而不分 → one undivided essential invariant

完全而不分割 → fullness without partition

The project now deliberately returns from theology to mathematics. This is an instance of the ABC Discipline of Termination: continue where the evidence warrants continuation; stop where further construction would outrun definition and proof.

14. Guiding Principle

Preserve the hypothesis. Define dimension independently. Return only after mathematics has earned the representation.

Representation ≠ Reality represented. Mathematical accessibility ≠ Divine ontology. Dimension ≠ Spacetime. Resonance ≠ Evidence.

Soli Deo Gloria. Amen and Amen.