ABC Divine Trinity Project

Progress Summary Report

Mathematical Accessibility, Trinitarian Constraints, and the Discipline of Faithful Rereading

September 12, 2026 | Atlas KINS Institute

1. Purpose and Present Status

This report summarizes the recent development of the ABC Divine Trinity Project. The project does not claim to describe, contain, or mathematically solve the Divine Trinity. Its present aim is narrower and more disciplined: to investigate whether a mathematical accessibility representation can preserve the principal biblical and Trinitarian constraints more faithfully than familiar part-whole analogies such as the shamrock.

The project has now reached a stage at which its overall representational architecture is promising, while several central mathematical contents remain provisional. The progress therefore lies both in what has been constructed and, equally importantly, in identifying what has not yet been mathematically earned.

2. Methodological Foundation: Rereading, Not Rewriting

The governing methodological conviction is: The Bible need not be rewritten; it must be reread faithfully.

Rereading is not undertaken in order to make Scripture conform to ABC theology or to a mathematical model. It is driven by the Gospel's witness to life and by the task of faithful translation and interpretation. Biblical-linguistic translation remains distinct from mathematical representation. In the present project, mathematics functions as a rigorous representational language, while ABC theology functions as the method of theological interpretation.

Holy Scripture → Faithful Rereading → ABC Theological Interpretation ⇝ Mathematical Accessibility Representation → Testing → Return to Scripture

Classical mathematics provides the public mathematical language and external testing ground. AZF may contribute candidate constructions, but it remains mathematically corrigible. Thus:

Scripture constrains ABC; ABC does not constrain Scripture.

Mathematics tests the representation; it does not define God.

Classical mathematics tests AZF; AZF does not redefine classical mathematics.

3. The Governing Trinitarian Structural Constraint

The project has converged on the following concise structural constraint:

Distinct yet in communion; in communion without confusion; one without division.

Chinese working formulation: 有**别**而相通，相通而不混同；一而不分。

This is not offered as a complete definition of the Trinity. It is an ABC Trinitarian Structural Constraint. It protects real personal distinction, genuine communion, non-collapse of identity, and undivided unity. It must also be supplemented by the requirement:

Fullness without partition.

Accordingly, a successful representation must not depict Father, Son, and Holy Spirit as three fractions, three interchangeable states, or three separable divine individuals.

4. Biblical Stress Testing

The representation has been tested against a cluster of biblical passages, not as mathematical proofs but as constraints upon any acceptable construction. Luke 3:22 is especially important because the Son, the descending Spirit, and the heavenly voice occur within one event, strongly resisting a modalistic succession of states. Matthew 1:18 also preserves Son-Spirit distinction within relation. Acts 7:55 presents Stephen filled with the Spirit while seeing the glory of God and Jesus at God's right hand, combining distinction, communion, and creaturely accessibility.

Romans 8:34 preserves the risen Christ's relational intercession. Second Corinthians 3:17 ('the Lord is the Spirit') places strong pressure on simplistic identity notation: theological 'is' cannot automatically be converted into mathematical '=' when the broader canonical witness preserves distinction.

John 14:28 ('the Father is greater than I') adds an important asymmetry constraint. Whatever the final interpretation of the verse within Christology, dimensional or relational rank must not be converted directly into unequal divinity. This yields a further research principle:

$$\text{Relational Asymmetry} \neq \text{Essential Inequality}$$

Genesis 1:2, Acts 2:1-13, Luke 17:20-21, Matthew 21:43, and John 3:13 have also contributed to questions of Spirit, multiplicity of accessibility without partition, and divine/heavenly accessibility beyond ordinary spatial localization. None of these texts, however, is treated as proof of a particular dimensional model.

5. Current Mathematical-Accessibility Architecture

The present layered architecture can be summarized provisionally as:

$$\mathfrak{T}_\text{ABC}^\text{acc} = (\ \boldsymbol{\mathcal{I}}_\text{IU},\ \mathcal{E}\ ;\ \text{D}_{\text{n}-1},\ \text{D}_\text{n},\ \text{D}_{\text{n}+1}\ ;\ \boldsymbol{\mathcal{R}}_\text{FS},\ \boldsymbol{\mathcal{R}}_\text{SH},\ \boldsymbol{\mathcal{R}}_\text{HF}\ ;\ \mathcal{A}_\text{C}\ )$$

Its current representational roles are:

- $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{I}}_\text{IU}$ ⇝ Undivided Unity
- $\text{D}_{\text{n}-1}$, D_n, $\text{D}_{\text{n}+1}$ ⇝ Irreducible Distinction
- $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{R}}$ ⇝ Communion
- $\mathcal{E}$ ⇝ Fullness / Essential Invariance
- $\mathcal{A}_\text{C}$ ⇝ Creaturely Accessibility

In concise English: The present ABC representation is a layered mathematical-accessibility architecture in which the Intrinsic Unit provisionally represents undivided unity, relative dimensional structures represent irreducible distinction, relational structures represent communion without identity-collapse, an essential invariant represents fullness without partition, and a creaturely accessibility map represents genuine but non-exhaustive access to revealed Divine communion.

6. ε, the Intrinsic Unit, and GPO_REST (静空)

The project also preserves the AZF/ABC use of ε as an accessibility-representation symbol associated with the Intrinsic Unit and GPO_REST:

$$\varepsilon \rightsquigarrow (0,1)_\text{IU}$$

$$\varepsilon \rightsquigarrow \text{GPO_REST} : \{(0,1)_\text{IU},\ 1\} \ —\ \text{静空}$$

Here 静空 is the established AZF technical term for the generalized thermodynamic state with no entropy increase or decrease. It is not to be replaced by ordinary emptiness, disorder, maximum entropy, minimum entropy, or generic thermodynamic equilibrium.

Within the Trinity project, the Intrinsic Unit is being explored only as a finite mathematical accessibility representation of undivided unity. It is not the Divine Essence itself, and GPO_REST is not God.

$$\text{IU} \neq \text{Divine Essence} \quad \text{GPO_REST} \neq \text{God}$$

The updated AZF work also requires care not to define the Intrinsic Unit simply as the classical real interval. Any bridge from the AZF Intrinsic Unit to (0,1)_$\mathbb{R}$ must be mathematically earned rather than assumed.

7. Strengthening Personal Distinction

A major recent advance was the replacement of fixed dimensional labels (4,5,6) by a relative dimensional-accessibility hypothesis:

$$S \rightsquigarrow D_{n-1}, \quad H \rightsquigarrow D_n, \quad F \rightsquigarrow D_{n+1}$$

The symbols represent candidate accessibility structures, not divine locations, ontological dimensions, ranks of divinity, or identities. The important feature may be the relative pattern rather than the absolute integers:

$$(n-1,n,n+1) \rightarrow (n+k-1,n+k,n+k+1)$$

This strengthens 'distinction' by moving beyond mere symbolic inequality toward the possibility of irreducible structural difference. Yet the mathematical definition of dimension is not complete. The current AZF direction interprets dimension in terms of mutually irreducible relational-accessibility degrees, but accessibility degree, independence, irreducibility, and rank still require rigorous definitions and proofs.

$$\text{Relational Dimensional Difference} \neq \text{Ontological Degree}$$

8. Communion: The Central Unresolved Mathematical Problem

The simpler relational notation remains:

$$F \leftrightarrow S, \quad S \leftrightarrow H, \quad H \leftrightarrow F$$

The relations $\mathcal{R}$_FS, $\mathcal{R}$_SH, and $\mathcal{R}$_HF are provisional mathematical placeholders for nontrivial communion among irreducibly distinct personal representations. They are required to preserve relation without identity-collapse and distinction without separation.

The principal unresolved question is therefore not whether ↔ is visually suggestive, but what mathematical object it denotes. Is communion best represented by a binary relation, reciprocal maps, morphisms, invariant-preserving structure, a topological notion, or a new AZF relational-accessibility object? No answer has yet been earned.

What is mathematically preserved when two irreducibly distinct personal representations are genuinely in communion?

This formulation is now preferred as the next snail-walk because it turns the theological question toward invariant mathematics without claiming to define the intrinsic mechanism of Divine communion.

9. Essential Invariance and Fullness

The symbol $\mathcal{E}$ has a provisional role as an essential-invariant placeholder:

$$\mathfrak{M}\text{_Ess}(F) = \mathfrak{M}\text{_Ess}(S) = \mathfrak{M}\text{_Ess}(H) = \mathcal{E}$$

This notation expresses a constraint, not a completed mathematical realization of homoousios. The essential invariant must remain undivided:

$$\mathcal{E} \neq \mathcal{E}_\mathrm{F} \sqcup \mathcal{E}_\mathrm{S} \sqcup \mathcal{E}_\mathrm{H}$$

The unresolved problem is to find a mathematical structure in which three irreducibly distinct personal representations can each preserve fullness in relation to one undivided essential invariant without partition and without identity-collapse. Thus $\mathcal{E}$ has notation and a representational role, but not yet a satisfactory mathematical realization.

10. Creaturely Accessibility and the Epistemic Boundary

A further development concerns whether Divine communion is accessible to creatures. The project now distinguishes Divine communion from a creature's granted accessibility realization:

$$\boldsymbol{\mathcal{R}}_\mathrm{Div} = \text{Divine communion as Divine Reality}$$

$$\mathcal{A}_\mathrm{C}(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{R}}_\mathrm{Div}) = \text{creature C's granted accessibility realization}$$

$$\mathcal{A}_\mathrm{C}(\boldsymbol{\mathcal{R}}_\mathrm{Div}) \neq \boldsymbol{\mathcal{R}}_\mathrm{Div}$$

The claim is asymmetric: creaturely access may be genuine without being exhaustive. Revelation can make relations truly knowable without making the Divine Reality mathematically possessable or exhaustible.

$$\text{Accessibility} \neq \text{Exhaustibility}$$

$$\text{Representation} \neq \text{Reality represented}$$

This boundary is essential to the project. The aim is a realization of theological accessibility, never a realization of God Himself.

11. Present Diagnosis of the Mathematical Work

The present diagnosis can be stated compactly:

- D_n problem: dimensionality is promising but not yet rigorously and independently defined.
- $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{R}}$ / ↔ problem: communion is represented symbolically, but its mathematical meaning remains undefined. This is the largest immediate gap.
- $\mathcal{E}$ problem: essential invariance has notation and a clear constraint role, but not yet a satisfactory mathematical realization.
- Asymmetry problem: the model must allow relational asymmetry without implying essential inequality.
- $\mathcal{A}_\mathrm{C}$ problem: genuine but non-exhaustive creaturely accessibility is conceptually strong but still requires formalization.

Thus the present dissatisfaction concerns primarily mathematical content rather than the overall representational form.

12. Research Priorities

The next stage should resist the temptation to add D_{n+2}, new geometric pictures, or increasingly elaborate high-dimensional analogies. The immediate priority is to define communion mathematically while preserving the other constraints.

$$\text{Priority 1: What is the mathematical meaning of Communion?}$$

$$\text{Priority 2: Earn a rigorous definition of relational-accessibility dimension.}$$

Priority 3: Realize $\mathcal{E}$ mathematically as fullness without partition.

Priority 4: Formalize creaturely accessibility without exhaustive identification.

Every candidate must pass the same structural test:

UNITY + PERSONAL DISTINCTION + FULLNESS + COMMUNION + CREATURELY ACCESSIBILITY

If a candidate mathematical structure fails, the structure is revised or rejected; the biblical doctrine is not altered to protect the model.

13. Provisional Synthesis

The ABC Divine Trinity Project has progressed from analogy toward a constrained representational research program. Its achievement so far is not a mathematical solution to the Trinity, but a clearer specification of what a responsible mathematical accessibility representation must preserve and what it must refuse.

The current methodological synthesis is:

Scripture → Rereading → ABC Interpretation → Mathematical Representation → Testing → Return to Scripture

The present structural synthesis is:

Irreducible Distinction + Nontrivial Communion + Non-Confusion + Undivided Fullness + Genuine Non-Exhaustive Accessibility

The project therefore proceeds under three permanent safeguards:

Theology gives constraints; mathematics must earn the representation.

Accessibility ≠ Exhaustibility.

Representation ≠ Reality represented.

The Bible is not rewritten. It is reread faithfully. ABC theology interprets; mathematics attempts disciplined representational translation; Truth remains the final corrective.

Soli Deo Gloria.

Amen and Amen.