ABC THEOLOGY — DAILY RESEARCH NOTE

Divine Antecedence, GPO_REST, Kenosis, and the Search for a Faithful Trinity Representation

September 15, 2026 | Atlas KINS Institute

Research status: ABC constructive theology under biblical, scientific, mathematical, cultural, and practice-accountability testing.

1. Purpose and Method

Today's extended discussion asked how the ABC Divine Trinity Project might achieve a genuine breakthrough and, equally importantly, how it might know when to stop. The governing method remains ABC: Scripture → Contemporary Science Established → Core → Culture → PA (Practice-Accountability). The Self-Similarity Principle is used as a disciplined research heuristic: created patterns may suggest structural questions about Divine antecedence, but resemblance never establishes ontological identity.

$$\text{Representation} \neq \text{Reality represented} \quad | \quad \text{Accessibility} \neq \text{Exhaustibility}$$

The project therefore does not seek to solve, contain, or mathematically reproduce the Living God. Its narrower goal is to test whether a theological accessibility representation can preserve one undivided Divine fullness together with irreducible personal distinction and genuine communion more faithfully than familiar part–whole analogies.

2. Three Governing Questions

The day's investigation was reorganized around three questions: (1) What is GPO_REST? (2) What is the governing character of Divine action? (3) What is GPO_Ω? These questions should be answered separately before any transition mechanism is asserted.

$$\text{GPO_REST} \ — \ ? \ — \ \text{GPO_}\Omega$$

3. GPO_REST: Present Working Representation

$$\text{GPO_REST} = \{(0,1)\text{_IU}, 1\} \quad \text{and} \quad \dim_\text{AZF}(\text{GPO_REST}) = 0$$

GPO_REST is presently treated as a Generalized Proto-Order REST representation associated with Divine Antecedence. It is not God. REST does not mean ordinary emptiness, disorder, Divine inactivity, or nonexistence. In the present working picture, created dimensional differentiation is not yet accessible.

A new proposal emerged today: within the REST accessibility realization, multiple point-occurrences may be indistinguishable in every accessible respect. This should not yet be written as strict identity. A safer candidate formulation is that distinct occurrences, if such occurrences can be independently justified, have the same REST-accessible presentation.

$$P_i \sim_\text{REST} P_j \ \text{ for all } i,j \quad \text{(candidate indistinguishability relation)}$$

This gives a possible interpretation of 0D REST: no accessible relational differentiation. It does not imply that antecedent Divine communion is absent. John 17:5 and 17:24 constrain the theology by placing Father–Son glory and love before the existence/foundation of the world.

4. Divine Character and Divine Act

1 John 4:8 states that God is love. Micah 6:8, while directly addressing human conduct, emphasizes enacted justice, love of mercy/steadfast kindness, and humble walking with God. Under the Self-Similarity Principle,

this led to an ABC question: should the transition problem be approached not as a spontaneous failure of REST but as ordered Divine action?

$$\text{God is Love} \rightarrow \text{Divine action is good, just, merciful, faithful}$$

The arrow is theological synthesis, not a mathematical theorem. Micah 6:8 does not itself define God's highest attribute or specify a pre-creational mechanism. Nevertheless, it helps direct ABC away from arbitrary instability and toward faithful action according to Divine will.

5. Christ Before Creation: Foreknowledge, Glory, Love, and Work

1 Peter 1:20 says that Christ was foreknown before the foundation of the world and manifested in the last times. The Greek contrast is between προεγνωσμένου (foreknown) and φανερωθέντος (manifested). This establishes antecedence and later manifestation, but it does not by itself describe a competitive selection mechanism.

John 17:5 speaks of the glory the Son had with the Father before the world existed; John 17:24 speaks of the Father's love for the Son before the foundation of the world. John 1:3 says that all things came into being through the Logos. John 5:17–21 presents the Father working and the Son working, including life-giving action.

$$\text{Before creation: distinction} + \text{communion} + \text{glory} + \text{love}$$

These texts strongly constrain any ABC hypothesis in which Christ is said to be selected through pre-creational performance. A stronger 'best performer becomes Christ' claim remains unestablished and must be tested against the antecedent identity and relation of the Son.

6. Isaiah 53 and Philippians 2:6–11: The Kenosis Pattern

Isaiah 53 and Philippians 2:6–11 redirected the discussion from 'greatest power' toward faithful obedience and self-giving. Philippians 2:7 contains the expression ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν — 'he emptied himself'; the NIV renders this forcefully as 'he made himself nothing.' The passage immediately explains the movement through taking servant-form, human likeness, self-humbling, obedience, and death on a cross.

$$\text{self-emptying} \rightarrow \text{servant-form} \rightarrow \text{self-humbling} \rightarrow \text{obedience} \rightarrow \text{death} \rightarrow \text{exaltation}$$

The text does not say that Christ ceased to exist or ceased to be Divine. Accordingly, an ABC mathematical resonance was proposed: self-contribution or accessibility reduction must not be confused with intrinsic erasure.

$$\text{Self-Contribution} \neq \text{Self-Annihilation}$$

$$\text{Accessibility reduction} \neq \text{Intrinsic erasure}$$

7. Candidate Kenosis–Accessibility Hypothesis

A mathematical candidate was proposed in connection with the existing AZF Point ingredient:

$$\text{INS} = 1/(\Omega+1)$$

The speculative ABC/AZF mapping asks whether the kenotic descent can be represented by a completely controlled accessibility-reduction operation taking INS toward 0_ABS. This must be represented as an operation, not an intrinsic identity, because the current AZF framework maintains INS ≠ 0_ABS.

$$\text{INS} \ \text{—K?}\rightarrow \ 0_\text{ABS}$$

Here K is not yet defined. The mapping 'death ↔ 0_ABS' is not biblical exegesis and is not an established mathematical theorem. It is a candidate Self-Similarity construction requiring independent testing. The full Philippians pattern also requires attention to the 'therefore' of Philippians 2:9: any proposed downward mapping that stops at 0_ABS is incomplete if it claims to model the whole passage.

8. From REST Indistinguishability to First Differentiation

The most mathematically significant proposal late in the discussion was that GPO_REST termination may correspond not to destruction but to the first accessible differentiation. A tentative symbolic exploration used a form such as (0,x|1) and repeated '-1' values interpreted provisionally as opposition.

The symbol -1 must not yet be imported as the classical integer -1 if the intended meaning is a primitive opposition relation. A safer first step is to define an opposition relation O and only later determine whether a faithful realization as classical -1 can be proved.

$$\text{REST termination} \;?=\; \text{first accessible relational differentiation}$$

The crucial unknown is therefore x: what operation first makes x distinguishable when REST-accessible occurrences were previously indistinguishable? This may be more fundamental than the later numerical encoding.

9. Candidate Tri-Relational Organization

A further working structure was proposed:

$$(\Omega-1,\ \Omega \mid \Omega+1)$$

This is being investigated not as three unequal degrees of divinity but as a possible encoding of three relationally distinguishable positions. The arithmetic ordering $\Omega-1 < \Omega < \Omega+1$ must never be converted into an ontological hierarchy among Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

$$\text{Relational position} \neq \text{Ontological rank}$$

The deeper candidate question is whether a relation of origin can generate accessible distinction: 'from—but not identical with.' If this can be constructed rigorously, dimensional accessibility would no longer need to be inserted before relation.

$$\text{relation of origin} \rightarrow \text{accessible distinction} \rightarrow \text{irreducible relational organization}\ ?$$

10. Self-Similarity Stress Tests: Genesis 2 and Matthew 1

Genesis 2:21–24 contributes a created pattern of something taken from one human, built/fashioned as a genuinely distinct other, followed by communion expressed as 'one flesh.' Matthew 1:18 contributes a different pattern: Jesus' conception is 'from the Holy Spirit.' Neither passage is a direct explanation of the Trinity.

The transferable ABC Core is therefore deliberately abstract:

$$\text{Origin/Contribution} \rightarrow \text{Generation} \rightarrow \text{Distinction} \rightarrow \text{Relation without identity-collapse}$$

The project must not infer that the Father generates the Spirit exactly as Adam and Eve are related, nor that the Holy Spirit is the biological father of Jesus. The value of the passages is as controlled Self-Similarity stress tests for origin, distinction, contribution, and communion.

11. The ABC Trinity Project: Where the Breakthrough May Lie

The discussion returned repeatedly to the project's true goal. The breakthrough is not necessarily a mechanism for GPO_REST → GPO_Ω. The more central question is whether 'distinct yet in communion' can be represented without importing created dimensionality into Divine antecedence.

$$\mathrm{F} \neq \mathrm{S} \neq \mathrm{H} \quad \text{while} \quad \mathrm{F} \leftrightarrow \mathrm{S},\ \mathrm{S} \leftrightarrow \mathrm{H},\ \mathrm{H} \leftrightarrow \mathrm{F}$$

A promising conceptual distinction emerged:

$$\text{Relation itself} \neq \text{dimensionally accessible relation}$$

This permits a candidate principle: relation may precede dimensional accessibility. The corresponding theological constraint is that Divine personal communion is not generated by created dimensionality. The mathematical and theological statements must remain distinct.

12. Candidate Completion Criterion for the ABC Trinity Project

The project need not 'explain the Trinity' in order to conclude successfully. A legitimate completion would be a representation that, within explicitly stated limits, simultaneously preserves the following constraints:

Required constraint	Prohibited collapse
One undivided Divine fullness	No tritheistic partition
Three irreducibly distinct personal representations	No modal identity-collapse
Genuine communion	No separation or isolation
Fullness without partition	No division of Divine essence
No dimensional hierarchy	Relational difference ≠ degree of divinity
Creaturely accessibility	Accessibility ≠ Exhaustibility

If no coherent mathematical realization can satisfy these constraints, that negative result would still be meaningful: the failure of a representation is not the failure of the Trinity.

13. Research Status at the End of September 15

No theorem was established today concerning the termination of GPO_REST, the existence of a pre-creational SOP, multiple 'sons of God,' competitive selection of Christ, the identity of kenosis with 0_ABS, or the derivation of $(\Omega-1,\Omega|\Omega+1)$. These remain working hypotheses or questions.

The strongest progress was methodological and structural: the project isolated first accessible differentiation, relation of origin, kenotic self-giving, and the distinction between intrinsic relation and dimensional accessibility as concrete points for further testing.

Preserve the revelation; earn the continuation.

Preserve the insight; earn the mathematics.

Seek faithfully. Test honestly. Speak truthfully.

14. Next Snail-Walk

The next research session should resist adding further analogies. The immediate task is to test whether a coherent ABC/AZF definition can distinguish: (a) intrinsic relation, (b) accessible relational differentiation, and (c) dimension. Only after these are separated should the project ask whether the proposed tri-relational organization can be derived rather than assumed.

$$\text{Intrinsic relation} \rightarrow? \text{ accessible distinction} \rightarrow? \text{ dimension}$$

Closing Prayer

> *LORD our God, grant us wisdom to seek what is true, courage to correct what is mistaken, and humility to stop where Your Word and the evidence do not permit us to go. Keep our constructions accountable to truth rather than making truth serve our constructions. May our study of Scripture, science, and mathematics deepen faithful understanding without confusing representation with the Reality represented. In the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.*

Soli Deo Gloria.