ATLAS KINS INSTITUTE

Daily Theological Research Note

Three Kinds of Emptiness, Divine Causal Provenance, and AZF as a Bridge for Dialogue

September 15, 2026

1. Purpose

Today's theological reflection distinguishes three meanings of "emptiness" within the developing ABC/AZF vocabulary. The aim is not to collapse Christian theology, Buddhist philosophy, and mathematical representation into one system. Rather, the distinctions are intended to make dialogue possible while preserving genuine differences.

A bridge connects distinct shores; it does not erase their distinction.

2. Three kinds of emptiness

Chinese term	Working English term	ABC/AZF identification
真空	Absolute Emptiness	0_ABS
靜空	Rest Emptiness	GPO_REST
色空	Form Emptiness	comparative Nāgārjuna-inspired category

3. 真空 — Absolute Emptiness

In the present ABC/AZF proposal, 真空 denotes 0_ABS. It is not the physical vacuum of modern physics. It is a completely controlled accessibility-reduction or destructive condition; it is passive and never an autonomous agent.

$$0_ABS \neq \text{physical vacuum.}$$

$$\text{God acts; } 0_ABS \text{ is acted upon.}$$

Within ABC theological provenance, the Living God alone controls 0_ABS. This theological claim must not be presented as a theorem of mathematics.

4. 靜空 — Rest Emptiness

靜空 denotes GPO_REST. It is not absolute nothingness and must not be identified with 0_ABS. It represents a rest-state of Proto-Order in which dimensional realization has not yet been established.

$$GPO_REST \neq 0_ABS, \qquad 0_ABS \notin GPO_REST.$$

Rest ≠ Nothingness.

The presence of intrinsic order in a rest-state therefore must not be confused with a physical vacuum or with an absolutely destructive condition.

5. 色空 — Form Emptiness

The term 色空 is used here as an ABC comparative category inspired by dialogue with Nāgārjuna, not as a complete historical definition of Madhyamaka śūnyatā. Today's simplified working idea is to bracket the theological premise of the Living God as the causal provenance of created-order development and then examine concrete things without treating them as independently self-subsisting.

$$\text{Bracketing Divine causal provenance} \neq \text{denying God.}$$

Accordingly, 色空 should no longer be summarized merely as "absence of concrete things." A more careful ABC working description is: the absence of independently self-subsisting concrete form when Divine causal provenance is bracketed for comparative analysis.

This is explicitly an ABC simplification for dialogue. It should not be attributed to Nāgārjuna as though it exhausted his historical philosophical account.

6. The Christian theological boundary

ABC does not leave Divine causal provenance bracketed in its own confession. Its governing theological statement remains:

The Living God Alone is antecedent.

Isaiah 44:6 provides today's scriptural anchor: "I am the first and I am the last; besides me there is no god." The verse functions here as a theological constraint and confession, not as a mathematical proof.

Thus no mathematical symbol, including Ω+1, 0_ABS, the Intrinsic Unit, or a Point-Circle, is to be identified with God.

7. AZF as a bridge for Buddhist-Christian dialogue

AZF may nevertheless offer a mathematical-philosophical meeting place. A central expression considered today is:

$$1 = (\Omega+1)/(\Omega+1) = (\Omega+1)\cdot 1/(\Omega+1).$$

With INS = 1/(Ω+1), the same relation becomes 1=(Ω+1)INS. The mathematical identity, where the quotient is defined, does not prove Christianity, Buddhism, or their equivalence. Its possible bridge-function is methodological: distinct interpretive traditions may ask what remains invariant when accessible form, scale, or explanatory framing changes.

One The Unit is invariant under admissible normalization.
Different interpretations of provenance do not by themselves change the mathematical identity.

8. Terminal mathematical accessibility and the unbounded God

The current AZF proposal treats Ω+1 as a Terminal Mathematical Accessibility Boundary: no mathematical object is admitted as independently accessible beyond it. Even INS=1/(Ω+1) is not thereby granted an independently accessible existence beyond that boundary.

$$\text{Beyond } \Omega{+}1\text{: no mathematical accessibility is admitted in the present proposal.}$$

This is categorically different from a theological boundary on God. ABC therefore pairs the mathematical proposal with the confession:

Beyond every mathematical boundary, the Living God remains unbounded.

Isaiah 44:6 does not prove the AZF boundary mathematically; rather, it prevents the mathematical boundary from being mistaken for a boundary of God.

9. Final synthesis

The three kinds of emptiness should therefore not be arranged casually as three numerical degrees of the same thing. They belong to different conceptual roles: 0_ABS is a controlled accessibility-reduction condition; GPO_REST is a rest-state organization; Form Emptiness is a comparative description in which concrete form is denied independent self-subsistence while Divine causal provenance is bracketed for the comparison.

$$\text{Absolute Emptiness} \neq \text{Rest Emptiness} \neq \text{Form Emptiness.}$$

The bridge offered by AZF is therefore neither syncretism nor equivalence. It is an invitation to place distinct accounts beside a common mathematical question while allowing Scripture to constrain ABC and mathematics to judge AZF.

Scripture constrains ABC.
Mathematics judges AZF.
The bridge preserves distinction while permitting dialogue.