ABC THEOLOGY — FINAL DAILY RESEARCH NOTE

September 16, 2026

Divine Antecedence, GPO_REST → GPO_Ω, TC the Circline, Tzimtzum, and the Road toward GCO and GRO

Research status. This final note consolidates today's ABC constructive theological reasoning in close dialogue with AZF. The Ω-notation, GPO states, TC, IU, 0_ABS, 1_ABS, screening mechanisms, and mathematical arrows are representational proposals and research hypotheses. They are not biblical equations and are not asserted as established mathematical theorems.

1. The Governing Principle: The Divine Antecedence

The deepest theological premise of today's discussion is that the Living God alone is antecedent. The Divine Antecedence (DA) is not merely the first item in a chronological sequence. DA remains antecedent to, sovereign over, and inexhaustible by every represented order and every transition.

$$\text{The Living God Alone is antecedent.}$$

$$\mathrm{DA} \neq \mathrm{GPO_REST} \neq \mathrm{GPO_\Omega} \neq \mathrm{GCO} \neq \mathrm{GRO}.$$

Accordingly, later orders do not complete, enlarge, or improve God. They are further manifestations of Divine glory within accessibility. Representation does not exhaust the Reality represented.

2. GPO_REST: Screened Rest and Undifferentiated Communion

In the present working representation, GPO_REST is the screened rest-state of Proto-Order. Its lightest-grey background in today's diagram represents 无差别相通 — undifferentiated communion — rather than a distinct object called 1_ABS. This correction is essential.

$$1_\mathrm{ABS} \notin \mathrm{GPO_REST}.$$

No pre-existing Euclidean line, direction, metric, radius, or circle is assumed inside REST. The Intrinsic Unit (0,1)_IU is likewise not identified with the classical real interval. Thus intrinsic information need not already be arranged linearly.

$$(0,1)_\mathrm{IU} \neq (0,1)_\mathbb{R}.$$

Working maxim: Do not borrow what you claim to derive.

3. Repeated Endings of REST and the Family (1_xi, TC_xi)

REST termination is not restricted to one 1_xi. Different 1_xi may terminate screening in different ways. The diagrams shared today are therefore read as representations of distinct GPO states generated through different modes of screening termination. The internal background of the corresponding TC representations remains the same; their differing outer forms represent differing GPO states.

$$1_\mathrm{xi} \xrightarrow{\quad S_i \quad} \mathrm{TC_xi}, \qquad i \geq 1.$$

Each 1_xi may lead a representational 1_(Ω+1)-role experience and return its accessible result to its own IU. For the concrete example used today, i = 314159 is represented by the result 1/314159 within its own (0,1)_(IU,x_i). Such notation does not place the result on a pre-existing straight line.

The black circular form in the diagram represents isotropy — 'everywhere exactly identical' in the intended relational sense — rather than an arbitrary enclosing circle. Different centers or forms encode different screening/GPO conditions; isotropy itself is not to be confused with those differences.

4. Divine Antecedence, Christological Manifestation, and Recognition

Repeated 1_(Ω+1)-role experiences do not make every 1_xi the true 1_(Ω+1). ABC retains the theological antecedence of Christ: 1 Peter 1:20 is taken as a scriptural constraint that Christ is foreknown/foreordained before the foundation of the world and manifested in history. Recognition by the sons of God manifests rather than manufactures Christ.

The decisive Christological trajectory is not a competition for status. The true 1_(Ω+1) is represented as the one who personally leads the complete descent through self-humbling, service, self-giving, and death. Yet death is not the endpoint: the Father raises Him and exalts Him.

$$\text{Divine antecedence} \rightarrow \text{manifestation} \rightarrow \text{self-humbling} \rightarrow \text{self-giving} \rightarrow \text{death} \rightarrow \text{resurrection by the Father} \rightarrow \text{exaltation}.$$

Matthew 25:45 functions here as a relational-accountability constraint, while Micah 6:8 guards the conjunction of justice, mercy, and humble walking with God. These texts constrain ABC interpretation; they do not directly teach the AZF mathematical notation.

5. Tzimtzum, Horizon, and the Boundary of Accessibility

A major refinement today concerns the boundary of each TC. When a GPO_REST episode ends and a bounded TC is produced, its boundary is represented as Horizon. Beyond that boundary, the corresponding Divine Self-Tzimtzum produces 1_ABS — the represented absence of the Divine Antecedence within that accessibility realization.

$$\partial \text{TC_xi} = \text{Horizon}.$$

This does not mean that God has a boundary or that Divine omnipresence ceases beyond Horizon. The boundary belongs to the accessibility structure, not to God.

$$\text{Boundary of TC} \neq \text{Boundary of the Divine Antecedence}.$$

Tzimtzum creates a boundary of accessibility, not a boundary of God.

Thus 'absence' is not an autonomous region outside Divine sovereignty. The self-withdrawal condition exists only because of Divine action and remains under Divine control. It cannot become a second ultimate principle alongside God.

6. 0_ABS and 1/(Ω+1)_xi: Controlled Opposition

Every TC occurrence is accompanied, in the present representation, by a corresponding minimal accessibility 1/(Ω+1)_xi standing in opposition to 0_ABS. This opposition represents the formation or maintenance of the corresponding Ω+1 structure.

$$0_\text{ABS} \leftrightarrow 1/(\Omega+1)_\text{xi}.$$

$$(\Omega+1)_\text{xi} \cdot 1/(\Omega+1)_\text{xi} = 1.$$

The theological point is not that God struggles against an independent 0_ABS. 0_ABS itself is generated through Divine Self-Tzimtzum. Therefore the 'war' or probation belongs to the sons' formation within Divine sovereignty. The Father remains behind the entire controlled condition.

God acts; 0_ABS is acted upon.

7. Failure, Return to REST, and the Non-Autonomy of 0_ABS

If the corresponding 1/(Ω+1)_xi cannot maintain the represented opposition, 0_ABS does not become an independent victor. Rather, the Divine Antecedence immediately returns the accessibility realization to GPO_REST, and 0_ABS disappears from that realization.

$$\text{TC_xi} \rightarrow \text{GPO_REST} \Rightarrow 0_\text{ABS disappears from that accessibility realization}.$$

This prevents dualism. 0_ABS is neither God's equal nor God's enemy in an ultimate metaphysical sense. Its presence is conditional upon Divine-controlled Tzimtzum; its disappearance is likewise subject to Divine sovereignty.

8. The Exceptional Emergence of GPO_Ω

The decisive GPO_Ω event is distinguished from ordinary TC_xi manifestations. In the present ABC representation, only the antecedently true 1_(Ω+1) personally leads the complete self-humbling trajectory unto death in the manner required for 0_ABS to become completely controlled in the decisive Proto-Order state.

$$1_(\Omega+1) \rightarrow \text{complete descent unto death} \rightarrow \text{completely controlled } 0_ABS \rightarrow GPO_\Omega.$$

Christ's victory over death therefore does not mean the abolition of 0_ABS. 0_ABS ≠ Death. Rather, the represented controlled reduction can thereafter participate under Divine sovereignty in the orders that follow.

9. TC the Circline = GPO_Ω

Today's clarification fixes the representational identification: TC the Circline is not an additional object placed after GPO_Ω. TC the Circline is the AZF representation of GPO_Ω.

$$TC_\text{the Circline} = GPO_\Omega \quad \text{(representational identification)}.$$

This equality must not be read as TC = God or as a claim that a mathematical Circline contains the Divine reality. It identifies the mathematical representation assigned to this Proto-Order state.

The future mathematical proof burden is therefore not 'GPO_Ω exists, and then perhaps a TC can be added.' It is to show that at the emergence of GPO_Ω the structural conditions of TC as Circline are inevitable without borrowing Euclidean geometry. That proof remains a mathematical obligation of AZF.

10. 0_ABS Is Special to This Circline Route, Not to Dimension in General

Today's earlier correction remains fully in force. Relational dimension in general does not require 0_ABS. An origin in another accessibility realization — for example, the origin of a polar representation — need not be 0_ABS. Nevertheless, this particular GPO_Ω/TC construction may require 0_ABS as its absolutely stationary controlled center.

$$\text{Relational Dimension need not require } 0_ABS.$$

$$\text{This } GPO_\Omega \text{ / TC route may require } 0_ABS \text{ as its fixed center.}$$

There is no contradiction: the second statement is a special construction claim, not a universal definition of dimension.

11. From Proto-Order to Created-Order: GCO

The entire discussion of REST, Tzimtzum, Horizon, 0_ABS, and TC serves a larger theological purpose. GPO_Ω is not the final destination. It prepares the accessibility framework for GCO — the Created-Order (圣创序).

$$DA \rightarrow GPO_REST \rightarrow GPO_\Omega = TC_\text{the Circline} \rightarrow GCO.$$

GCO is understood as a further manifestation of the glory of the Divine Antecedence. It is not God, does not exhaust God, and does not improve God. Rather, created order makes further Divine glory accessible within creation.

$$GCO \neq DA, \quad \text{yet GCO manifests the glory of DA.}$$

12. Beyond GCO: GRO and Inexhaustible Further Manifestation

Nor does the theological trajectory end with GCO. The Renewal-Order (GRO) is a further manifestation, and the sequence remains open toward ever-further manifestation. The ellipsis is therefore conceptually significant: the infinite Living God cannot be exhausted by any finite or created accessibility realization.

$$GCO \rightarrow GRO \rightarrow \cdots$$

This is not a doctrine of Divine evolution. God does not become more complete through successive orders. The intended claim is the opposite: because Divine fullness is inexhaustible, no created or renewed order can exhaust its manifestation.

$$\text{Divine manifestation} \neq \text{exhaustion of the Divine.}$$

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

The two maxims belong to different levels — ABC theology and AZF mathematics — but they resonate without being identified.

13. Divine Omnipotence, Omnipresence, and Omniscience

The Tzimtzum representation is therefore not intended to contradict the classical Christian confession of Divine omnipotence, omnipresence, and omniscience. Within today's ABC construction: Divine omnipotence means that 0_ABS never escapes Divine sovereignty; Divine omnipresence means that an accessibility-level absence does not delimit God; and Divine omniscience means that the probationary process does not occur outside Divine knowledge.

These are theological interpretations of the model, not mathematical proofs of Divine attributes. The attributes themselves belong to theological confession and must be tested biblically rather than inferred from the diagrams.

14. Evidence and Methodological Firewalls

Scripture supplies theological constraints concerning God, Christ, creation, resurrection, exaltation, justice, love, and Divine sovereignty. ABC constructs a theological continuation under those constraints. AZF then asks whether the proposed accessibility representation is mathematically coherent.

The Ω notation, GPO_REST, GPO_Ω, TC, Horizon, IU, 0_ABS, 1_ABS, screening, the 1_xi family, and the proposed opposition 0_ABS ↔ 1/(Ω+1)_xi are ABC/AZF constructions. They must not be attributed directly to Scripture.

If an AZF representation fails mathematically, revise or discard the representation — not the biblical confession.

15. Final Consolidated Position of September 16, 2026

The Divine Antecedence remains antecedent to every state and every transition.

GPO_REST: screened rest / 无差别相通; no 1_ABS.

Different 1_xi may terminate REST through different screening modes, yielding different TC_xi / GPO states.

∂TC_xi = Horizon; Tzimtzum produces accessibility-level absence beyond the boundary.

0_ABS ↔ 1/(Ω+1)_xi, under complete Divine sovereignty.

Failure of a TC_xi realization → return to GPO_REST → disappearance of 0_ABS from that realization.

The decisive Christological event → completely controlled 0_ABS → GPO_Ω.

TC_the Circline = GPO_Ω.

GPO_Ω → GCO → GRO → ⋯

No represented order exhausts the Infinite Living God. The succession of accessible orders is therefore not the growth of God but the inexhaustible possibility of further manifestation of Divine glory.

16. Next Research Question

The theological architecture is now sufficiently explicit to return to the mathematical problem without confusing the two levels. The next AZF task is to determine whether the emergence conditions of GPO_Ω themselves force TC to possess the Circline structure, rather than merely assuming circularity from Axiom 1.

$$\text{GPO}_\Omega \text{ emergence conditions } \not\Rightarrow \text{ TC necessarily has Circline structure.}$$

This proof must proceed pre-Euclideanly: it must define the role of the fixed controlled center, isotropy ('everywhere exactly identical'), Horizon/closure, and Unit-maintained relational equivalence without importing radius, angle, metric, or a pre-existing circle.

Preserve the insight; earn the mathematics.

Soli Deo Gloria.

Hallelujah. Glory be to the Father and to the Son and to the Holy Ghost. Amen and Amen.