In the mind-bending realm of Christian theology, we grapple with the concept of the Trinity - Father, Son, and Spirit, three-in-one. It's a divine trio and a monotheistic marvel, not some comic book deity. This isn't "God for Dummies," but a profound theological truth, an enigmatic reality that surpasses human understanding. It's a celestial paradox: three and one simultaneously, multifaceted yet indivisible, personal yet universal. Three doesn't equal one, as even kindergartners know. Yet there's a lyrical logic to it: God from God, light from light, true God from true God. This concept centers us and compels us to see our God as all-encompassing. The Trinity isn't a box in which to confine God but a gateway to divine simplicity. It demands rigorous faith, invites exploration of divine mystery, and challenges us to depict a God capable of operating in a complex and diverse universe in need of grace and salvation.

Navigating the theological intersection of Divine Simplicity and the Trinity, this paper offers a comprehensive model. However, let's acknowledge upfront that our human efforts can't fully grasp the mystery, beauty, and grace of our Lord. Despite our limitations, we press on in the spirit of truth.

The claim of this paper is pretty simple to state. Here's the premise: Gregory of Nyssa's catechism suggests a middle ground between the polytheistic pantheon of ancient Greece and the austere monotheism of Judaism. We aren't dualists, pluralists, or monists; we're Trinitarians, finding balance between transcendence and immanence. Our faith is strengthened by the confession of the Father, the Son, and the Spirit of truth and life. The good bishop basically says the Christian God is the attempt to have a golden mean to the principals of transcendence and immanence. So, here’s the claim, I propose a simple formula for modeling the Christian God hopefully in the vein of this golden mean principal Nyssa teaches in his catechism: Trinity = [Actus Purus, Immanentia Omnis], or in shorthand, T=[AP, IO]. Why don’t we just put transcendence and immanence together? With a little bit of math it’s actually very easy to do ironically. I’m surprised no one has done the math before.

Let’s start with some definitions of the key terms to this model of God so this encapsulation can be comprehended for how simple it is. One just needs to understand the terms we Christians have inherited and then the short proposition should make a lot of sense. And if it doesn’t I’ll put it altogether in an argument so one can see how the premises and conclusion all fit together to make the claim work.

Sure! Here's an updated glossary of the terms we have been using to construct our theological model:

1. T = [Actus Purus, Immanentia Omnis]: The convention that brackets together the full scope of two domains — transcendence (Actus Purus) and immanence (Immanentia Omnis) to offer a dynamic, relational understanding of the divine nature.

2. Actus Purus (AP): A Latin term used to denote God as pure actuality, meaning God is without potential, change, or dependency. In our model, it represents the domain of transcendence in the divine nature.

3. Immanentia Omnis (IO): A proposed Latin term representing the scope of divine immanence, referring to the three Persons of the Trinity.

4. Hypostasis: A term used in Trinitarian theology to denote the individual reality or personal subsistence of each of the three Persons of the Trinity: the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.

5. Transcendence (Full Scope): The state in which, "In God, all that transcends is actual and all actuality transcends." This represents the full actualization of all potential, with God existing beyond the limitations of the created universe.

6. Interval: A concept used to bridge the domains of transcendence and immanence, holding distinct yet related aspects of the divine nature together in a single, dynamic essence.

7. Moderate Realism: A philosophical position that acknowledges the reality of universal concepts (like the divine essence) while also asserting the real existence of particulars (like the distinct Persons of the Trinity).

8. Relational Ontology: An understanding of being in terms of interrelatedness or relationality, used in our model to affirm the unity of the divine essence while acknowledging the distinctiveness of the divine Persons.

9. Constituent Ontology: This is an ontological perspective where entities (or beings) are understood in terms of their constituent parts. In the context of our discussion, it's been used as a traditional approach to understanding God's nature where God's attributes are seen as parts of God. However, this approach can sometimes lead to logical challenges when trying to reconcile the unity and diversity in God (e.g., the doctrine of the Trinity).

10. Doctrine of Mixed Relations: This doctrine, often employed in Trinitarian discussions, explains that while the relations between the divine Persons are real on our side (the created world), they are not real in God (who is unchangeable and beyond relations). It's been used traditionally to reconcile the apparent contradiction between divine simplicity and the Trinity.

11. Dialogical Approach: A method of exploration that involves open, interactive discussion or dialogue. In our context, it's been the process by which we're engaging with, and building upon, traditional and new theological concepts to better understand and explain the divine nature, particularly in relation to the doctrine of the Trinity.

12. Persons (in Trinitarian theology): The three distinct realities—Father, Son, and Holy Spirit—within the one God of Christian belief. In the context of the convention T = [AP, IO], the Persons are seen as pure agencies (DivAP\*DivIO), each fully actualizing all divine potentials (DivAP) in an infinitely open manner (DivIO). This allows them to present, represent, and manifest the immanent reality of the transcendent qualities they embody. They each fully express the divine nature’s transcendent aspects within their unique relational identities, not bound by temporal, spatial, or sensory constraints.

13. Divine Actualized Potential (DivAP): This term denotes the state in which all inherent qualities, capacities, and potentials of the divine essence are fully actualized in each Person of the Trinity. It speaks to the completeness and perfection of divine essence in each Person, emphasizing the actuality of all that is divinely possible.

14. Divine Infinite Openness (DivIO): This term signifies the unbounded, limitless nature of the divine essence as embodied in each Person of the Trinity. It captures the infinite possibilities inherent in the divine essence, all of which are open and accessible to each Person, thereby emphasizing the dynamic and expansive nature of God's being.

15. Pure Agency (PA): This term refers to the unadulterated action and relational capability of each Person of the Trinity. It is characterized by the divine Persons’ ability to fully express, embody, and represent the divine essence in its transcendent and immanent dimensions, without any temporal, spatial, or sensory constraints.