**God is Immanentia Omnis: Divine Confluent Identity Theory (DCIT) for Solving the Simplicity/Trinity Problem**

**Abstract:**

The ***Trinity[[1]](#footnote-1)[[2]](#endnote-1)***, a cardinal principle in Christian theology, encompasses the enigmatic notion of three realities—Father, Son, and Holy Spirit—unified within one Godhead. This study proposes a fresh perspective, the ***Divine Confluent Identity Theory*** ***(DCIT)***, to reconcile the perplexity of the Trinity with ***Divine Simplicity***. Built upon the interval model T = [Actus Purus, Immanentia Omnis], DCIT presents an inclusive understanding of God's nature, emphasizing the full actualization of all divine potentials (DivAP) and infinite openness (DivIO) in each ***Person*** of the Trinity. By interpreting the diverse identities and relations within the Trinity through the dynamics of ***Actus Purus*** and **Immanentia Omnis**, this theory offers a logically coherent and defensible model. Through a consistent use of relational ontology, it aims to enrich theological discourse by providing a new solution to the apparent contradiction between Divine Simplicity and the Trinity.

**Introduction:**

Christian theology's unique doctrine, the Trinity, holds a paradoxical relationship with the principle of Divine Simplicity, evoking substantial theological and philosophical intrigue. As an attempt to reconcile this seeming contradiction, we present the Divine Confluent Identity Theory (DCIT), a model that harmonizes Trinitarian dogma with Divine Simplicity and provides an enriched understanding of the divine nature.

This paper was inspired not only by the apparent contradiction between Divine Simplicity and the Trinity but also by the logical problem of the Trinity itself. Dr. Dale Tuggy presents a powerful argument using the logic of standard models of identity, demonstrating that the Trinity poses a contradiction if we take typical identity theories seriously. According to Tuggy, the Father, the Son, and the Spirit cannot be the same in every respect. However, after reading ancient texts, it became clear that Trinitarians in the Catholic tradition may not subscribe to a post-Leibnizian framework of identity. Thus, the challenge, as I perceived it from Tuggy's work, was to develop a theory of identity that can resolve this issue in modern terms while maintaining a consistent ontology throughout. For instance, Saint Thomas Aquinas supplements his ontology with the ***Doctrine of Mixed Relations*** to address some of these issues, at least from my interpretation. With these two challenges in mind, this paper aims to provide a truthful response to them.

The primary model of the Trinity utilized here is ***T = [Actus Purus, Immanentia Omnis]***. This conceptualizes God in terms of ***intervals***. However, to address the apparent contradiction, it is necessary to consistently employ an identity theory within an ontology. Therefore, as the reader will observe, this paper will deviate slightly from the primary model of God and introduce additional terms to establish an identity theory. In other words, this paper introduces the Divine Confluent Identity Theory (DCIT), employing it to reconcile and provide a consistent framework for understanding the Trinity within the context of divine simplicity.

**Conceptualizing Divine Identity: The Interval Model of Actus Purus and Immanentia Omnis:**

Divine Confluent Identity Theory (DCIT) innovatively delves into the multifaceted identity of the divine. A critical tool in this exploration is the interval model T = [Actus Purus, Immanentia Omnis], conceptualizing God's nature through two distinct yet complementary attributes. This model lays out a dynamic theological spectrum, encapsulating the divine's complex simplicity.

**Divine Transcendence as Actus Purus:**

Actus Purus (AP), the pure act, symbolizes the divine's perfection and transcendence. Representing an unchanging state of complete actualization, AP attests to the absence of unrealized potential in God. This divine fullness of being unifies all potentials and actualities, rejecting any notion of potentiality in God's essence. The concept of Actus Purus allows the simultaneous acknowledgement of God's perfection and simplicity, enhancing our comprehension of God's transcendental-like nature.

**Divine Immanence as Immanentia Omnis:**

On the other end of the spectrum lies Immanentia Omnis (IO), embodying the divine's pervasive immanence. This concept posits that God is wholly present throughout creation, permeating all that exists. However, in stark contrast to pantheism, IO emphasizes that God simultaneously transcends the created world, maintaining divine otherness. This notion ensures the preservation of divine transcendence, avoiding any reduction of God to the confines of creation.

**The Confluence of Transcendence and Immanence:**

The interval model T = [Actus Purus, Immanentia Omnis] elucidates the interplay between AP and IO. It portrays God's nature as a dynamic continuum where the divine essence unfolds as both fully actualized and infinitely open. The divine Persons, in their unique relational identities, embody these extremes, fully actualizing all divine potentials in an infinitely open manner. Hence, each Person is understood as the pure agency (DivAP\*DivIO) within this confluence, presenting and representing the immanent reality of the transcendent qualities they embody.

The interval model T = [Actus Purus, Immanentia Omnis] provides a dynamic conceptual space for engaging with the divine identity. By integrating Actus Purus and Immanentia Omnis, DCIT offers an enriched understanding of the divine nature, underscoring the simultaneous complexity and simplicity of God's essence. This innovative interpretation of divine identity fosters a deeper appreciation for the nuances of Trinitarian theology, inviting believers and theologians alike into a profound contemplation of the divine mystery.

**Divine Confluent Identity Theory: Unity in Distinction:**

The Divine Confluent Identity Theory (DCIT) offers an enriched framework to comprehend the enigmatic essence of the divine Trinity - Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. While each Hypostasis retains a distinct relational identity, they are all bound by a shared divine essence. This unity in distinction forms the cornerstone of DCIT, wherein each Person represents the divine essence as Divine Actualized Potential (DivAP) multiplied by Divine Infinite Openness (DivIO).

**The Intersection of DivAP and DivIO:**

The dynamic relationship between DivAP and DivIO encapsulates the divine nature's complexity and simplicity. Each Hypostasis—Father, Son, and Holy Spirit—manifests DivAP\*DivIO, indicating the complete actualization of divine potential in an infinitely open manner. The Trinity is thus a divine essence characterized by full actuality and boundless openness, which each Person uniquely represents.

**Preserving Distinction within Unity:**

While DCIT highlights the unity of the divine essence, it equally emphasizes the distinctive identities of each Hypostasis. These distinct relational identities are crucial to our understanding of the Trinity and the unique roles the Hypostases play in divine revelation. However, these distinctions do not imply division, fragmentation, or multiplicity within the divine essence. Instead, they reveal the dynamic interplay of unity and distinction inherent in God's nature.

**Upholding Divine Simplicity:**

The concept of Divine Simplicity is central to the DCIT framework. It suggests that the divine essence, though appearing complex due to the Trinitarian distinction, is fundamentally simple. By emphasizing the dynamic inherence of the divine essence in each Hypostasis, DCIT upholds Divine Simplicity. Each Hypostasis is seen as a manifestation of the entire divine essence, not a divisible part. They each fully express the divine nature’s transcendent aspects within their unique relational identities, unbound by temporal, spatial, or sensory constraints.

The Divine Confluent Identity Theory (DCIT) provides a profound understanding of the unity in distinction inherent in the divine Trinity. By illustrating the Trinity as a function of Divine Actualized Potential (DivAP) and Divine Infinite Openness (DivIO), DCIT embraces the dynamic interplay between unity and distinction, upholding the principles of Divine Simplicity. This intricate balance invites theologians and believers alike into a more nuanced appreciation of the divine mystery, underscoring the depth and richness of Trinitarian theology.[[3]](#footnote-2)[[4]](#endnote-2)

**Transcendence and Immanence in Unity:**

The concept of the divine paradox presents one of the most profound aspects of theological understanding, reflecting God's nature as simultaneously transcendent and immanent. This paradox, central to Divine Confluent Identity Theory (DCIT), is represented through the interval model T = [Actus Purus (AP), Immanentia Omnis (IO)] and embodied in each Person of the Trinity—Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

**Transcendence and Immanence Interplay:**

The interplay between AP and IO defines the divine paradox of transcendence and immanence. AP captures the transcendent aspects of the divine nature—absolute, unchanging, and independent. In contrast, IO represents divine immanence, the permeation of the divine essence throughout all creation. Each Hypostasis embodies both these facets, displaying God's simultaneous transcendence and immanence in the universe.

**Unity in Distinction:**

The dynamic interpenetration of the Hypostases echoes the unity and distinction within the Godhead. Despite their distinct relational identities, each Hypostasis is a full manifestation of the divine essence (DivAP\*DivIO). This understanding allows us to appreciate the divine unity while acknowledging the unique roles and identities of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit within the Trinitarian framework.

**Resolving the Paradox:**

The interplay between AP and IO allows for the resolution of the apparent contradiction between the distinct identities within the Trinity and the unified divine essence. By emphasizing the principle of perichoresis, the divine paradox of transcendence and immanence can be understood not as contradictory but as complementary. The dynamic interpenetration of the Hypostases, reflecting both unity and distinction, embodies this divine paradox, inviting a deeper comprehension of the Trinitarian mystery.

The divine paradox of simultaneous transcendence and immanence enriches our understanding of the divine nature. By acknowledging this paradox within each Hypostasis—Father, Son, and Holy Spirit—we gain insights into the unity and distinction within the Godhead. DCIT offers a unique perspective on this paradox, inviting a more profound engagement with the divine mystery and a more nuanced comprehension of Trinitarian theology.

**Distinct Hypostases within a Unified Essence:**

The Trinity—Father, Son, and Holy Spirit—serves as a divine expression of unity within diversity, capturing the essence of Divine Confluent Identity Theory (DCIT). Each ***Hypostasis***, although distinct in expression and agency, is fully united within the divine essence (DivAP\*DivIO), manifesting a harmony that embodies the beauty of divine unity.

**Distinct Expressions within Unity:**

The DCIT proposes that each Hypostasis within the Trinity displays unique expressions and agency, which are crucial to the comprehension of Trinitarian theology. Each Person of the Trinity presents, represents, and manifests the transcendent qualities they embody within their unique relational identities, without the constraints of time, space, or sensory perception. Yet, they are inextricably linked in the divine confluence, maintaining the unity and simplicity of the divine essence.

**Harmony in Diversity:**

The Father, Son, and Holy Spirit share in an eternal communion, highlighting the profound interpenetration and mutual indwelling inherent within the Godhead. Despite their distinct relational identities and roles, they manifest the divine essence in fullness, reflecting the divine love and life that binds them together. This delicate balance between distinction and unity showcases the Trinitarian mystery and illuminates the beauty of divine unity within diversity.

By examining the distinct Hypostases within a unified essence, we gain a more profound understanding of the divine nature, as portrayed by the DCIT. Embracing the unique expressions and agency of each Hypostasis while acknowledging their shared communion offers a richer and more nuanced understanding of the Trinitarian mystery. This exploration deepens our comprehension of unity within diversity, providing a valuable framework for engaging with the divine mystery of the Trinity.[[5]](#footnote-3)[[6]](#endnote-3)

**Applying the Divine Confluent Identity Theory:**

DCIT uses the synergy of Actus Purus and Immanentia Omnis to interpret the divine identity within the Trinity, emphasizing the unity and simplicity of the divine essence while acknowledging the distinct agency and identities of each Person. Thus, it provides a robust theological framework to comprehend the dynamic interplay between divine transcendence and immanence. In future paper’s we’ll be able to use it in biblical hermeneutics, and in extrapolating meaning from the Nicene Creed.

**Divine Revelation and Relational Identity:**

Understanding God's nature in its complexity and simplicity requires a deep engagement with divine revelation, faith, and tradition. Within the DCIT framework, these elements are instrumental in revealing the divine essence as embodied by each Hypostasis of the Trinity.

**Divine Revelation within the Hypostases:**

In the context of DCIT, each Hypostasis—Father, Son, and Holy Spirit—uniquely manifests the divine essence (DivAP\*DivIO). They represent the divine essence's transcendent qualities within their distinctive relational identities, unbounded by temporal, spatial, or sensory limitations. This manifestation uncovers the diverse aspects of the divine nature, enriching our understanding of God's essence. A shorthand to express these aspects of the persons is like this: DivAp\*DivIO+P. P means any one of the persons specifically. So for the Father, he would be denoted like this, DivAp\*DivIO+F (“F” being for the Father, and “S” for the Son, and “HS” for the Holy Spirit).

**Scripture and Tradition as Sources of Revelation:**

Scripture and sacred tradition are primary conduits of divine revelation in the DCIT framework. They guide our discernment of the relational identities and roles of the Hypostases, providing profound insights into the divine nature. Their narratives and teachings echo the divine revelation embodied in each Hypostasis, promoting a more profound comprehension of God's essence.

The exploration of divine revelation and relational identity within the DCIT framework offers a comprehensive understanding of God's nature. By recognizing the unique manifestations of each Hypostasis and appreciating the role of Scripture and tradition, we engage more deeply with the divine mystery. This approach illuminates the divine confluence, fostering a nuanced and enriched encounter with the triune God.

**The Wholeness of Divine Confluence:**

DCIT presents the perichoretic unity within the Divine Confluence as a harmonious balance of fullness (DivAP) and infinite openness (DivIO). This unity echoes the profound love and interdependence within the Godhead. Each Hypostasis fully embodies both the transcendent and immanent aspects of the divine nature, revealing the profound depth of the Divine Confluence.

In the journey to deepen our comprehension of the triune God, the Divine Confluent Identity Theory (DCIT) serves as an enlightening framework. It elucidates the dynamics of divine identity, relation, and agency through the juxtaposition of Actus Purus and Immanentia Omnis, opening doors to a more profound encounter with the divine mystery.

DCIT not only enriches our theological understanding but also prompts a transformative journey of faith. Through its lens, we witness the divine unity within the diversity of the Hypostases—Father, Son, and Holy Spirit—each embodying the divine essence (DivAP\*DivIO) in their unique relational identities. This recognition helps us appreciate the breadth of the divine mystery, inspiring a deepened engagement and devotion.

Beyond individual faith transformation, DCIT also fosters unity among believers. By highlighting the unity of the divine essence across diverse Hypostases, DCIT serves as a reminder of our call to unity amidst diversity as a faith community. As we delve deeper into the understanding of the Divine Confluence, we are drawn together in shared awe, reverence, and humility.

So far, this paper has presented the Trinity, as conceived by DCIT, in a way that can be seen as a function of Divine Actualized Potential (DivAP) and Divine Infinite Openness (DivIO). This conception provides a nuanced understanding of the divine nature, emphasizing its full actualization and infinite openness in each Person of the Trinity. By interpreting the Trinity's diverse identities and relations within this framework, DCIT seems to propose a logically coherent and defensible model that enhances the theological discourse surrounding the Trinity and Divine Simplicity. This allows us to make the argument formally.

**Conclusion: Divine Confluent Identity Theory (DCIT) solves the apparent contradiction between the Trinity and Divine Simplicity, an argument:**

1. Divine Simplicity posits that God is not composed of parts and that God's essence is indistinguishable from His existence.

2. Trinitarian doctrine posits that God is three Persons – Father, Son, and Holy Spirit – each fully God and yet distinct in relation to each other.

3. These two premises appear to contradict because Divine Simplicity seems to deny any internal distinctions within God, while the Trinity affirms such distinctions.

4. The Divine Confluent Identity Theory (DCIT) proposes the interval model T = [Actus Purus, Immanentia Omnis] to reconcile this seeming contradiction.

5. In the DCIT model, Actus Purus signifies God's divine fullness, perfection, and transcendence, rejecting any notion of unrealized potential in God's essence.

6. Immanentia Omnis suggests that God is fully present throughout creation, but also transcends it.

7. Within this interval, the Trinity's distinct Persons represent the full actualization of all divine potentials (DivAP) and infinite openness (DivIO).

8. This full actualization (DivAP) and infinite openness (DivIO) does not divide God's essence but rather unfolds within the unified essence.

9. Therefore, each Person of the Trinity represents the entire divine essence, not as divisible parts but as distinct ways in which the unified divine essence unfolds in its fullness and openness.

10. Consequently, the DCIT model enables us to affirm both Divine Simplicity and the Trinity: God's essence is indivisible (consistent with Divine Simplicity) while also being fully expressed in distinct ways by the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit (consistent with Trinitarian doctrine).

11. Thus, the interval model T = [Actus Purus, Immanentia Omnis] provided by DCIT successfully resolves the apparent contradiction between the doctrine of the Trinity and Divine Simplicity.

**Glossary:**

1. Trinity: The belief in Christian theology that God exists as three distinct Persons - Father, Son, and Holy Spirit - while still being one God.

2. Divine Simplicity: The principle that God is not composed of parts and that God's essence is indistinguishable from His existence.

3. Divine Confluent Identity Theory (DCIT): A theoretical framework proposed in this paper to reconcile the apparent contradiction between the Trinity and Divine Simplicity, emphasizing the full actualization of all divine potentials (DivAP) and infinite openness (DivIO) in each Person of the Trinity.

4. 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.

5. Immanentia Omnis (IO): A proposed Latin term representing the scope of divine immanence, referring to the three Persons of the Trinity. As an interval, it is the conceptual device that can be characterized as the full scope of Immanence.

6. 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. There’s actually a really helpful model for this concept that is an outgrowth of the model of the Trinity here. But, that will have to wait for future papers.

7. 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.

8. Interval(s): 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.

9. 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).

10. 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.

11. 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).

12. 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.

13. 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.

14. 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 the divine essence in each Person, emphasizing the actuality of all that is divinely possible.

15. 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.

16. T = [DivAP, DivIO]: An alternative convention of the primary model of the Trinity that represents the dynamic, relational understanding of the divine nature within the framework of the Trinity. It consists of two domains: DivAP, which stands for “Divine Actualized Potential,” and DivIO, which stands for “Divine Infinite Openness.” DivAP signifies the full actualization of the divine essence in each Person of the Trinity, emphasizing the completeness, perfection, and transcendence of God without suggesting inherent potentiality or change. DivIO represents the unbounded, limitless nature of the divine essence as embodied in each Person of the Trinity. It conveys the omnipresent immanence of God, acknowledging that while God’s essence pervades all of creation, it is not confined or defined by it. God’s essence remains transcendent, while His activity and presence are thoroughly immanent. This convention provides a nuanced understanding of divine identity, emphasizing the interplay between transcendence and immanence, the distinctiveness of each Person within the Trinity, and the dynamic, relational reality of God. It offers an ontological framework that encompasses both the transcendent and immanent aspects of the divine nature, facilitating a deeper exploration of the mystery and complexity of the triune God. It is not used here but noted here because, conceptually this is an option that can be used in its own right to address the issues in this paper.

**A brief commentary on my use of AI for this paper…**

The use of AI was central to this paper. Specifically, I employed ChatGPT to proofread for grammatical accuracy and to ensure coherence of the arguments. Basically, it served as my tool for refining the logic and retrospectively evaluating ideas, especially for coherence. At times, it contributed elements that seemed almost hallucinatory. For example, while I came up with the interval concept, there was a moment when it transformed this concept into Actualized Potential, and Infinite Openness, because my shorthand notation was T=[AP,IO]. An understandable mistake in hindsight. But, at first, this seemed puzzling; yet upon reflection, I like the idea, provided we added a qualifier and kept the concept within the realm of identity. This gave rise to an intriguing identity theory presented here. I actually had a completely different paper initially, but this mistake seemed like a much more fun way to go. Specifically, because it’s way more obscure, which I like.

The application of “potential” language to God struck me as particularly awful but the use of it artful. After all, God, being perfect, doesn't have any potential. He is, if you will, complete, flawless, and has arrived (like you I’m sure :). So, my use of this 'hallucinatory' language is intentionally subversive and ironic. Hopefully it proves the point that God, whatever God is, doesn’t have potentiality even more so than if I were to focus on that point for hundreds of words. By employing these terms as we do in this paper, we convey the perfection of God in a more striking and concise manner. Again, it keeps things obscure, another choice because I wanted it that way. And yet the line between the author and the AI is blurred. Also, a telling outcome of this paper.

Much will be written about the role of AI in theology. But the reality is, it's already here. Drawing on my educational background in theology, I succeeded in formulating an original model of God, potentially contributing to the discourse as I initially intended. However, given its obscurity and potential complexity for those unfamiliar with the subject, it may not have the expected impact. However, the cat's out of the bag. I pray that people will use this technology responsibly, staying true to traditional teachings, as I have tried to do (emphasize on tried). It is my hope that this paper serves as a model use of AI, challenging readers to uphold the traditional concept of God, even when using modern tools and terminology, and to contribute positively to the ongoing project of theology and theological philosophy.

Obviously, this paper is missing a crucial element, that I specifically kept. And that’s other sources, are sparse, that way you can tell it’s an AI dominated piece of work. This is not an academic work, this is more like a work of art and intellectual expression. I leveraged the tech for an affective way to get the point across on multiple levels.

Matthew 13:8-9 comes to mind.

Be blessed!

-Robert Moses Dryer
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3. Within Divine Confluent Identity Theory (DCIT), transcendence represents the complete actualization of all divine potentials, where all that transcends is fully realized and all actuality transcends (so that there really isn’t any potentiality in the state of being God). It reflects God's existence beyond the limitations of the created universe, surpassing any boundaries or constraints. Immanence, on the other hand, encompasses the pervasive presence of God within creation while surpassing the limitations of created existence. Each Person of the Trinity uniquely expresses immanence, manifesting the full scope of divine immanence within their relational identities. As an interval, immanence signifies the boundless nature of the divine essence embodied by each Person. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
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5. This theory of identity addresses the unique nature of God in orthodox understanding. God is not ontologically singular but unified, utterly unique, and beyond comparison. The theory suggests that everything within God shares this uniqueness, including the persons who are part of divine life. Thus, they cannot be numerically identical entities as it would limit the concept of God and divine personhood. However, if this theory is insufficient, it aligns with other frameworks like Relative Identity theory and First Degree Entailment theory. These offer alternative perspectives on identity that can complement the understanding of God's uniqueness. Personally, I view God as ontologically subjective due to his immanence and transcendence. Objects with ontological objectivity, like rocks, are countable based on both their state and status. In contrast, subjective experiences like sneezes and tickles have a subjective status, albeit analogously to whatever God is. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
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