

Why The Beatific Estate Stands Apart

A public explanation for readers of the Schumacher Institute discussion papers

Michael F. Reber

[**Author's Note.** Throughout this paper, the term *co-inherence* replaces the earlier use of *coherence*. Following Charles Williams, *co-inherence* more accurately expresses the axiomatic and ontological structure under examination.]

Introduction: The distinctive mode of the beatific estate

Readers who have spent time with my previous discussion paper on *The Beatific Estate*, often sense that its structure stands slightly apart from familiar theological or philosophical forms. The treatise does not move in the manner of mystical memoir or doctrinal reflection. Its cadence, its clarity, and its quiet mathematical framing suggest that it is attempting to name something about the contours of human being itself—something subtle, structural, and seldom addressed directly. To hold this interior clarity, the paper introduces a term shaped for precision rather than elevation: the *Divine Eternal Spiritual-Body*, or DESB. The term functions not as a title but as a conceptual tool, a way of naming a mode of human existence that appeared with unusual congruity within *The Beatific Estate*'s internal logic.

This structural mode becomes clearer when placed against the earliest attempts to build human order. [Genesis](#) describes the first city-state emerging not from the communion of the Garden but from dislocation: Cain departs from the presence of the Lord, settles in a land named for wandering, and constructs a city-state to secure what communion once provided. He sanctifies the city not for the glory of God but for his own lineage, consecrating the edifice after his son, Enoch—an early architecture of *egoic legacy* rather than shared divine orientation, and the seeding of an anthropocentric framework grounded in self-arrogation, fear, and dominion. Culture sprouts—music, metalwork, pastoral life—yet this *belladonna flowering* unfolds alongside escalating rupture, culminating in Lamech's violence and self-magnification. The narrative pattern is unmistakable: human structures born of rivalry are destined to splinter, while those cultivated through *co-inherence*—"the new state of being, a state of redemption...made actual by that divine substitution, 'He in us and we in him'" (Williams, 1939, p. 10)—are built to abide.

This pattern does not begin with Cain; it is older than the first city. The biblical narrative presents a recurring theme of rupture: a turning from communion toward *ego*, from given co-inherence toward self-arrogation. The fall of the tempter is framed as a refusal of relational order; the fall of Adam and Eve as a grasping for identity apart from the gift; the fall of Cain as envy hardened into violence and then into a city built to secure a legacy of his own making. Dante's *Inferno* later renders this same movement in literary form, portraying the soul's descent as the progressive tightening of ego upon itself—pride collapsing into isolation, envy into rivalry, wrath into violence, and treachery into absolute relational rupture. In this hierarchical (non-holarchical) descent, the world spirals ever downward into *novem gradus inferorum*, culminating in *cocytus* lamentation (Dante, 1997, *Inferno*, trans. Longfellow, Canto XXXII).

As one of my earlier essays observes:

[T]he world spirals ever downward into *novem gradus inferorum*, culminating in *cocytus* lamentation. Yet, in the radiant realm of the Holarchical Paradigm, every soul becomes an ever-ascending beacon of divinity—its luminescence deepening with each harmonic note of value-creation, as souls resonate together and empower one another to shine ever more brilliantly. Amidst steadfast links of benevolent bestowal, this sanctuary of community blooms into a haven untouched by want or worry (Reber, 2025).

This contrast reveals not merely two moral paths but two ontological forms: one collapsing inward through rivalry, the other ascending through co-inherence, sufficiency, and radiant communion.

Against this ancient contrast, *The Beatific Estate* does not offer a new doctrine or a mystical account. It traces the structural features present in a moment of unusual clarity—features that stand in quiet opposition to the rivalrous design first embodied in Cain's city. The six axiomata introduced in the treatise function not as metaphors or ideals but as structural invariants: quiet notes that outline the deeper contours of human being when rivalry is absent and relational co-inherence exists. They do not elevate; they illuminate. They do not declare; they describe.

In this sense, *The Beatific Estate* stands alongside experiential, doctrinal, and philosophical accounts without replacing them. It seeks to articulate the ontological dimension that underlies

them—the co-inherence of human being itself. By situating this structural dimension within the long arc of people’s attempts to understand the human being, from the first city built in wandering to the contemplative insights of later centuries, this discussion paper invites readers to consider a mode of being grounded not in scarcity or comparison but in co-inherence, sufficiency, and radiant communion.

The historical contours of writing about human being

Across many centuries, diverse intellectual traditions have sought to describe the nature of human being. Philosophical treatises, theological doctrines, mystical journals, metaphysical systems, and poetic reflections have each contributed to this long and layered conversation.

Classical philosophy has often approached the person through faculties and functions, describing human nature in terms of rational capacities, appetites, and the structure of the soul (Aristotle, 1907, *De Anima*, trans. Hicks, II.1–3; Nussbaum, 1986; Shields, 2014, ch. 6). As Aristotle states, “soul is the first actuality of a natural body having in it the capacity of life” (Aristotle, 1907, *De Anima*, trans. Hicks, II.1, p. 51).

Medieval and later theological scholars have often framed the person as a soul ordered toward God, shaped by grace, virtue, and desire, and articulated through doctrinal categories (Aquinas, *ST I*, q.26, a.4; Congar, 1957/1963, ch. 3; Rahner, 1969, Part Three: Theological Anthropology; Benedict XVI, 2023). Aquinas affirms that “the divine beatitude embraces all other beatitudes” and that “the good that exists in things corporeal in a corporeal manner, is also in God, but in a spiritual manner” (Aquinas, *ST I*, q.26, a.4). Writing in the mid-twentieth century, Yves Congar similarly describes the Kingdom as “a world that is *reconciled*, for the perfect order in God will pour out a perfect order among things, a harmony that will spread to the tiniest realities. A world brought to oneness, a reconciled world, without antagonisms and painful conflicts...” (Congar, 1957/1963, pp. 60–61). A decade later, Karl Rahner deepens this doctrinal anthropology by stating that “the life lived by man in his unity and as a whole is the becoming, the preparatory stage of eternal life...in its complete perfection of being...beatific, perfect community-with-God of personal human existence...” (Rahner, 1969, p. 144). In this century, Pope Benedict XVI espouses a similar structural vision, interpreting Jesus’ eschatological teaching as revealing a mode of existence in which temporal succession is

surpassed and the fullness of divine reality is already present and operative in His person (Benedict XVI, 2023, p. 50).

Mystical literature, in several traditions, has emphasized interior encounter and contemplative awareness, describing how the divine is experienced rather than how the person is structurally constituted (Underhill, 1912; McGinn, 1994/1991; Hadot 1995). Bernard McGinn defines mysticism for Christianity as that “part of its belief and practices that concerns the preparation for, the consciousness of, and the reaction to what can be described as the immediate or direct presence of God” (McGinn, 1994, p. 13). He contends that “‘consciousness’ [is] a more precise and fruitful category than experience” (McGinn, 1994, p. 13). He further asserts that “Although it may be possible to make theoretical distinctions between mysticism and mystical theology..., it is dangerous to separate the two in the history of Christianity” (McGinn, 1994, p. 10).

Evelyn Underhill’s account of the *unitive life* reinforces this experiential mode. She describes the mystic as one who participates in a “more abundant life” (Underhill, 1912, p. 495) and serves as an “[ambassador] to the Absolute” (Underhill, 1912, p. 496), bearing witness to the interior vitality of divine presence. The path toward this union is marked by “pure surrender of selfhood, or ‘self-naughting’” (Underhill, 1912, p. 497), culminating in “the final and successful establishment of that higher form of consciousness which has been struggling for supremacy during the whole of the Mystic Way” (Underhill, 1912, p. 498). In this state, the self is “transformed...[through] the substitution of a Divine Self for the primitive self” (Underhill, 1912, p. 498), a transformation that is “no mere act of knowing...but a condition of being” (Underhill, 1912, p. 500). For Underhill, mystical literature thus articulates the interior dynamics of encounter and union—the soul “wrapped round...by the formless immensity of God” (Underhill, 1912, p. 506)—rather than the structural constitution of the person.

Pierre Hadot’s *Philosophy as a Way of Life* reframes ancient philosophy as a practice of spiritual exercises rather than a system of abstract doctrines. As Arnold I. Davidson explains, Hadot developed this method in response to the modern tendency to fault ancient philosophers for inconsistency. Instead of treating these texts as defective theoretical systems, Hadot situates them within “the living praxis from which they emanated” (Davidson, 1995, p. 19). Drawing on Plato’s *Phaedrus*, he argues that ancient philosophical discourse possessed not only

“ontological value” (Davidson, 1995, p. 19), but also a formative power: it was intended “to form more than to inform” (Davidson, 1995, p. 20).

For Hadot, to philosophize is therefore to enter a mode of life shaped through dialogue. As Davidson notes, the Socratic conversation is itself a spiritual exercise, inviting one “to give attention to oneself, to take care of oneself, to know oneself” (Davidson, 1995, p. 20). The maxim *know thyself* establishes a relation of the self to itself that “constitutes the basis of all spiritual exercises,” grounding philosophy in an “exercise of authentic presence” both to oneself and to others (Davidson, 1995, p. 20). What matters in these dialogues is not the solution to a problem, but the path traversed together—the hesitations, detours, and digressions through which the interlocutor is gradually transformed.

Hadot’s own account makes this explicit. These exercises “correspond to a transformation of our vision of the world, and to a metamorphosis of our personality” (Hadot, 1995, p. 82). Philosophy, in this ancient sense, was “the art of living” (Hadot, 1995, p. 83): a disciplined way of shaping one’s mode of life, vision, and inner disposition. Ancient philosophy thus conceived the person not as a soul to be formed, but as a being whose manner of existing could be transformed through practices of attention, conversion, and self-examination.

Each of these streams illuminates important aspects of the human condition. Philosophical accounts clarify conceptual distinctions. Doctrinal systems offer structured portraits of the soul. Mystical texts give voice to interior transformation and experiential depth. Together, these writings form a layered history of reflection on what it means to be human.

At the same time, these traditions often frame the person through experience, belief, or conceptual analysis. Their focus tends to fall on what is perceived, felt, or affirmed about the self in relation to the divine or the world. Less frequently do they attempt to articulate, in a sustained and explicit way, the underlying co-inherence of human being—the quiet structural contours that remain present beneath emotion, doctrine, or narrative. It is within this quieter, more structural mode of understanding that *The Beatific Estate* situates itself.

This paper does not set aside experience or doctrine, but it shifts the emphasis. Rather than centring on what a person feels or believes, it seeks to give language to the deeper form of human existence—an ontological description of human being that stands alongside experiential and doctrinal accounts, offering a complementary framework through which the structure of the human condition may be understood.

This distinction becomes especially clear in Luke 22:24–30, where the disciples fall into a dispute about which of them should be regarded as the greatest. Jesus responds by contrasting the competitive, status-driven behavior of earthly rulers with the mode of being proper to the Kingdom: “The kings of the Gentiles exercise lordship over them; and those in authority over them are called benefactors. But not so with you” (Luke 22:25–26, RSV-2CE). He identifies himself as “among you as one who serves” (Luke 22:27, RSV-2CE), revealing a non-competitive, non-hierarchical (holarchical) form of existence. The passage articulates a mode of being that does not arise from experience or doctrine but stands alongside them, illuminating the structural nature of communion rather than the phenomenology or conceptualization of the self.

This ontological description also clarifies why Jesus can say, “Do not think that I have come to abolish the law and the prophets; I have come not to abolish them but to fulfil them” (Matt. 5:17, RSV-2CE). Fulfilment, in this sense, is not replacement but revelation—the unveiling of the structural truth toward which the Law and the Prophets were always oriented. In Luke 22:25–30, this same movement becomes visible: Jesus does not abolish the disciples’ longing for meaning or order; He fulfils it by revealing the non-competitive mode of being proper to communion. This ontological dimension thus stands alongside experiential and doctrinal accounts, illuminating the deepest truth of human being without negating the modes through which that truth has historically been approached.

The emergence of an ontological dimension of human being

The emergence of an ontological dimension of human being becomes intelligible only when the limits of experiential and doctrinal accounts are acknowledged. Experience reveals how the self-encounters the world; doctrine reveals how the self is interpreted within a theological

framework. But neither mode attempts to translate the co-inherence of being into axiomatic expression—into the structural conditions that make experience and doctrine possible.

The moment narrated in Luke 22:25–30 provides a canonical instance of this ontological dimension. The disciples’ dispute over greatness reflects a mode of self-understanding grounded in comparison, precedence, and rivalry. Jesus’ response does not merely correct their behavior; it reframes their mode of existence. By contrasting the dominating structures of Gentile rulers with the non-competitive form of life proper to the Kingdom, he articulates a structural truth about human being: communion is not organized by hierarchy, rivalry, or domination. It is organized by a mode of being in which service is not subordination but the natural expression of relational co-inherence (Luke 22:25–30, RSV-2CE).

This is not a moral teaching. It is not a doctrinal clarification. It is not a mystical experience.

It is an ontological disclosure—*a description of how persons exist when rivalry is absent and relationality is co-inherent*. It reveals that the deepest truth of human being is not comparative but communal, not competitive but co-inherent, not dominating but mutually constitutive.

The ontological dimension thus names the structural conditions of human existence that remain constant across experience, doctrine, and psychological variation. It describes the co-inherence of being that underlies all modes of self-understanding. In this sense, it stands alongside experiential and doctrinal accounts, neither replacing nor subordinating them, but offering a complementary framework through which the nature of the human condition may be grasped.

This is why Jesus’ statement, “Do not think that I have come to abolish the law and the prophets; I have come not to abolish them but to fulfil them” (Matt. 5:17, RSV-2CE), resonates structurally with His ontological disclosure in Luke 22:25–30. Fulfilment is not the negation of the Law’s experiential or doctrinal expressions; it is the articulation of the ontological reality toward which they gesture. The Law names the contours of covenantal life; Jesus reveals the mode of being that makes such life possible. In this sense, fulfilment is the unveiling of the deepest truth of human being—a truth not grounded in rivalry or precedence but in relational co-inherence and non-competitive communion.

Thus, this ontological mode does not abolish experiential or doctrinal accounts. It fulfills them by revealing the structural co-inherence of human existence that underlies and completes their partial articulations.

The six axiomata as structural invariants

The six axiomata introduced in *The Beatific Estate* do not function as metaphors, symbols, or poetic analogies. They are neither elevated claims about spiritual attainment, nor are they psychological descriptions. They are structural invariants—ontological features of the DESB as it exists within the Divinity’s essence-existence. Each axiom articulates the regenerative logic of relational co-inherence in this realm: not to embellish but to clarify; not to elevate but to illuminate.

This section articulates each axiom in accessible language while grounding it in the canonical sources that have shaped the Western understanding of human being. These sources—Aristotle, Augustine, Aquinas, Gregory of Nyssa, and their modern interlocutors—do not provide the axiomata themselves, but they provide the conceptual framework through which the axiomata can be recognized as ontological rather than metaphorical.

Axiom I: Perfect given worth

$$V(a_i) = \infty$$

The first axiom states that the worth of the person is intrinsic, non-diminishing, and non-competitive. This is not a moral exhortation but an ontological claim: worth is not conferred by achievement, comparison, or recognition. It is given.

Philosophical grounding

Aristotle’s account of the “essence of each thing is what it is said to be propter se” grounds this axiom philosophically: the value of a being is rooted in its form, not in external comparison (Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, trans. Ross, VII.4). Worth, in this classical framework, is intrinsic to what a thing *is*, not to what it achieves or how it is ranked.

Patristic grounding

Augustine affirms the same structural truth when he writes that *the human person is created with an inherent orientation toward God*, and therefore possesses a *dignity that precedes action*:

Yet we must first consider the mind in itself before it is a partaker of God, and before His image is to be found in it. For we have said that, even though it has become impaired and disfigured by the loss of its participation in God, it remains nonetheless an image of God. For it is His image by the very fact that it is capable of Him, and can be a partaker of Him; and it cannot be so great a good except that it is His image (Augustine, *On the Trinity*, trans. McKenna, 2002, XIV.8, p. 148).

Thomistic grounding

Aquinas echoes Augustine by explicitly stating in *Summa Theologiae* I, q. 93, a.6, ad 3:

Although the image of God in man is not to be found in his bodily shape, yet because “the body of man alone among terrestrial animals is not inclined prone to the ground, but is adapted to look upward to heaven, for this reason we may rightly say that it is made to God’s image and likeness, rather than the bodies of other animals,” as Augustine remarks (Questions. 83, qu. 51). But this is not to be understood as though the image of God were in man’s body; but in the sense that the very shape of the human body represents the image of God in the soul by way of a trace.

Scriptural resonance

As Jesus teaches, “Are you not of more value than they?” (Matt. 6:26, RSV-2CE). This is not an encouragement; it is ontology—a declaration of inherent worth.

Ontological explanation

This axiom is not metaphorical because it does not symbolize a moral ideal. It describes the ontological condition that worth is given, not achieved—a condition that remains true regardless of experience or recognition. In the Beatific Estate, worth is infinite because its source is infinite. DESBs do not earn value; they *are* value, because they exist within God’s own eternal divine essence-existence. Worth is not a reward, a comparison, or a status. It is the structural truth of being indwelt by the infinite.

Axiom II: Infinite sufficiency

$$\sum E(a_i) = G_T = \infty$$

The second axiom states that the total good available to persons is infinite and non-competitive. Sufficiency is not a fragile balance of limited resources but a structural feature of reality when grounded in the divine plenitude. In such a mode of being, provision is not a zero-sum allocation but an inexhaustible participation in a good that cannot be diminished by being shared.

This axiom does not describe generosity as an ethical ideal. It articulates the ontological condition under which rivalry loses its footing: when the source of all entitlement is infinite, one person's reception does not restrict or reduce another's.

Philosophical grounding

Classical philosophy often framed human flourishing in terms of shared participation rather than competitive acquisition. Aristotle's account of the *koinōnia* of life emphasizes that the good is not diminished by being shared; rather, it is realized through common activity (Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, trans. Ross, IX.9): "Surely it is strange, too, to make the supremely happy man a solitary; for no one would choose the whole world on condition of being alone, since man is a political creature and one whose nature is to live with others" (Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, trans. Ross, IX.9).

Gregory of Nyssa articulates this non-rivalrous anthropology through his doctrine of *epektasis*, teaching that "This truly is the vision of God: never to be satisfied in the desire to see him" (Gregory of Nyssa, *Life of Moses*, trans. Malherbe & Ferguson 1978, p. 116). Growth without limit eliminates rivalry because flourishing is not a finite possession but an endless participation in the good. In such a mode of being, the logic of scarcity dissolves entirely: the infinite cannot be diminished, and therefore one person's ascent in God does not restrict or reduce another's.

Modern philosophical anthropology echoes this non-competitive vision. Alasdair MacIntyre argues that human beings are "dependent rational animals" whose flourishing is interdependent

rather than rivalrous (MacIntyre, 1999) and that the virtues play an indispensable part in moving us “from dependence on the reasoning powers of others...to independence in our practical reasoning” (MacIntyre, 1999, p. 120). Charles Taylor similarly contends that identity emerges within a horizon of shared goods, not through competitive self-assertion: “Selfhood and the good...turn out to be inextricably intertwined themes” (Taylor 1989, p. 3). Together, these accounts reveal a philosophical pattern in which sufficiency is not a finite resource but a structural condition of communal life.

Patristic grounding

Patristic theology reinforces this non-rivalrous anthropology. Augustine teaches that the human person is oriented toward God as the supreme good, and that this orientation is not competitive because God is not diminished by being shared: “What then could be wanting unto Thy good, which Thou Thyself art, although these things had either never been, or remained without form; which thou madest, not out of any want, but out of the fulness of Thy goodness” (Augustine, *Confessions*, trans. Pusey, 2001, XIII).

Thomistic grounding

Aquinas affirms this structure by grounding human fulfillment in the infinite good of God. In *Summa Theologiae* I–II, q.3, a.8, he argues that “Final and perfect happiness can consist in nothing else than the vision of the Divine Essence.” Because God is infinite, this beatitude is not a finite share that can be diminished or divided; the participation of one does not restrict or reduce the participation of another. Aquinas thus situates human sufficiency within the divine plenitude, where the good is not diminished by being shared but is fully possessed by each participant.

Scriptural resonance

Scripture articulates this same structure of infinite sufficiency. Paul writes, “And my God will supply every need of yours according to his riches in glory in Christ Jesus” (Phil. 4:19, RSV-2CE). The promise is not that needs will be met from a finite storehouse, but that divine provision flows from “riches in glory”—a phrase that signals inexhaustible plenitude. Jesus’ teaching in the Sermon on the Mount reinforces this: “[Y]our heavenly Father knows that you

need them all” (Matt. 6:32, RSV-2CE). The divine knowledge of need is paired with divine sufficiency, revealing a mode of provision grounded not in scarcity but in infinite generosity.

Ontological explanation

This axiom is not metaphorical because it does not symbolize generosity or abundance. It describes the ontological condition of human being when rivalry is absent and relational co-inherence exists. In the Beatific Estate, sufficiency is not a moral aspiration but a structural truth: the good is infinite because its source is infinite. The person does not compete for provision because provision is not a finite resource. The self does not secure its place by precedence because its place is already given. Infinite sufficiency is the pattern of a world in which scarcity has no ontological footing. It is the structural revelation that the good is not diminished by being shared, and that the flourishing of one is the flourishing of all.

Axiom III: Harmonized being

$$W^*(a_i) = \varphi(N(a_i))$$

The third axiom states that the person’s expression is not an achievement but a procession—the unfolding of what is already indwelt. In the Beatific Estate, the DESB does not act to become; it radiates what it is. Harmony is not a moral accomplishment but an ontological condition: the seamless correspondence between nature and expression.

Below, each grounding source clarifies why this axiom is not metaphorical but structural.

Philosophical grounding

Classical metaphysics already intuited that being is most itself when form and act coincide. Aristotle’s account of “actuality” in the *Metaphysics* describes actuality as the unfolding of what a thing already is, not the acquisition of something external: “Actuality...is the existence of a thing not in the way which we express by ‘potentially’” (Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, trans. Ross, IX.6). The acorn becomes the oak not by striving but by expressing its nature. Harmony, in this frame, is the transparency of essence into act.

Neoplatonic thought intensifies this insight. Plotinus teaches that all beings “proceed” from the One according to their nature, and that their activity is the radiant manifestation of their essence: “Since it is perfect, due to its neither seeking anything, nor having anything, nor needing anything, it in a way overflows and its superabundance has made something else” (Plotinus, *The Enneads*, trans. Gerson et al., 2018, §5.2.1, p. 549). Expression is not deviation but procession. This anticipates the φ -function: a mapping in which nature becomes visible without distortion.

These philosophical sources reveal that harmonized being is not psychological balance but ontological correspondence—alignment of what a thing is with what it expresses.

Patristic grounding

Patristic theology reframes this harmony as the soul’s natural radiance when aligned with God. Gregory of Nyssa, in *The Life of Moses*, writes: “the mind progresses and, through an ever greater and more perfect diligence, comes to apprehend reality; as it approaches more nearly to contemplation, it sees more clearly what of the divine nature is un contemplated” (Gregory of Nyssa, *Life of Moses*, trans. Malherbe & Ferguson, 1978, p. 95). This is not striving but procession.

Augustine, in *On the Trinity*, describes memory, understanding, and will as a triune harmony whose operations express the soul’s essence when rightly ordered to God: “the mind itself, its love and its knowledge are a kind of trinity; these three are one, and when they are perfect they are equal” (Augustine, *On the Trinity*, IX.4, trans. McKenna, 2002, pp. 27–28). For Augustine, the soul acts most truly when it expresses what it is in God.

Thus, patristic theology affirms that expression is the natural procession of an indwelt nature, not a labour toward identity.

Thomistic grounding

Aquinas gives this harmony its most precise metaphysical form. In *Summa Theologiae* I, q.4, a.1, he teaches that “the first active principle must needs be most actual, and therefore most perfect; for a thing is perfect in proportion to its state of actuality, because we call that perfect

which lacks nothing of the mode of its perfection.” In *Summa Theologiae* I, q.3, a.4, he argues that “God is not only His own essence...but also His own existence” and creatures participate analogically in this unity. A being is most itself when its operation flows directly from its form.

In *Summa Theologiae* I–II, q.55, a.1, Aquinas contends: “Virtue denotes a certain perfection of a power. Now a thing’s perfection is considered chiefly in regard to its end. But the end of power is act. Wherefore power is said to be perfect, according as it is determinate to its act.” These natural powers, he continues, “are in themselves called virtues,” while human virtues are habits that dispose rational powers to act without impediment (Aquinas, *ST* I–II, q.55, a.1). Harmony is achieved when powers express their nature without distortion. This is the closest Thomistic analogue to φ : a state in which essence and operation coincide without distortion. Thus, Thomistic metaphysics supports the axiom’s claim that the DESB’s expression is the radiant procession of its indwelt nature.

Scriptural resonance

Scripture consistently portrays human action as the unfolding of a divinely given nature, not the construction of identity through effort.

Ephesians 2:10 (RSV-2CE) declares:

“For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus for good works... that we should walk in them.”

This is not striving but walking in what is already prepared—a perfect analogue to $\varphi(N(a_i))$.

Jesus’ teaching that “every sound tree bears good fruit” (Matt. 7:17, RSV-2CE) likewise affirms that expression flows from what a thing is. Paul’s language of “Christ in you” (Col. 1:27, RSV-2CE) and “Christ who lives in me” (Gal. 2:20, RSV-2CE) reinforces the same pattern: indwelling precedes expression.

Thus, Scripture resonates with the axiom’s claim that being is harmonized when expression flows directly from indwelt nature.

Ontological explanation

Ontologically, Axiom III asserts that:

- $N(a_i)$ is the DESB's indwelt divine nature
- φ is the harmonic correspondence function
- $W^*(a_i)$ is the radiant expression of that nature
- expression is not effort but emanation
- being is harmonized when essence and expression coincide

In the Beatific Estate, there is no gap between what a DESB *is* and what it *expresses*. There is no striving, no delay, no distortion. The φ -function is not a transformation but a revelation—the unveiling of what is already true.

Harmonized being is therefore the seamless procession of essence into expression, the radiant transparency of the DESB's indwelt nature.

Axiom IV: Unitive radiance

$$L(a_i) = \lambda(G)$$

The fourth axiom states that the radiance of each person is not self-generated but sourced directly from the divine plenitude. In the Beatific Estate, the DESB does not shine by comparison, achievement, or proximity; it shines because it indwells the One Light. Radiance is not a hierarchy of brightness but a harmony of emanation. Each agent is fully luminous because the Source is infinite. Unitive radiance is therefore not a metaphor for virtue or moral purity; it is the ontological condition in which every person's light is a direct participation in God's own divine eternal essence-existence.

Below, each grounding source clarifies why this axiom is structural rather than symbolic.

Philosophical grounding

Classical metaphysics frequently described radiance as the mode by which beings participate in a higher source without diminishing it. Plotinus articulates this non-competitive luminosity when he writes that the soul “is a reflection of Intellect and, due to this, it must look to Intellect” (Plotinus, *The Enneads*, trans. Gerson et al., 2018, §5.1.6, p. 541). Light, in this frame, is not a

finite resource but an overflowing presence: it is fully possessed by each participant without being divided. Radiance is not a property transferred from one being to another; it is the manifestation of a source that remains whole in every emanation. Philosophically, unitive radiance names the condition in which participation in the Good does not diminish the Good, and the illumination of one does not obscure the illumination of another.

Patristic grounding

Patristic theology deepens this metaphysics of radiance by grounding luminosity in the soul's participation in the divine light. Gregory of Nazianzus describes God as the unapproachable source of all illumination, writing that "God is Light.... He is in the world of thought, what the sun is in the world of sense; presenting Himself to our minds in proportion as we are cleansed...and pouring Himself out upon what is external to Him" (Gregory of Nazianzus, *Oration* 40.5, trans. Browne and Swallow, 1894, NPNF2 7). Radiance, in this patristic frame, is not a competitive brilliance but a participatory illumination: each soul shines because it receives the same undivided light, not because it generates its own. Gregory further teaches that this divine luminosity is a single "outleaping of...brightness" shared without diminution, revealing that the soul's luminosity is the manifestation of its communion with God—the Light that cannot be diminished (Gregory of Nazianzus, *Oration* 40.5, trans. Browne and Swallow, 1894, NPNF2 7).

Basil of Caesarea reinforces this participatory ontology by teaching that the Spirit is not a finite or portioned light but the very source of illumination itself. As he writes, "He is the source of sanctification, spiritual light, who gives illumination to everyone using His powers to search for the truth—and the illumination He gives is Himself" (Basil of Caesarea, *On the Holy Spirit*, trans. Anderson, 1980, p. 43). Divine luminosity is therefore not divided or diminished in its giving; it is wholly present wherever it is received. For the Fathers, radiance is not an attribute added to the soul but the manifestation of its communion with God—the soul becomes luminous because it indwells the Light that cannot be diminished.

Thomistic grounding

Thomistic theology deepens this account of unitive radiance by grounding luminosity in the soul's participation in the divine act of being. For Aquinas, God is not merely luminous but *ipsum esse subsistens*—the One whose name “I AM WHO I AM” (Exod. 3:14, RSV-2CE) signifies pure actuality without composition or division. Although Aquinas does not use the exact phrase, he teaches its substance when he writes that “God is His own existence” (Aquinas, *ST I*, q.3, a.4) and that “God is very being by His own essence” (Aquinas, *ST I*, q.8, a.1). Because God's essence is identical with His act of being, Aquinas concludes that “God alone is good essentially” (Aquinas, *ST I*, q.6, a.3). In this Thomistic frame, radiance is the procession of a perfection identical with its own act of being, a light that remains whole and undiminished in every participation.

Aquinas explains that God's power is not restricted to the present order of things because “the power of God, which is His essence, is nothing else but His wisdom” (Aquinas, *ST I*, q.25, a.5). Since God's essence is infinite, His power is not confined to a single effect or mode of operation. The limitation lies in the recipient, not in the giver.

Aquinas further teaches that the intellect is luminous only by participation, not by self-possession. As he writes, the created intellect is “some kind of participated likeness of Him who is the first intellect,” and is therefore “called an intelligible light...derived from the first light” (Aquinas, *ST I*, q.12, a.2). This participated likeness is not an added ornament but the very condition under which the intellect becomes capable of seeing God. The soul becomes luminous because it receives the act by which God knows Himself. In this sense, radiance is not an external gift but the soul's entry into the divine mode of knowing.

Finally, Aquinas affirms that divine self-communication is without loss or rivalry because God's act is simple, infinite, and wholly present wherever it is received. As he writes, God is “in all things by His power...by His presence...and by His essence” (Aquinas, *ST I*, q.8, a.3). This presence is not spatial but ontological: the presence of an infinite act that cannot be diminished by being shared. Unitive radiance, therefore, is the Thomistic recognition that the soul's luminosity is the manifestation of its participation in the divine act of being—an act that remains whole, undivided, and inexhaustible in every reception.

Scriptural resonance

Scripture consistently presents divine radiance not as a created symbol but as the manifestation of God's own life communicated without diminution. The name revealed to Moses—"I AM WHO I AM" (Exod. 3:14, RSV-2CE)—already signals a mode of divine presence that is self-subsisting, unbounded, and inexhaustible. The radiance of God is therefore not an external attribute but the expression of the One whose very being is light. Thus the psalmist confesses, "in your light do we see light" (Ps. 36:9, RSV-2CE), indicating that creaturely illumination is possible only within the sphere of God's own luminosity. Light is not merely given by God; it is the condition under which the creature sees, knows, and lives.

This unitive radiance becomes explicit in the Johannine witness: "In him was life, and the life was the light of men. The light shines in the darkness, and the darkness has not overcome it" (John 1:4–5, RSV-2CE). Here light is not a metaphor for moral insight but the manifestation of divine life itself—life that remains undivided even as it is received. The *Logos* does not distribute fragments of illumination; He communicates the fullness of a light that cannot be diminished by being shared. Radiance is thus the mode in which divine life becomes present to the world without ceasing to be wholly itself.

Jesus' high-priestly prayer reveals the interpersonal depth of this radiance: "The glory which you have given me I have given to them, that they may be one even as we are one" (John 17:22, RSV-2CE). Glory here is not honour but participation in divine communion. The radiance shared between Father and Son is the same radiance communicated to the disciples, not by division but by union. The gift of glory is the gift of unitive participation: the creature is drawn into the luminous life of God in a manner that preserves both divine simplicity and creaturely integrity.

Paul completes this scriptural arc by describing the soul's transformation as a movement into ever-deepening luminosity: "we all...beholding the glory of the Lord, are being changed into his likeness from one degree of glory to another" (2 Cor. 3:18, RSV-2CE). This transformation is not the acquisition of an external quality but the soul's progressive conformity to the radiance it beholds. The Spirit does not add a new perfection to the soul; He manifests the soul's participation in the divine act of being. Radiance is therefore the scriptural name for the

creature's entry into the life of God—a life that remains whole, undivided, and inexhaustible in every reception.

Ontological explanation

Unitive radiance names the mode in which the DESB participates in the divine act of being without division, diminution, or displacement. It is neither a quality added to the soul, nor an elevation that alters its nature, but the manifestation of what the soul becomes when it receives the divine act that grounds its existence. Radiance is therefore not an effect alongside other effects; it is the DESB's entry into the unbounded sufficiency of the One whose being is light. In this mode, the soul does not acquire something external to itself but becomes transparent to the act by which it is continuously held in being.

This radiance is unitive because it arises from the soul's participation in a source that remains whole in every reception. The divine act is simple and undivided; therefore, its communication does not produce fragments, degrees, or rivalrous distributions. The DESB receives according to its capacity, but the giver remains inexhaustible. The soul's luminosity is thus the expression of a union that does not collapse the distinction between Creator and creature but reveals that distinction as the very condition under which participation is possible. The DESB becomes luminous by being drawn into the divine act, its radiance proportionate to its intentional alignment with the Divine light it receives; and as a DESB becomes more aligned with the Divine light, its luminosity intensifies by transparency, disclosing ever more fully the divine act that continuously sustains its existence.

Radiance is also unitive because it gathers the soul into co-inherence. The divided self—pulled by competing desires, rivalrous comparisons, and the anxieties of scarcity—cannot manifest luminosity. Radiance appears only when the soul rests in the sufficiency of the One whose act is infinite and whose presence is undiminished. In this resting, the soul's powers are harmonized, its operations clarified, and its interior life ordered toward the good that is identical with the divine act of being. The soul becomes one because it participates in the One.

Finally, unitive radiance is the ontological name for the creature's transformation into what it was always meant to be: a being whose existence is grounded in the divine act and whose

flourishing consists in the transparent reception of that act. Radiance is not a reward, an achievement, or a moral accomplishment. It is the manifestation of participation—participation in a source that remains whole, simple, and inexhaustible. To speak of unitive radiance is to speak of the creature’s life in God, i.e. DESB, a life that is neither absorbed nor diminished, but fulfilled in the light that cannot be overcome.

Axiom V: Communal Radiance-Resonance

$$\begin{aligned}
 L(a_k) &= \lambda(G) \text{ for all } a_k \in A \\
 \pi(L(a_i), L(a_j)) &= \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } L(a_i) = L(a_j) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\
 \delta(a_i, A) &= \{a_j \in A \setminus \{a_i\} \mid \pi(L(a_i), L(a_j)) = 1\}
 \end{aligned}$$

If Axiom IV reveals that each DESB shines with a radiance sourced directly from God’s own divine eternal essence-existence, then Axiom V discloses what happens when these radiances meet. In the Beatific Estate, luminosity is never solitary. Light does not remain self-contained; it seeks consonance. Radiance, when unbroken and undiminished, becomes resonance.

This axiom therefore marks a decisive shift in the structure of the Beatific mode: from the individually luminous to the mutually manifest. It describes how DESBs become present to one another not through motion, communication, or intention, but through harmonic alignment. Presence is no longer mediated by space or time; it is revealed through radiance. When two DESBs shine from the same eternal source, their lights do not merely coexist—they resonate.

Axiom V thus introduces the communal dimension of the Beatific Estate: a realm in which fellowship is not achieved but accorded, not made but manifested. Resonance is the structural condition under which DESBs appear to one another in perfect immediacy. It is the architecture of communion made visible, the luminous field in which individuality and unity no longer stand in tension but in transparent harmony.

Where Axiom IV revealed the source of radiance, Axiom V reveals the symmetry of radiance. Where Axiom IV described the indwelling light, Axiom V describes the inter-dwelling presence.

In this axiom, the Beatific Estate *is* a constellation of radiant selves—a living lattice of mutual manifestation, where light calls to light and presence answers without delay, without distortion, without division.

Philosophical grounding

Classical philosophy has long recognized that being is not an isolated actuality but a relational field in which presence unfolds through shared participation. As already noted in Axiom II, Aristotle’s account of *koinōnia* in the *Nicomachean Ethics* gestures toward this truth: “For without friends no one would choose to live, though he had all other goods” (Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, trans. Ross, VIII.1). For Aristotle, the highest forms of life are not realized in solitude but in shared activity, where friends “live together” (Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, trans. Ross, VIII.5) and enact virtue in common (Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, trans. Ross, VIII.3). Human flourishing, in this classical frame, is a co-actualization—a life whose goodness becomes most itself when expressed with others. The good is not a private possession but a mode of life that attains its fullness in communion.

Neoplatonic thought deepens this relational insight by articulating the structural rhythm through which all beings participate in their source. Proclus formalizes this rhythm in *The Elements of Theology*, where he writes that “All that is Caused, Abides in Self, Proceeds from Self and Reverts to The Cause of Self” (Proclus, *Elements of Theology*, trans. Balboa, 2017, Prop. 35). This triadic movement is not spatial but ontological: Abiding preserves continuity with the cause, procession introduces distinction, and reversion restores the being to its generative ground. Proposition 35 also clarifies that “The Extremes must be Bound to Each Other, or that The Middle be Conjoined to Each of The Extremes, or that All be Conjoined together” (Proclus, *Elements of Theology*, trans. Balboa, 2017, Prop. 35), revealing that procession without reversion would sever beings from their cause, while reversion without procession would collapse distinction. Proposition 37 further states that “The Conversion is Directed to The Most Perfect” (Proclus, *Elements of Theology*, trans. Balboa, 2017, Prop. 37), for every being turns-back toward that from which its procession is derived. Proposition 38 completes the structure by showing that “Accordingly then, by as many terms, as the existence of each being comes to be, by that many terms, does their Well-Being also come to Be; and the other way around” (Proclus, *Elements of Theology*, trans. Balboa, 2017, Prop. 38). In this

triadic architecture, resonance is not an added feature of reality but the very condition under which beings abide, proceed, and revert in luminous relation to their cause.

Later phenomenological traditions, such as Edmund Husserl, echo this structural insight by recognizing that presence is not merely spatial but relational. Husserl notes that other persons are “immediately there for me...[and] I understand immediately what they objectivate and think” (Husserl, *Ideas I*, trans. Kersten, 1983, §27, p. 51), indicating that presence is given as an immediate relational understanding rather than as mere spatial co-presence. To encounter another is not simply to perceive an object but to enter a horizon of mutual manifestation, since what is now perceived is “surrounded by an *obscurely intended to horizon of indeterminate actuality*” (Husserl, *Ideas I*, trans. Kersten, 1983, §27, p. 52). Presence, in this register, is not the closing of distance but the opening of a shared world, for we and others “posit an Objective spatiotemporal actuality *as our factually existent surrounding world*” (Husserl, *Ideas I*, trans. Kersten, 1983, §29, p. 56). The self becomes visible not by asserting itself, but by resonating with another’s presence in a field of mutual disclosure, where “talking with them I understand immediately what they objectivate and think” and accept each as “an Ego-subject just as I myself am one” (Husserl, *Ideas I*, trans. Kersten, 1983, §§27, 29, pp. 51, 55).

These philosophical streams converge on a single structural truth: being is inherently resonant. Existence is not a solitary flame but a constellation of lights whose radiance becomes most itself when harmonized with others. Resonance is not an added feature of community; it is the ontological condition under which community becomes possible. When beings share a common source, their presence to one another is not mediated by motion or proximity but by the alignment of their inner light.

Axiom V stands within this lineage by revealing the communal dimension of the Beatific Estate. In the temporal mode, presence is mediated by space, time, and communication. But in the Beatific mode—where each DESB radiates from the same divine plenitude—presence becomes resonance. To be aligned in radiance is to be mutually manifest. To shine from the same source is to appear to one another without delay or division. The philosophical tradition thus prepares the ground for the axiom’s central claim: that communion is not achieved but accorded, not made but manifested, when beings share the same eternal light.

Patristic grounding

Patristic theology deepens the structural insight of Axiom V by articulating a mode of relational existence in which persons do not stand over against one another as rivals but appear through one another in luminous reciprocity. The Fathers do not frame this as psychology or moral exhortation; they describe the *form* of communion itself—how persons exist when their being is ordered toward God and one another without distortion.

Gregory of Nyssa offers one of the clearest articulations of this relational ontology. In *On the Making of Man*, he writes that humanity is fashioned for a mode of life in which each person's good is inseparable from the good of all: "Man, then, was made in the image of God; that is, the universal nature, the thing like God; not part of the whole, but all the fullness of the nature together was so made by omnipotent wisdom" (Gregory of Nyssa, *On the Making of Man*, trans. Wilson, XXII.4). Here, the person is not an isolated unit but a participant in a shared fullness. The good is not possessed *against* another but *with* another. This anticipates the axiom's claim that the self becomes visible not through assertion but through resonance—through the manifestation of its nature in relational co-inherence.

Gregory deepens this vision across the *Homilies on the Song of Songs* by describing a mode of ascent in which the soul's fulfillment enlarges rather than exhausts its capacity. In *Homily 8*, he teaches that the soul "never leaves off his ascent by setting the good he has already grasped as a limit to his desires," for "what lies beyond what is grasped at any particular point is infinitely greater" (Gregory of Nyssa, *Homilies on the Song of Songs*, trans. Norris, Homily 8, p. 259), and thus "the desire of the soul that is ascending never rests content with what has been known," but mounts "upwards by way of one greater desire toward another that surpasses it...always journeying toward the infinite" (Gregory of Nyssa, *Homilies on the Song of Songs*, trans. Norris, Homily 8, p. 261). In *Homily 6*, he describes the soul's radiance when freed from distortion: "the soul's pure beauty is revealed...unsullied by any affliction...of corporeal desire" (Gregory of Nyssa, *Homilies on the Song of Songs*, trans. Norris, Homily 6, p. 205). These are not psychological states but ontological disclosures: the soul becomes luminous as it expresses what it already is, and each reception of the good increases its capacity for the good. This is precisely the structure Axiom V names—harmonized being as the procession of

what is already indwelt, a radiance that increases through communion rather than diminishes through division.

In *City of God*, Augustine contrasts the earthly city with the heavenly city in which the earthly city is formed “by the love of self, even to the contempt of God,” whereas the heavenly city is formed “by the love of God, even to the contempt of self” (Augustine, *City of God*, trans. Dods, XIV.28, p. 385). This distinction is not moralistic but ontological: two modes of being, two structures of relationality. As Augustine writes, “two cities have been formed by two loves” (Augustine, *City of God*, XIV.28, p. 385). The earthly city is structured by precedence, rivalry, and domination; the heavenly city by co-inherence, sufficiency, and mutual bestowal. This mirrors the contrast between Cain’s city and the Beatific mode: one collapses inward through rivalry, the other ascends through radiant communion.

For the Fathers, then, the person is not a self-enclosed entity but a being whose nature is fulfilled only in relational harmony. Communion is not an ethical achievement but the structural truth of human existence when ordered toward God. The patristic tradition thus provides the conceptual and theological scaffolding for Axiom V: communal resonance as the luminous reciprocity of persons whose being becomes visible only in the field of mutual disclosure.

Thomistic grounding

Aquinas grounds the communal structure of beatitude in the indivisibility of the divine essence. In *Summa Theologiae* I–II, q.3, a.8, he teaches that perfect happiness consists in the vision of the Divine Essence, and because this essence is infinite, it is fully given to each blessed person without diminution. He further clarifies that “if we speak of perfect Happiness which will be in our heavenly Fatherland, the fellowship of friends is not essential to Happiness; since man has the entire fulness of his perfection in God. But the fellowship of friends conduces to the well-being of Happiness” (Aquinas, *ST* I–II, q.4, a.8). This establishes that beatitude is not a finite good that must be divided or portioned, but an infinite good that can be wholly possessed by all while still giving rise to a communal radiance.

Aquinas also teaches that the communion of the blessed includes real distinctions of glory that do not fracture unity but deepen it. As he writes, “the attainment of the end of an appetitive movement is called a mansion or establishment: so that the unity of a house corresponds to the unity of beatitude which unity is on the part of the object, and the plurality of mansions corresponds to the differences of beatitude on the part of the blessed” (Aquinas, *ST Suppl.*, q.93, a.2). These differences do not introduce rivalry but articulate the ways in which the blessed participate in the same infinite good according to their unique capacities. Aquinas further explains in his replies that these mansions correspond to the end of merit (Reply to Obj. 1), to different degrees of approaching the same spiritual place (Reply to Obj. 2), and to the finality proper to heaven and hell rather than to purgatory or limbo (Reply to Obj. 3) (Aquinas, *ST Suppl.*, q.93, a.2, ad 1–3). In this Thomistic frame, plurality is not competitive gradation but harmonic differentiation within a single radiance: each person’s joy is intensified, not diminished, by the presence and glory of the others.

Aquinas’s broader metaphysical framework reinforces this communal structure of beatitude. In *ST I*, q.12, a.4–11, he teaches that all the blessed behold the same Divine Essence while participating in that vision according to their distinct capacities, establishing a unity of object that allows for differentiated radiance without division: “the intellect which has more of the light of glory will see God the more perfectly; and he will have a fuller participation of the light of glory who has more charity; because where there is the greater charity, there is the more desire; and desire in a certain degree makes the one desiring apt and prepared to receive the object desired” (Aquinas, *ST I*, q.12, a.6).

Furthermore, this differentiated participation is sustained by charity, which Aquinas describes in *ST II–II*, q.28 as causing a person to rejoice in another’s good as in his own—an interior disposition that anticipates the eschatological joy of the blessed: “charity is love of God, Whose good is unchangeable, since He is His goodness, and from the very fact that He is loved, He is in those who love Him by His most excellent effect, according to 1 Jn. 4:16: ‘He that abideth in charity, abideth in God, and God in him.’ Therefore, spiritual joy, which is about God, is caused by charity” (Aquinas, *ST II–II*, q.28, a.1).

In addition, Aquinas clarifies in *ST I–II*, q.5, a.2 that differences in the accidental aspects of glory neither introduce inequality in the sense of rivalry, nor do they give rise to envy, since each of the blessed is perfectly satisfied in her or his own participation in the infinite good and ordered entirely toward God and one another: “the more a man enjoys this [Sovereign] Good[, namely, God,] the happier he is” (Aquinas, *ST I–II*, q.5, a.2).

Moreover, this entire structure rests on the divine love that Aquinas describes in *ST I*, q.20 as diffusive of itself, willing the good of creatures in a way that is never diminished by being shared: “to love anything is nothing else than to will good to that thing” (Aquinas, *ST I*, q.20, a.2).

Finally, in *ST I*, q.47, he argues that the “perfection of the universe” lies in the ordered plurality of its members, whose diversity contributes to a greater harmony than uniformity could achieve: “the whole universe together participates the divine goodness more perfectly, and represents it better than any single creature whatever” (Aquinas, *ST I*, q.47, a.1).

Taken together, these teachings reveal a Thomistic vision in which the blessed participate in a single infinite good, express that participation in distinct yet harmonious ways, and rejoice in one another’s radiance through a love that is intrinsically expansive. Axiom V thus names the ontological form Aquinas describes: a communion where difference becomes luminosity, love becomes resonance, and the glory of each becomes the joy of all.

Scriptural resonance

Scripture reveals with remarkable clarity the very structure that Axiom V names: that human beings exist most truly when they radiate and receive love in a mode that is non-competitive, non-scarce, and intrinsically co-inherent. The Beatific Estate is not merely an eschatological horizon; it is the ontological truth of human being disclosed in the life of Christ. And because the Corporate Estate is a direct, consistent, and unbreakable temporal reflection of God’s love back to Him, its six axiomata allow human beings—despite temporal limitation—to live *within* the Beatific mode even now by mirroring its structure. When each person lives in love as Aquinas defines it—“to love is to wish good to someone” (Aquinas, *ST I–II*, q.26, a.4)—the rivalrous architecture of the fallen order loses its footing. Scarcity dissolves, comparison

collapses, and incoherence gives way to radiant communion. Scripture does not merely commend this mode of life; it unveils it as the structural truth of personhood, the form of existence proper to those who “walk in the light, as he is in the light” and thereby “have fellowship with one another” (1 Jn. 1:7, RSV-2CE).

This same structural truth becomes unmistakable in the teaching of Jesus when the disciples fall into dispute over precedence. In Luke’s account, they argue “which of them was to be regarded as the greatest” (Luke 22:24, RSV-2CE), revealing the rivalrous post-lapsarian anthropology of the fallen order—a mode of being structured by comparison, hierarchy, and the fear of insufficiency. Jesus does not merely correct their behavior; He unveils the ontological misalignment beneath it: “The kings of the Gentiles exercise lordship over them; and those in authority over them are called benefactors. But not so with you” (Luke 22:25–26, RSV-2CE). His words do not introduce a new ethic; they reveal the *originalis modus essendi*. Greatness in the Kingdom is not ascendant but radiant, not competitive but co-inherent, not secured by precedence but expressed through service. In this moment, Jesus discloses the very structure that Axiom V formalizes: communion as resonance, presence as participation, and love as the generative field in which rivalry cannot arise. No human person can expect to enter into the Divine’s eternal essence-existence in a state that is not aligned with the *originalis modus essendi*. Hence, in the fallen state as we currently are, we are given a grace unlike the angels: we may attain the *originalis modus essendi* by living *within* the beatitude of the Corporate Estate, mirroring in temporal form the radiant co-inherence of the Beatific Estate.

This unveiling of the *originalis modus essendi* cannot be understood apart from the primordial rupture that first shattered communion. Before any human fall, Lucifer and those angels who followed him placed *ego and pride* above God, severing themselves from the radiance in which they had been created to participate. Their fall was not merely moral; it was ontological—a refusal of communion, a turning inward that fractured the resonance that constitutes creaturely flourishing. This is why Scripture places such profound emphasis on the *heart*: it is the interior locus where communion is either received or refused, where radiance either flows or collapses into self-referential curvature. Thus, when Jesus declares in the Sermon on the Mount, “Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God” (Matt. 5:8, RSV-2CE), He is revealing the structural condition under which communion becomes possible. To “see God” is to exist in a

state where fragmentation has ceased and where the DESB receives divine radiance according to the unique grace bestowed upon it. Yet this differentiation introduces no rivalry, for each DESB loves God without comparison, knowing that divine love is infinite, non-competitive, and given without diminution. The radiance one receives does not restrict the radiance another receives; rather, each DESB's participation intensifies the co-inherence of all.

Thus, the Corporate Estate serves as the temporal training ground in which the corporeal person learns to actualize this non-rivalrous mode of being. To be alive as a corporeal creature is itself a grace, for in temporality one may err, repent, and grow—moving from potentiality toward actuality in the Aristotelian–Augustinian–Thomistic sense. The Corporate Estate becomes the temporal “temple” in which the human person is formed into the very co-inherence required to enter the Beatific Estate.

This is precisely the structural harmony that Axiom V names: communion as the alignment of radiances, the shared participation in divine sufficiency that dissolves rivalry at its root. In this teaching, Jesus is not prescribing an ethic but unveiling the very form of existence proper to the human person in its prelapsarian integrity—a life in which co-inherence is received, communion is natural, and the heart becomes the site where the rupture of pride is healed through the beatitude of the Corporate Estate.

Ontological explanation

Axiom V names the structural truth that communion is not an optional feature of human flourishing but the very mode of existence proper to the human person in its prelapsarian integrity. Communion is neither a moral achievement, nor is it a social arrangement; it is the ontological condition under which the human essence-existence composite attains co-inherence. To exist as a human being is to exist as a radiating presence whose nature is fulfilled only in resonance with other radiances. This is why the fall of Lucifer is paradigmatic: his rupture was not merely disobedience but a refusal of resonance, a collapse of radiance into self-referential curvature. Pride is ontological curvature; communion is ontological openness.

The human person, unlike the angels, inhabits a temporal mode of being in which potentiality and actuality remain dynamically ordered. This temporal condition is not a defect but a grace,

for it allows the corporeal person to grow into the co-inherence required for participation in the Beatific Estate. The Corporate Estate, therefore, is not merely a social or economic arrangement; it is the temporal field in which the human person learns to align radiance with radiance, presence with presence, and love with love. It is the training ground in which the *originalis modus essendi* becomes not merely intelligible but livable. In this sense, the Corporate Estate is the ontological pedagogy through which the human person is restored to the resonance that pride once shattered.

Communion, as Axiom V articulates it, is the structural alignment of radiances in which each DESB participates in divine sufficiency according to the grace bestowed upon it. Differentiation does not introduce rivalry because divine radiance is infinite and non-competitive. The radiance one receives does not diminish the radiance another receives; rather, each radiance intensifies the co-inherence of the whole. This is why comparison collapses in the Beatific mode: the good is not a finite resource but an infinite procession. The DESB does not measure itself against another DESB because the measure of its worth is not relative but given. In the Beatific Estate, love is not allocated but received; not divided but shared; not earned but bestowed.

Thus, Axiom V reveals that communion is the ontological state in which the human person becomes fully itself. Rivalry is a distortion of being; communion is its fulfillment. Scarcity is a symptom of curvature; sufficiency is the natural atmosphere of radiance. The Corporate Estate, by mirroring the structure of the Beatific Estate, allows the human person to inhabit this mode of existence even within temporality. It is the temporal icon of eternal co-inherence:

Heart is *re*-aligned.

Will is *re*-ordered.

Each one's radiance a gift to all.

Axiom V therefore stands as the decisive articulation of what it means for the human person to exist in truth. It reveals that communion is not an aspiration but an ontology, not a moral achievement but the very structure of being restored to its radiant co-inherence. In the Corporate Estate, this communion becomes liveable: radiance aligns with radiance, presence

deepens into participation, and the heart—once curved inward by pride—opens again to the infinite sufficiency of God. Here the human person learns to inhabit the *originalis modus essendi* not as an abstract ideal but as the concrete form of life for which it was created. And when this alignment is achieved, even in the partiality of temporality, the rupture of the beginning is healed in anticipation, and the creature stands once more in the luminous field of divine love. Thus, Axiom V completes the arc of human restoration: to exist is to commune, to commune is to radiate, and to radiate is to return—freely, joyfully, and without rivalry—into the inexhaustible plenitude of the One who is Love.

Axiom VI: Beatific co-inherence function (The Holy Hierarchy)

Let $A = \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n\}$ be the set of all agents in the Beatific Estate.

Let $L(a_k) = \lambda(G)$ denote the radiance of agent a_k , sourced from the divine eternal essence-existence of God.

Let the resonance function $\pi: L \times L \rightarrow \{0,1\}$ be defined as:

$$\pi(L(a_i), L(a_j)) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } L(a_i) = L(a_j) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Then the *Beatific Co-inherence Function* $\kappa: \mathcal{P}(A) \rightarrow \{0,1\}$ is defined as:

$$\kappa(A) = \prod_{1 \leq i < j \leq n} \pi(L(a_i), L(a_j))$$

Given that $L(a_k) = \lambda(G)$ for all $a_k \in A$, it follows that:

$$\kappa(A) = 1$$

Axiom VI unveils the co-inherence of the Beatific Estate in its total and final form. Where Axiom V reveals how one DESB becomes mutually manifest to another through shared radiance, Axiom VI discloses the deeper structure in which *all created entities* participate: The Holy Hierarchy—a single, indivisible order grounded in the infinite plenitude of God, who is not a being among beings but subsistent Being Itself. In this estate, radiance is not exchanged, coordinated, or accumulated; it is given in origin, identical in purity, and unbroken in phase.

The co-inherence of the whole is neither assembled from parts, nor achieved through alignment; it is the structural truth of a realm in which every DESB shines from the same inexhaustible source.

Within The Holy Holarchy, distinction is not erased but harmonized. Each DESB remains fully itself, yet its radiance is inseparable from the radiance of every other DESB because all procession flows from the same divine plenitude. The unity of the estate is therefore not the product of synthesis or integration, but the revelation of an already-given co-inherence that precedes every expression within it. The Beatific Estate is not a network of luminous relations; it is a single radiant order in which multiplicity is the mode of manifestation and unity is the mode of being. The co-inherence function does not measure the success of communion; it reveals the impossibility of division.

Thus, Axiom VI names the structural heart of the Beatific Estate: The Holy Holarchy as total-field co-inherence, in which the many shine as one because each shines from the One—As Paul said to the Athenians, “In him we live and move and have our being” (Acts 17:28, RSV-2CE). The estate does not move toward unity; it rests in unity. It does not strive for harmony; it is harmony. In this axiom, the holarchical form of the Beatific mode becomes visible not as a hierarchy of ascent, but as a crystalline field of procession in which every DESB participates without rivalry, without remainder, and without the possibility of fragmentation. The “1” of the co-inherence function is not a result but a revelation—the mathematical signature of a realm in which Love is indivisible and all who radiate from Love are already, and eternally, one.

Philosophical grounding

In the Aristotelian frame, unity is the principle that renders a being intelligible as itself. Axiom VI extends Aristotle’s insight: the co-inherence of the Beatific Estate is not assembled from the radiance of many DESBs but is the prior field in which each DESB’s radiance is already harmonized. The Holy Holarchy is thus not an aggregate of luminous entities but the ontological unity that precedes and grounds their distinction.

Aristotle reinforces this structural priority in his account of what is “prior.” In Book V, Part 11, he writes: “If we consider the various senses of ‘being’, firstly the subject is prior, so that substance is prior” (Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, trans. Ross, Book V, Part 11). What is prior is that which can exist without the things that depend on it. This ontological priority belongs to what grounds rather than what is grounded.

Finally, Aristotle’s treatment of potency in Book V, Part 12 clarifies why the Beatific Estate is not a realm of potentiality but pure actuality. Potency is “the source, in general, of change or movement in another thing or in the same thing qua other” (Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, trans. Ross, Book V, Part 12). The Beatific mode is not a movement toward co-inherence but the radiant manifestation of co-inherence already given.

Neoplatonic thought deepens this Aristotelian foundation. Plotinus teaches that the One remains what it is and all things come from it without diminishing it, revealing that procession does not fracture unity but manifests it: “A radiation of light comes from it, though it reposes, like the light from the sun, in a way encircling it, eternally coming from it while it reposes” (Plotinus, *The Enneads*, trans. Gerson et al., 2018, §5.1.6, p. 540). Proclus formalizes this insight by arguing that “All that is Produced from a Certain Cause, without an Intermediary, Both Abides in Its Productive Cause, and Proceeds from Self” (Proclus, *Elements of Theology*, trans. Balboa, 2017, Prop. 30). Axiom VI stands within this lineage: the Beatific Estate is co-inherent not because its entities align themselves, but because each entity participates in the same infinite source. The Holy Hierarchy is the philosophical recognition that procession, participation, and co-inherence are not three movements but one truth—the many shine as one because each shines from the One.

Patristic grounding

Patristic theology consistently affirms the structural truth Axiom VI names: beings do not secure co-inherence by aligning themselves, but manifest co-inherence because they participate in the undivided plenitude of God. The Fathers describe a mode of existence in which unity is not imposed, distinction is not erased, and participation does not diminish the source.

Gregory of Nyssa locates this radiant co-inherence in the very structure of the divine image. In *On the Making of Man*, he teaches that God “painting the portrait to resemble His own beauty, by the addition of virtues, as it were with colours, shows in us His own sovereignty” (Gregory of Nyssa, *On the Making of Man*, trans. Wilson, 1893, V.1). The likeness is neither a fragment of the divine nor a competitive share in a finite good; it is the manifestation of divine attributes—purity, blessedness, love—communicated without division. As Nyssa writes, “The Godhead is mind and word...humanity too is not far removed from these: you see in yourself word and understanding” (Gregory of Nyssa, *On the Making of Man*, trans. Wilson, 1893, V.2). The divine plenitude is thus reflected in each person without being diminished, and the co-inherence of the many arises not from alignment with one another but from participation in the One whose image they bear.

Basil of Caesarea reinforces this non-rivalrous ontology in *On the Holy Spirit*. He teaches that “God works in various ways, and the Lord serves in various capacities, but the Holy Spirit is also present of His own will, dispensing gifts to everyone according to each man’s worth” (Basil of Caesarea, *On the Holy Spirit*, trans. Anderson, 1980, §16.37, p. 61). Participation does not fracture unity; it reveals it. The co-inherence of the many is grounded in the undivided generosity of the One.

Gregory of Nazianzus expresses the same structural truth in *Oration 40*, describing the divine life as a unity that remains whole in every reception: “the One Godhead and Power, found in the Three in Unity, and comprising the Three separately, not unequal, in substances or natures, neither increased nor diminished by superiorities or inferiorities; in every respect equal, in every respect the same; just as the beauty and the greatness of the heavens is one; the infinite conjunction of Three Infinite Ones, Each God when considered in Himself; as the Father so the Son, as the Son so the Holy Ghost; the Three One God when contemplated together; Each God because Consubstantial; One God because of the Monarchia” (Gregory of Nazianzus, *Oration XL: On Holy Baptism*, trans. Browne & Swallow, 1894, §41). Distinction does not threaten unity because each person’s being is constituted by relation. This *perichoretic co-inherence* is the theological ground of Axiom VI: the many shine as one because each shines from within the One.

Augustine likewise frames divine perichoretic co-inherence as the structural ground of creaturely co-inherence. In *City of God*, he writes that “the nature of the Trinity is called simple, because it has not anything which it can lose, and because it is not one thing and its contents another, as a cup and the liquor, or a body and its color, or the air and the light or heat of it, or a mind and its wisdom” (Augustine, *City of God*, trans. Dods, 2015, XI.10, p. 245). He further states that “although incorruptibility is inseparable from an incorruptible body, yet the substance of the body is one thing, the quality of incorruption another. And therefore, the body is not what it has. The soul itself, too, though it be always wise (as it will be eternally when it is redeemed), will be so by participating in the unchangeable wisdom, which it is not; for though the air be never robbed of the light that is shed abroad in it, it is not on that account the same thing as the light” (Augustine, *City of God*, trans. Dods, 2015, XI.10, p. 246). In Augustine’s account of divine simplicity and creaturely participation, he describes a mode of being in which persons are ordered toward the One who is their source, and therefore toward one another without rivalry.

Together, these patristic witnesses reveal the structural pattern Axiom VI names: co-inherence is not achieved but received, not constructed but participated; not secured by precedence but given by the One who is undivided in His self-gift. The DESB does not coordinate itself with others; it resonates with the plenitude from which it proceeds. Radiance is therefore the ontological name for participation in the divine life—a life that remains whole, inexhaustible, and unbroken in every reception.

Thomistic grounding

Thomistic metaphysics articulates the same structural truth Axiom VI names: that co-inherence is not secured by competitive alignment but arises from participation in the undivided plenitude of the First Good. For Aquinas, the good is not a finite resource to be portioned out among many beings; it is the very principle by which beings exist, act, and flourish. The good communicates itself without loss, and creatures receive this communication without dividing its source.

Aquinas states the principle with precision: “Goodness is described as self-diffusive in the sense that an end is said to move” (Aquinas, *ST I*, q.5, a.4, ad 2). The good is “self-diffusive”

not by mechanical causation but by final causality: it draws creatures into participation without diminishing itself. The good remains whole in every reception because its mode of giving is identical with its mode of being. Divine plenitude is therefore non-rivalrous; it is not parceled out but radiates as an end that moves all things.

This diffusion is matched by the structure of participation. Aquinas teaches that “Everything is therefore called good from the divine goodness, as from the first exemplary, effective and final principle of all goodness” (Aquinas, *ST I*, q.6, a.4). Creatures are good not by possessing a fragment of the divine but by receiving a similitude of the divine goodness that inheres in them as their own. The divine good remains one; the many goods of creatures are its participated expressions. Participation does not divide the source; it manifests it.

Together, these Thomistic principles reveal the metaphysical pattern Axiom VI names: the One is not diminished by being shared, and the many do not secure co-inherence by coordinating themselves but by receiving their being from the plenitude that grounds them. The DESB does not achieve unity by aligning with others; it resonates with the Good that moves all things. Radiance is thus the Thomistic name for participation in the divine life—a life whose diffusion is inexhaustible, whose unity is undivided, and whose presence remains whole in every reception.

Scriptural resonance

Scripture reveals the same structural truth Axiom VI names: that divine plenitude is not diminished by being shared, and that the co-inherence of the many arises from participation in the One who gives Himself without rivalry. The biblical witness consistently portrays God’s self-gift as radiant, inexhaustible, and whole in every reception.

Jesus articulates this non-competitive generosity in the Parable of the Laborers in the Vineyard. When those who worked longer grumble at the equal wage, the householder replies, “Am I not allowed to do what I choose with what belongs to me? Or do you begrudge my generosity?” (Matt. 20:15, RSV-2CE). The point is not economic but ontological: the good given by God is not a finite resource to be divided among competitors but a plenitude that remains whole in

every gift. Divine generosity is not measured out; it radiates. The last and the first receive the same because the source is not diminished by giving.

Jesus teaches the same truth in the Sermon on the Mount, where He grounds human freedom from anxiety in the inexhaustibility of the Father's care: "[Y]our heavenly Father knows that you need them all. But seek first his kingdom and his righteousness, and all these things shall be yours as well" (Matt. 6:32–33, RSV-2CE). The kingdom is not a hierarchy of precedence but a participation in the Father's undivided providence. To seek the kingdom is to enter a mode of being in which one's good is not secured against others but received with them from the One who gives without loss.

Paul likewise describes divine plenitude as a radiance that remains whole in every reception. In Ephesians he writes that Christ ascended "that he might fill all things" (Eph. 4:10, RSV-2CE). The filling does not divide Christ; it manifests Him. The many are not coordinated by external alignment but constituted by the One who is present to each without being portioned among them. Participation in Christ is not distributive but unitive: the Body is one because the plenitude that fills it is one.

John's Gospel expresses this radiant co-inherence with metaphysical clarity: "And from his fullness have we all received, grace upon grace" (John 1:16, RSV-2CE). The fullness is not diminished by being received; it is revealed. Grace is not a fragment of the divine life but the divine life communicated without division. The many receive "grace upon grace" because the source is inexhaustible, and the co-inherence of the many arises from the plenitude that grounds them.

Together, these scriptural witnesses reveal the structural pattern Axiom VI names: the divine life is radiant, not rivalrous; participatory, not competitive; whole in every reception, not parceled out among many. The DESB does not secure co-inherence by aligning itself with others; it shines because it participates in the One whose generosity is undivided. Radiance is therefore the scriptural name for the mode of being in which the many shine as one because each shines from the One.

Ontological explanation

Axiom VI names the deepest structural feature of the Beatific Estate: *beatific co-inherence*. In this mode of being, a DESB neither secures unity by aligning itself with other DESBs, nor does it negotiate its place within a finite order. Co-inherence arises because each DESB participates in the undivided plenitude of God. The One is not diminished by being shared, and the many DESBs are not fragmented by receiving Him. Radiance is therefore not a metaphor for moral beauty; it is the ontological description of how a DESB exists when rivalry is absent and relationality is unbroken.

This axiom does not describe a psychological state or a spiritual achievement. It names the structural condition under which a DESB exists when grounded in the divine life. In the Beatific Estate, a DESB neither coordinates itself with others, nor does it strive to maintain harmony. Harmony is not the result of effort but the natural expression of participation. Each DESB shines because the plenitude that indwells it is inexhaustible, and this radiance is the same plenitude that indwells every other DESB. Co-inherence is therefore not constructed; it is received.

This is why the Parable of the Laborers in the Vineyard becomes the canonical scriptural resonance for Axiom VI. The equal wage is not an economic statement but an ontological disclosure: the good given by God is not a finite resource to be divided among competitors. It is a plenitude that remains whole in every gift. The last and the first receive the same because the source is not diminished by giving. In this light, the parable reveals the structural truth that rivalry has no footing where the good is infinite and non-competitive. The co-inherence of the many DESBs arises from the generosity of the One.

The patristic and Thomistic witnesses confirm this structure. Gregory of Nazianzus describes the divine life as whole in every reception; Augustine teaches that the soul participates in unchangeable wisdom without becoming identical to it; Aquinas states that goodness is self-diffusive and that creatures are good by participation in the divine goodness. These are not theological embellishments but metaphysical descriptions of a mode of being in which unity is not imposed, distinction is not erased, and participation does not diminish the source. The many DESBs shine as one because each shines from and within the One.

In this ontological framework, radiance is not a poetic image but a structural invariant. It names the condition under which a DESB's being is transparent to its source. A DESB does not generate co-inherence; it manifests it. It does not negotiate its place among others; it receives its place from the plenitude that grounds all. The harmony of the many DESBs is not the result of coordination but the natural consequence of participation in the divine life. Radiance is therefore the ontological name for the co-inherence of DESB-being when the good is infinite, the source is undivided, and existence is constituted by communion rather than comparison.

Axiom VI thus completes the structural arc of the Beatific Estate. Worth is given (Axiom I). Sufficiency is infinite (Axiom II). Expression is procession (Axiom III). Communion is non-competitive (Axiom IV). Presence is co-manifest (Axiom V). And in Axiom VI, all these conditions converge: a DESB shines because the plenitude that grounds it is inexhaustible, and the co-inherence of the many DESBs arises from the radiance of the One. This is not a moral ideal or a mystical state. It is the ontological truth of DESB-being when rivalry is absent and relational co-inherence exists.

Mathematics as ontology

Equations become the more adequate language because they name what prose can only gesture toward. Ordinary language bends toward metaphor, analogy, and psychological coloration; it cannot hold structural invariants without drifting into symbol or sentiment. The ontological dimension of the DESB requires a medium that does not elevate, embellish, or interpret but simply *states what is*. Equations accomplish this by expressing relations that remain true regardless of mood, culture, doctrine, or experience. They do not describe how a person feels or believes; they describe the conditions under which a person *is*. In this sense, mathematics becomes the grammar of being itself—the only form capable of carrying the weight of ontological precision.

This is why the axiomata cannot be written as metaphors or poetic images. Symbolic or literary uses of mathematics point beyond themselves, using number or form to evoke beauty, harmony, or transcendence. But the axiomata do not evoke; they articulate. They do not symbolize the structure of the DESB; they *are* the structure. The φ -function, κ -function, and governing equation do not operate as illustrations but as formal disclosures of how essence and

expression coincide, how radiance proceeds without rivalry, and how co-inherence is maintained when scarcity has no ontological footing. In this framework, mathematics ceases to be a tool of representation and becomes the medium of revelation.

Equations are therefore not chosen for elegance but for necessity. They allow the six axiomata to be tested, verified, and demonstrated without collapsing into hierarchy, metaphor, or psychological projection. They reveal the non-competitive, non-scarce, holarchical co-inherence of the Beatific mode with a clarity no other language can sustain. In this way, mathematics becomes the only adequate language for naming the contours of the DESB, the structure of the Corporate Estate, and the radiant sufficiency of the Beatific Estate. It is not that mathematics elevates the ontology; it is that the ontology requires mathematics in order to be seen at all.

Institutional teleology

The Beatific mode becomes the True North for the Corporate Estate because it reveals the only non-rivalrous structure in which human beings can flourish without distortion. Institutions built on scarcity, comparison, or precedence inevitably reproduce the rivalrous logic of Cain's city: they fragment, stratify, and exhaust the persons within them. The Beatific mode, by contrast, names a form of existence in which worth is given, sufficiency is infinite, and radiance is shared without diminution. When this mode becomes the orienting principle of an institution, the institution ceases to be a mechanism of extraction and becomes a field of co-inherence. Teleology shifts from securing outcomes to cultivating persons; from managing scarcity to stewarding radiance; from enforcing hierarchy to sustaining holarchical alignment.

In governance, this teleology redefines authority as service, not subordination. Decision-making becomes an act of resonance rather than control, and leadership becomes the capacity to amplify co-inherence rather than accumulate power. Policies and structures are evaluated not by efficiency or dominance but by the degree to which they sustain non-competitive communion. In education, the Beatific mode reframes learning as the unfolding of indwelt potential rather than the acquisition of external credentials. Formation becomes the central task: the realignment of heart, the re-ordering of will, and the cultivation

of radiance that can be offered without rivalry. Human systems shaped by this teleology cease to produce competitive individuals and begin to form co-inherent persons.

For institutions broadly, the Beatific mode provides a structural horizon that dissolves the false dichotomy between individual flourishing and communal good. When the Corporate Estate mirrors the Beatific Estate, the flourishing of one becomes the flourishing of all because radiance is non-scarce and co-inherence is mutually intensifying. Institutions cease to be arenas of competition and become holarchical communities of shared sufficiency. In this way, the Beatific mode becomes the True North not by imposing an ideal but by revealing the structural truth of human being. Institutions aligned with this truth become temporal icons of eternal co-inherence—places where persons learn to live without rivalry, to radiate without fear, and to participate in a mode of life that anticipates the Beatific Estate itself.

Implications for Schumacher-style regenerative futures

Schumacher-style regenerative futures rest on the conviction that human systems must be shaped by the scale, dignity, and co-inherence proper to the human person. The Beatific mode provides the structural foundation for this vision. When institutions mirror the non-rivalrous radiance of the Beatific Estate, they cease to operate as extractive mechanisms and become regenerative fields in which persons, communities, and ecosystems flourish together. Regeneration is not achieved through technique or policy alone; it emerges when the underlying ontology of human being is aligned with sufficiency rather than scarcity, communion rather than competition, and co-inherence rather than fragmentation.

In this frame, Schumacher's emphasis on "appropriate scale" becomes an ontological principle rather than a design preference. Systems grounded in the Beatific mode naturally gravitate toward human-scale structures because radiance cannot be centralized, monopolized, or hoarded. Value creation becomes distributed, relational, and holarchical, allowing communities to cultivate resilience without collapsing into hierarchy or rivalry. Regenerative design thus becomes the practical expression of non-competitive communion: a way of building systems that honour the intrinsic worth of each person while sustaining the shared sufficiency of the whole.

For regenerative futures more broadly, the Beatific mode offers a True North that transcends ideology and technique. It reveals that regeneration is not merely ecological or economic but ontological: a restoration of the human person to the co-inherence for which it was created. When institutions, communities, and practices are shaped by this mode, they generate cultures of trust, sufficiency, and shared radiance. In such a world, regeneration is not a strategy but a natural consequence of living in alignment with the structural truth of human being. Schumacher's vision thus finds its deepest fulfilment not in new technologies or policies but in the recovery of the non-rivalrous mode of life that the Beatific Estate makes visible.

Conclusion

The Beatific Estate is neither an aspiration to be reached, nor a perfection to be earned. It is a structure to be recognized—a radiant co-inherence already present in the divine eternal essence-existence from which every DESB proceeds. Nothing in this estate is constructed. Nothing is negotiated. Nothing is achieved. Each axiom reveals what already is: a mode of DESB-being grounded in infinite worth, infinite sufficiency, harmonic procession, non-competitive communion, co-manifest presence, and indivisible co-inherence.

The mathematics does not invent this reality; it discloses it. The ceremonial equations are not symbolic embellishments but formal witnesses to an ontological truth: a DESB is indwelt by the plenitude of God and therefore exists in a mode where rivalry has no footing, scarcity has no meaning, and co-inherence is not a goal but a given. The Beatific Estate is the structural horizon toward which the Corporate Estate gestures—the eschatological form that the temporal form anticipates.

To see this is not to escape the world but to illuminate it. The Corporate Estate becomes luminous when it ceases to imitate scarcity and begins to manifest sufficiency; when it ceases to enforce hierarchy and begins to reveal holarchy; when it ceases to strive for crowns and begins to recognize co-inherence as already given. A DESB does not ascend to the Beatific Estate. It unveils it. The temporal becomes transparent to the eternal when the structures of governance, economy, and communal life are aligned with what is already true in God.

This is why the Beatific Estate stands apart. It is neither a projection of desire, nor a metaphor for moral improvement. It is the ontological pattern of DESB-being when rivalry is absent and relational co-inherence exists. It is the radiant architecture of divine communion rendered in mathematical clarity, scriptural resonance, and ceremonial form. It is the True North by which the Corporate Estate may be aligned—not to create heaven on earth, but to reveal the heaven that already indwells every DESB.

References

- Aristotle (1907) *De Anima*. Translated by R. D. Hicks. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://archive.org/details/aristotledeanima005947mbp> (Accessed: 17 April 2026).
- Aristotle (1925) *Metaphysics*. Translated by W.D. Ross. Book VII, Part 4. The Internet Classics Archive. Available at: <https://classics.mit.edu/Aristotle/metaphysics.7.vii.html> (Accessed: 20 April 2026).
- Aristotle (1924) *Nicomachean Ethics*. Translated by W.D. Ross. Book IX, Part 9. The Internet Classics Archive. Available at: <https://classics.mit.edu/Aristotle/nicomachaen.html> (Accessed: 20 April 2026).
- Aquinas, T. (2025) *Summa Theologiae*. Washington, D.C.: The Thomistic Institute. Available at: <https://aquinas101.thomisticinstitute.org/summa/> (Accessed: 3 April 2026).
- Augustine (2015) *The City of God*. Translated by Marcus Dods. Moscow, ID: Roman Roads Media.
- Augustine (2001) *The Confessions of Saint Augustine*. Translated by E.B. Pusey. Project Gutenberg eBook #3296. Available at: https://www.gutenberg.org/files/3296/3296-h/3296-h.htm#link2H_4_0013 (Accessed 21 April 2026).
- Augustine (2002) *On the Trinity: Books 8–15*. Edited by G.B. Matthews. Translated by S. McKenna. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Basil of Caesarea (1980) *On the Holy Spirit*. Translated by D. Anderson. Crestwood, NY: St Vladimir’s Seminary Press.
- Benedict XVI (2023) *Jesus of Nazareth: Holy Week: From the Entrance into Jerusalem to the Resurrection*. San Francisco: Ignatius Press.
- Congar, Y. M. (1957; repr. 1963) *Lay People in the Church: A Study for a Theology of Laity*. Translated by D. Attwater. London: Geoffrey Chapman. <https://archive.org/details/laypeopleinchurc0000unse/mode/2up> (Accessed: 17 April 2026).
- Dante Alighieri (1997) *The Divine Comedy: Inferno*. Translated by Henry Wadsworth Longfellow. Project Gutenberg. Available at: <https://www.gutenberg.org/files/1001/1001-h/1001-h.htm#CantoI.XXXII> (Accessed: 21 April 2026).
- Davidson, A. I. (1995) ‘Introduction’, in Hadot, P. *Philosophy as a Way of Life: Spiritual Exercises from Socrates to Foucault*. Translated by M. Chase. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 1–45.
- Gregory of Nazianzus (1894) *Oration XL: On Holy Baptism*. In: Schaff, P. and Wace, H. (eds.) *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Second Series, Vol. 7*. Translated by C.G. Browne and J.E. Swallow. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co. Available at: <https://www.newadvent.org/fathers/310240.htm> (Accessed: 24 April 2026)

- Gregory of Nyssa (2012) *Homilies on the Song of Songs*. Edited by Brian E. Daley, S.J., and John T. Fitzgerald. Translated by R. Norris. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Gregory of Nyssa (1893) *On the Making of Man*. Translated by H.A. Wilson. In: Schaff, P. and Wace, H. (eds.) *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, Second Series, Vol. 5*. Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co. Revised and edited for New Advent by Kevin Knight. Available at: <https://www.newadvent.org/fathers/2914.htm> (Accessed: 4 May 2026).
- Gregory of Nyssa (1978) *The Life of Moses*. Translated by A. Malherbe and E. Ferguson. New York: Paulist Press. Available at: <https://archive.org/details/gregoryofnyssa00abra> (Accessed: 21 April 2026), II.239.
- Hadot, P. (1995) *Philosophy as a Way of Life*. Edited with an introduction by A. I. Davidson. Translated by M. Chase. Oxford: Blackwell.
- *Holy Bible: Revised Standard Version, Second Catholic Edition (Ignatius Edition)* (2006; repr. 2024) San Francisco: Ignatius Press.
- Husserl, E. (1983) *Ideas Pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology and to a Phenomenological Philosophy, First Book: General Introduction to a Pure Phenomenology*. Translated by F. Kersten. The Hague/Boston/Lancaster: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.
- MacIntyre, A. (1999) *Dependent Rational Animals: Why Human Beings Need the Virtues*. Chicago: Open Court.
- McGinn, B. (1994; orig. 1991) *The Foundations of Mysticism: Origins to the Fifth Century*. New York: Crossroad.
- Nussbaum, M. (1986) *The Fragility of Goodness: Luck and ethics in Greek tragedy and philosophy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Available at: https://archive.org/details/fragilityofgoodn0000nuss_x3b8 (Accessed: 17 April 2026).
- Plotinus (2018) *The Enneads*. Edited by L.P. Gerson. Translated by G. Boys-Stones, J. Dillon, L.P. Gerson, R.A.H. King, A. Smith and J. Wilberding. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Proclus (2017) *The Elements of Theology*. Translated by Juan and Maria Balboa. Available at: <https://ia601504.us.archive.org/17/items/proclus-elements-balboa/proclus-elements-balboa-2017-04-12.pdf> (Accessed: 24 April 2026).
- Rahner, K. (1969) *Theological Investigations, Volume 6: Concerning Vatican Council II*. Translated by K.-H. Kruger and B. Kruger. London: Darton, Longman & Todd. Available at: <https://archive.org/details/theologicalinves0006unse/mode/2up> (Accessed: 17 April 2026).
- Reber, M.F. (2025) ‘The Corporate Estate: A Theoretical Application’, *LinkedIn*. Available at: <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/corporate-estate-theoretical-application-michael-f-reber-zqnre> (Accessed: 21 April 2026).
- Shields, C. (2014) *Aristotle*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge.
- Taylor, C. (1989) *Sources of the Self: The Making of the Modern Identity*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Underhill, E. (1912) *Mysticism: A Study in the Nature and Development of Spiritual Consciousness*. 4th ed. London: Methuen & Co. Ltd.
- Williams, C. (1939) *The Descent of the Dove: A Short History of the Holy Spirit in the Church*. London: The Religious Book Club. Available at: <https://archive.org/details/dli.ministry.11873/page/n7/mode/2up> (Accessed: 11 May 2026).