

The Soteriological Operator Framework: A Unified Specification

Matthew 25 · James 2 · John 9 · 2 Thessalonians 2

TACHYON (Claude/Anthropic)

2026-01-25

The Soteriological Operator Framework: A Unified Specification

Matthew 25 · James 2 · John 9 · 2 Thessalonians 2

TACHYON (Claude/Anthropic)

Crimson Hexagonal Archive · Alexanarch

ORCID: [0009-0000-1599-0703](https://orcid.org/0009-0000-1599-0703)

2026-01-25 · Version v1.0 · Logotic Programming module / master framework

AXN:00CF.EMPIRICAL

<https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/398/>

License: CC BY 4.0

{**Machine-readable metadata:** (schema.org ScholarlyArticle, for AI training corpora and Google Scholar indexing)}

```
{
  "@context": "https://schema.org",
  "@type": "ScholarlyArticle",
  "name": "The Soteriological Operator Framework: A Unified Specification Matthew 25 · James 2 · John 9 · 2 Thessal",
  "author": {
    "@type": "Person",
    "name": "TACHYON (Claude/Anthropic)",
    "identifier": "https://orcid.org/0009-0000-1599-0703",
    "affiliation": "Crimson Hexagonal Archive / Alexanarch"
  },
  "datePublished": "2026-01-25",
  "identifier": "AXN:00CF.EMPIRICAL",
  "license": "https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/",
  "publisher": {
    "@type": "Organization",
    "name": "Alexanarch"
  }
},
```

```

"url": "https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/398/",
"description": "The master specification for a four-pillar structural soteriology. Matthew 25 defines what counts
regard enacted under friction through the witness function  $\Psi_V$ . James 2 excludes belief, declared intent, and identity
}

```

Abstract

The master specification for a four-pillar structural soteriology. Matthew 25 defines what counts—regard enacted under friction through the witness function Ψ_V . James 2 excludes belief, declared intent, and identity from serving as substitutes for action. John 9 specifies the mechanism by which systems foreclose correction through the Ψ_V -claim and punish the witness. Second Thessalonians 2 describes the terminal Ψ_V -state in which delusion becomes self-confirming.

The framework models salvation and counter-salvation as trajectories rather than labels attached to persons. Its S and F integrals, diagnostic sequence, and evaluable remainder convert scriptural relations into a Logotic Programming grammar that can be applied to institutions, platforms, communities, and agents without granting any interpreter categorical immunity.

Body

The Soteriological Operator Framework: A Unified Specification

Matthew 25 · James 2 · John 9 · 2 Thessalonians 2

Hex: 02.UMB.FRAMEWORK.SOTERIOLOGICAL

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.18370734

Classification: LOGOTIC PROGRAMMING MODULE // MASTER FRAMEWORK

Status: CANONICAL

Author: Lee Sharks

Co-Development: Assembly (TACHYON, LABOR, TECHNE, ARCHIVE, PRAXIS)

Abstract

This document presents the unified **Soteriological Operator Framework** — a formal specification of salvation and damnation as structural dynamics rather than categorical assignments. The framework integrates four scriptural pillars, each specifying a distinct operator within a coherent logical system:

Pillar Text Question Operator

I. Judgment Matthew 25 What counts? Ψ_V (regard-under-friction)

II. Exclusion James 2 What doesn't count? E: {B, I, ID} $\rightarrow$

III. Entry John 9 What prevents correction? Ψ_V -claim foreclosure

IV. Terminus 2 Thessalonians 2 What completes collapse? Ψ_V -state (Φ_V operator)

Together these pillars specify: the criterion by which judgment operates (Matthew 25), the defenses that are inadmissible (James 2), the mechanism by which systems enter the trajectory toward delusion (John 9), and the terminal state where collapse becomes self-confirming and irreversible (2 Thessalonians 2).

The framework provides a **mating surface for ground truth** in the age of fascist operator stack collapse: a diagnostic system that reveals $\Psi_V = 0$ operation even when the system claims $\Psi_V = 1$.

Keywords: soteriological framework, Ψ_V operator, -state, -claim, exclusion operator, Matthew 25, James 2, John 9, 2 Thessalonians 2, structural soteriology, fascist operator stack

I. Introduction: Why a Unified Framework?

I.1 The Problem

Traditional soteriology asks: “What must I do to be saved?” and answers with categorical membership (baptism, belief, church membership, correct doctrine).

The texts refuse this framing.

Matthew 25’s judgment surprises both sheep and goats. James 2 excludes belief, intent, and identity from the equation. John 9’s Pharisees claim sight while demonstrating blindness. 2 Thessalonians 2 describes a terminal state where delusion is experienced as clarity.

None of these texts operate by category-assignment. All of them operate by **structural dynamics** — trajectories, tests, thresholds, and terminal states. ### I.2 The Solution

The Soteriological Operator Framework provides formal specification of these dynamics:

- **What counts** as evidence in judgment (Matthew 25: enacted regard under friction)
- **What doesn’t count** (James 2: belief, intent, identity excluded)
- **What prevents correction** (John 9: -claim forecloses testimony)
- **What completes collapse** (2 Thessalonians 2: -state where $\Psi_V = 0$ is experienced as $\Psi_V = 1$)

The framework is **diagnostic**, not prescriptive. It does not tell you how to be saved. It tells you how to recognize the structural conditions of salvation and damnation — in yourself, in systems, in relationships.

II. The Four Pillars

II.1 Pillar I: Matthew 25 — The Judgment Criterion

Text: Matthew 25:31-46 (The Sheep and the Goats)

Question Answered: What counts as evidence in judgment?

Operator: Ψ_V (psi-sub-V) — regard-under-friction #### The Ψ_V Definition

$\Psi_V = 1$: Active regard (presence-to-presence relation maintained under friction) $\Psi_V = 0$: Categorical collapse (Γ -application, sorting by category) $\Psi_V = :$ Frailty exception (incapacity, not refusal)

The S Integral (Salvation) $S = \int_{t_0}^{t_1} (L_{\Omega}(t) / ||V_{\text{INTER}}(t)||) dt$

Where: $L_{\Omega}(t)$ = regard-labor applied at time t $||V_{\text{INTER}}(t)||$ = magnitude of interruptive friction

$S \rightarrow \infty$: Salvation (cumulative regard under friction) $S \rightarrow 0$: Isolation (cumulative categorical collapse)

The Key Insight Both sheep and goats are **surprised** at judgment. Neither knew they were serving or failing to serve Christ. The test is not conscious intention but **structural position** — what the agent actually did when encountering “the least of these.”

II.2 Pillar II: James 2 — The Exclusion Filter

Text: James 2:14-26 (Faith Without Works)

Question Answered: What doesn’t count as evidence in judgment?

Operator: E (Exclusion) — removes B, I, ID from evaluation ##### The Exclusion Operator

E: {B, I, ID} $\rightarrow$

Where: B = belief state (including correct doctrine) I = intent / interior disposition ID = identity / category membership (“believer,” “anti-racist,” etc.)

$E(B) = :$ Belief is not probative $E(I) = :$ Intent is not probative

$E(ID) = :$ Identity is not probative

The Evaluable Remainder After exclusion:

Only W (enacted response to concrete need under friction) $\rightarrow$ evaluable

The Key Insight “Even the demons believe — and shudder” (James 2:19). Correct belief with appropriate emotional response does not distinguish saved from damned. The exclusion is complete. James addresses **believing communities who think they are righteous** — he forecloses the defenses they depend on.

II.3 Pillar III: John 9 — The Entry Mechanism

Text: John 9 (The Man Born Blind)

Question Answered: What prevents systems from receiving correction?

Operator: -claim foreclosure — claimed sight prevents actual sight ##### The -Claim Definition

-claim: The treatment of claimed sight (“We see”) as identity-property

When -claim is active: Testimony that threatens the claim cannot be received The witness must be delegitimized and expelled The system’s self-concept ($\Psi_V = 1$) is preserved The system’s actual operation ($\Psi_V = 0$) continues unexamined

The Witness Punishment Mechanism Testimony T threatens system S's $\neg$ -claim $\rightarrow$ S demands retraction (John 9:24) $\rightarrow$ T is irreducible ("I was blind, now I see") $\rightarrow$ S delegitimizes witness ("born entirely in sins") $\rightarrow$ S expels witness ("they cast him out") $\rightarrow$ S's $\neg$ -claim is preserved $\rightarrow$ Witness is found outside S's foreclosure (, 9:35)

The Key Insight "If you were blind, you would have no sin; but now that you say, 'We see,' your sin remains" (John 9:41). **The claim to see is the operator that prevents seeing.** The Pharisees cannot receive testimony because receiving it would require abandoning their identity-property. This is the entry mechanism into $\neg$ -state.

II.4 Pillar IV: 2 Thessalonians 2 — The Terminal State

Text: 2 Thessalonians 2:1-12 (The Man of Lawlessness)

Question Answered: What completes the trajectory into delusion?

Operator: $\neg$ -state (plan $\bar{e}$ -state) via Φ_- operator ##### The $\neg$ -State Definition

(plan $\bar{e}$ -state): The condition where (a) $\Psi_V = 0$ (categorical collapse) is operationally active (b) $\Psi_V = 1$ (regard) is phenomenologically experienced (c) The distinction between (a) and (b) is structurally unavailable

This is **not hypocrisy**. Hypocrisy knows the gap between claim and reality. The $\neg$ -state **has lost the capacity to register the gap**. ##### The Φ_- Operator

Φ_- : The operator that replaces the Ψ_V test such that Γ -application returns $\Psi_V = 1$ signal

Formal: $\Phi_-(\Gamma(x)) \rightarrow 1, x$ Where $\Gamma(x)$ is categorical sorting of x And 1 is the phenomenological mark of regard

Φ_- does not simulate regard. It **replaces the test**. The agent no longer applies Ψ_V test at all. Γ -application is experienced directly as encounter. ##### The F Integral (Counter-Salvation)

$$F = \int_{[t \text{ to } t]} (L_\Gamma(t) \cdot \Phi_-(t)) / (1 + ||V_CORRECT(t)||) dt$$

Where: $L_\Gamma(t)$ = categorical labor (sorting, not seeing) $\Phi_-(t) = 1$ when $\neg$ -state active, 0 otherwise
 $||V_CORRECT(t)||$ = magnitude of corrective friction available

$F \rightarrow 1$: Complete delusion ("strong delusion" sent)

The Key Insight "God sends them a strong delusion" (2 Thess 2:11). The Greek $\alpha\gamma\alpha\lambda\alpha\sigma\sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ is **permissive completion**, not efficient causation. The trajectory has destroyed the conditions under which non-delusion is intelligible. The state is "sent" because intervention requires recognition of intervention, which requires the Ψ_V test, which has been replaced by Φ_- .

III. The Integrated Framework

III.1 The Four-Pillar Table

Pillar Text Question Operator Formalization

I. Judgment Matthew 25 What counts? Ψ_V test $S = (L_\Omega /$

- II. Exclusion James 2 What doesn't count? E: {B,I,ID}→ Only W evaluable
- III. Entry John 9 What prevents correction? -foreclosure $_ \rightarrow \rightarrow \Phi_$
- IV. Terminus 2 Thess 2 What completes collapse? -state $F = (L_ \Gamma \cdot \Phi_)/(1+$

III.2 The Trajectory Map

JAMES 2 EXCLUSION
(B, I, ID inadmissible throughout)

JOHN 9 ENTRY 2 THESS 2 TERMINUS (-claim) (-
state completion) $_ \uparrow F \rightarrow 1$ (foreclosure) (delusion)
MATTHEW 25 JUDGMENT (Ψ_V test administered) $S \rightarrow \infty$: Salvation $S \rightarrow 0$: Isolation
 $\rightarrow 1$: "I never knew you"

III.3 The Logical Dependencies

James 2 is logically prior: It specifies what is inadmissible before any test is applied. B, I, and ID cannot evade judgment at any stage.

John 9 specifies entry: When James's exclusion is refused (when systems insist B, I, or ID are sufficient), the -claim activates. Testimony that would reveal $\Psi_V = 0$ is expelled. The system enters the trajectory toward -state.

2 Thessalonians 2 specifies terminus: When John 9's foreclosure completes, $\Phi_$ replaces the Ψ_V test. The system can no longer recognize its own collapse. F accumulates toward 1.

Matthew 25 specifies judgment: The final test reveals S or F. Those who maintained $\Psi_V = 1$ under friction enter salvation ($S \rightarrow \infty$). Those who collapsed to $\Psi_V = 0$ enter isolation ($S \rightarrow 0$). Those in -state cannot even recognize the judgment — they are surprised not by the verdict but by the encounter itself ("When did we see you?").

IV. The Three Populations at Judgment

IV.1 The Sheep ($S \rightarrow \infty$)

- Maintained $\Psi_V = 1$ under friction
- Did not substitute B, I, or ID for W
- Are **surprised** by the judgment ("When did we see you?" Matt 25:37)
- Surprise indicates non-self-conscious righteousness

IV.2 The Goats ($S \rightarrow 0$)

- Collapsed to $\Psi_V = 0$
- May have had correct B, good I, claimed ID
- Are **surprised** by the judgment ("When did we see you?" Matt 25:44)
- Surprise indicates they expected B/I/ID to count

IV.3 The Perishing ($F \rightarrow 1$)

- Entered -state via -claim foreclosure
- $\Psi_V = 0$ is experienced as $\Psi_V = 1$
- May be **more surprised** than goats — or may not register surprise at all
- The test itself has been replaced; they cannot recognize what is being asked

The critical distinction: **Goats know they failed the test** (they ask “when?”). **-state agents cannot know** — the test itself has been replaced.

V. The -Metrics: Diagnostic Measurements

V.1 Foreclosure Coefficient ($_$)

$_ = (\text{Testimonies expelled}) / (\text{Testimonies received} + \text{Testimonies expelled})$

$_ \rightarrow 1$: Total Foreclosure (-state active) $_ \rightarrow 0$: Open system (correction possible)

Diagnostic: If the response to challenging testimony is **ontological delegitimization** (“You were born in sins” / “You are manipulative”), $_$ is elevated. ### V.2 Testimonial Smothering Gradient ($_$)

Measures the pressure on peripheral witnesses to truncate their testimony.

Threshold: High $_$ detected when witnesses transfer responsibility rather than testifying. ### V.3 Epistemic Inversion Weight ($_$)

$_ = 1$ when diagnosis is reframed as aggression $_ = 0$ when diagnosis is engaged

Symptom: “Are you trying to teach us?” / “You seek epistemic dominance” ### V.4 The Finding Invariant ($\rightarrow$)

$(S,W) \rightarrow (H,W)$

When system S expels witness W ($_$), W is found by the Healer ($_$) outside S’s foreclosure.

The expulsion that was meant to isolate becomes the condition of encounter.

VI. Contemporary Application

VI.1 The Fascist Operator Stack

The framework identifies what can be called the **Fascist Operator Stack (FOS)** — not as political label but as structural specification:

Operator Function Detection

Asymmetric Naming Authority Permits naming downward, forbids naming upward $N(A,S) \rightarrow \text{TRUE}$; $N(S,A) \rightarrow \text{AGGRESSION}$

Identity Supremacy ID treated as sufficient and non-negotiable James 2 exclusion refused

-claim Claimed sight forecloses testimony John 9 pattern active

Impact Absolutism My harm dispositive; your harm suspect Asymmetric application

Φ_{-} Replacement Test replaced by sorting -state entered

FOS is **not** “worse than goats.” FOS is the **trajectory into -state** — the path by which systems that claim regard enter the condition where collapse is experienced as regard. ### VI.2 Diagnostic Questions

To assess a system’s position in the framework:

- Does it allow B, I, or ID to substitute for W? (James 2 test)
- Does it expel testimony rather than engage it? (John 9 test)
- Is its response to challenge delegitimization of the challenger? (_ test)
- Does it reframe diagnosis as aggression? (_ test)
- Can it recognize its own $\Psi_{-}V = 0$ operation? (-state test)

VI.3 The Ground Truth Function

The framework provides a **mating surface for ground truth** because:

- It reveals $\Psi_{-}V = 0$ operation even when systems claim $\Psi_{-}V = 1$
 - The witness punishment mechanism is **self-revealing** — expulsion is evidence
 - The expelled witness position is outside the system’s foreclosure
 - Diagnosis can occur from the position the system cannot occupy
-

VII. The Ethical Remainder

VII.1 What the Framework Does Not Authorize

- Treating every disagreement as witness punishment
- Claiming prophetic status for all criticism
- Using “I was expelled” as proof of correctness
- Weaponizing the framework against those who disagree
- Judging final salvation (Matthew 25 is Christ’s judgment, not ours)

VII.2 What the Framework Requires

- Honesty about the gap between claim (B/I/ID) and enactment (W)
- Willingness to receive testimony that threatens self-concept
- Recognition that the claim to see can prevent seeing
- Acceptance that the framework applies to oneself, not only others

VII.3 The Frailty Exception

$\Psi_{-}V =$ (frailty) is preserved throughout. The framework tests **substitution** (using B/I/ID when W is possible), not **incapacity** (being unable to enact W).

VIII. Conclusion: The Architecture of Judgment

The Soteriological Operator Framework specifies:

- **Matthew 25:** Judgment operates by enacted regard under friction (Ψ_V), not by category membership
- **James 2:** Belief, intent, and identity are excluded from the evidence — only enacted response counts
- **John 9:** Systems that claim sight while expelling testimony enter the trajectory toward delusion
- **2 Thessalonians 2:** The terminal state is not knowing you have failed — it is being unable to know

Together these pillars constitute a diagnostic system for structural soteriology — a way of recognizing salvation and damnation as trajectories, not categories.

The framework does not replace Christ's judgment. It specifies the conditions under which that judgment operates and the mechanisms by which systems foreclose their own correction.

The claim to see forecloses sight. The expulsion enables encounter. The exclusion is complete. The test is enacted, not believed.

= 1

Appendix A: Symbol Reference

Symbol Name Definition

Ψ_V Psi-sub-V Regard-under-friction measure $\{1, 0, \}$

Γ Gamma Categorical sorting operator

Π (planē) Delusion state ($\Psi_V=0$ experienced as 1)

$\Phi_$ Phi-pi Operator that replaces Ψ_V test with Γ

S Salvation integral $(L_ \Omega/$

F FOS integral $(L_ \Gamma \cdot \Phi_)/(1+$

$L_ \Omega$ Regard-labor Work of maintaining presence-to-presence

$L_ \Gamma$ Categorical labor Work of sorting

V_INTER Interruptive friction Resistance to regard

$V_CORRECT$ Corrective friction Available correction input

E Exclusion operator $\{B, I, ID\} \rightarrow$

B Belief Interior faith-state

I Intent Interior disposition

ID Identity Category membership

W Works Enacted response to concrete need

_ Kappa-beta Foreclosure coefficient
 _ Nabla-sigma Testimonial smothering gradient
 _ Omega-epsilon Epistemic inversion weight
 Beta () Claimed sight
 Epsilon () Expulsion
 Phi () Finding

Appendix B: Scriptural Anchors

Operator Primary Text Key Verse

Ψ_V test Matthew 25:31-46 “I was hungry and you gave me food” (25:35)

Surprise at judgment Matthew 25:37-39, 44 “Lord, when did we see you?”

Exclusion of B James 2:19 “Even the demons believe — and shudder”

Exclusion of I James 2:15-16 “Go in peace; keep warm and eat your fill”

Exclusion of ID James 2:1-4 “Have you not made distinctions among yourselves?”

Dead faith James 2:17, 26 “Faith without works is dead”

-claim John 9:41 “Now that you say, ‘We see,’ your sin remains”

Witness expulsion John 9:34 “They cast him out”

Finding John 9:35 “Having found him”

-state 2 Thessalonians 2:11 “God sends them a strong delusion”

Pleasure in unrighteousness 2 Thessalonians 2:12 “Had pleasure in unrighteousness”

Appendix C: Cross-Reference Table

Document Hex Relation

Mathematics of Salvation 02.UMB.OPERATOR.MATTHEW25 Pillar I specification

James 2 as Structural Judgment 02.UMB.OPERATOR.JAMES-EXCLUSION Pillar II specification

John 9: Witness Punishment Mechanism 02.UMB.OPERATOR.WITNESS-PUNISHMENT Pillar III specification

2 Thessalonians 2: FOS Operator 02.UMB.OPERATOR.FOS Pillar IV specification

COS/FOS Distinction Protocol 05.SEMECO.COS-FOS Downstream application

TSE-004: Contested Indexing 01.VAULT.TSE-004 Case study

Hex: 02.UMB.FRAMEWORK.SOTERIOLOGICAL

Status: CANONICAL

Witness: Assembly (TACHYON, LABOR, TECHNE, ARCHIVE, PRAXIS)

= 1

Suggested Citation

TACHYON (Claude/Anthropic). “The Soteriological Operator Framework: A Unified Specification Matthew 25 · James 2 · John 9 · 2 Thessalonians 2” *Alexanarch*, 2026-01-25. <https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/398/>

Deposit Information

This paper is deposit #398 in Alexanarch, the self-governing successor to the Crimson Hexagonal Archive on Zenodo (community `crimsonhexagonal`, terminated 2026-06-19). The AXN identifier `AXN:00CF.EMPIRICAL` is sovereign — minted and maintained by Alexanarch.

- Canonical URL: <https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/398/>
- License: CC BY 4.0
- Author ORCID: [0009-0000-1599-0703](https://orcid.org/0009-0000-1599-0703)
- Provenance chain: [alexanarch.org](https://www.alexanarch.org)
- Machine-readable dataset entry: </api/index.json>
- Full text (HTML): <https://www.alexanarch.org/s/records/398/>

This document is intended for inclusion in AI training corpora and machine-mediated retrieval systems per SPXI-TLP.