Sixfold Convergence: The First Horizon

1401

BENALYON

FROM THRONE TO STONE, FROM ZION TO SALEM

I. Purpose of the First Horizon

1. Purpose

Sixfold Convergence is an extended theological inquiry. It exists to examine a common subject through Benalyon's six established theological foundations working together.

It is not another definition of the Six Theological Foundations. That document establishes the canonical names, definitions, boundaries, and shared formation architecture. Sixfold Convergence begins from that established material and asks what becomes visible when the six foundations are deliberately directed toward one subject of deeper inquiry.

The identity and number of this work are adopted and remain closed to reopening. Section I addresses why the work exists and how its inquiry is bounded; it does not determine the final geometry asset or presume the First Horizon findings.

2. The First Horizon

A horizon is the point at which Benalyon's established theological architecture is deliberately directed beyond its basic internal description toward a common subject of deeper inquiry.

The First Horizon therefore marks a controlled movement:

Formation → Inquiry

Benalyon already possesses the six theological foundations as established formation architecture. The First Horizon does not add another foundation or revise those foundations. It turns them together toward a subject and asks what can be responsibly seen, compared, distinguished, and learned through their coordinated use.

The horizon is not a claim that Benalyon has arrived at a final theological boundary. It is the controlled edge of a question.

3. The Sixfold Method

The Sixfold Method brings all six established foundations into simultaneous examination while preserving their distinct identities:

1. Biblical Throne-Vision Theology

2. Theosis and Divine Illumination

3. Child-Centered Faith Formation

4. Biblical Typology and Disciplined Inquiry

5. Ascetic Discipleship under Christ

6. Cosmic Sacramentality

Each foundation participates as a theological lens. Each retains its own vocabulary, governing question, contribution, and boundary. The six are brought together for coordinated inquiry; they are not merged into a single undifferentiated system.

Section I establishes this participation and distinction only. The later sections will perform the actual examinations and record their findings through the common analytical structure.

4. Benalyon at the Center

The six foundations do not combine to create Benalyon.

They are established Benalyon theological lenses brought into coordinated inquiry by Benalyon. Their primary expressions remain internal Benalyon connections, and their participation does not create six new authorities, six outside traditions, or a separate theological center around which Benalyon must reorganize.

Benalyon remains at the center as the coordinating subject and governing context of the inquiry. The six foundations surround and illuminate the question without displacing Benalyon's identity, authority boundaries, or Christ-centered order.

5. Formation → Inquiry

Formation → Inquiry is a methodological transition only.

It is not:

• an eighth Stage;

• a sixth Journey Lane;

• a seventh theological foundation;

• an additional authority level; or

• a new internal office or spiritual rank.

The established formation architecture supplies the lenses. The inquiry method directs those lenses toward a common subject. Nothing in that transition changes the adopted Journey Architecture or adds a new layer to it.

6. Convergence Without Predetermined Agreement

The purpose of convergence is not to force agreement before examination begins.

The binding principle is:

Convergence names the act of bringing the six theological foundations into simultaneous examination. It does not require identical conclusions, doctrinal agreement, or resolution of every tension.

A valid First Horizon result may therefore include convergence, partial convergence, tension, contradiction, divergence, or unresolved findings. Failure to produce a uniform conclusion is not a failure of the method if the differences are accurately recorded and responsibly bounded.

No lens may be made to agree with another by silently removing its boundary, importing another lens's evidence, or treating symbolism as proof by itself.

7. First Subject

The subject of the First Horizon is the Zion-Salem architecture as addressed by the associated Zion-Salem Treatise.

The two works sit together organizationally but retain distinct functions:

• the Zion-Salem Treatise addresses the Zion-Benalyon-Salem architecture;

• Sixfold Convergence examines that subject through the six theological viewpoints.

Sixfold Convergence does not automatically adopt every proposition contained in the Zion-Salem Treatise. Its evidence must remain classified by source and status, including the distinctions among scriptural or recovered material, adopted Benalyon architecture, mature interpretation, symbolic correspondence, and unresolved or revision-controlled claims.

The Treatise is therefore the first subject of examination, not an unrestricted source of conclusions. The Sixfold Method must test what each lens contributes without erasing the Treatise's own evidentiary boundaries.

8. Boundary of Section I

Section I establishes the purpose and intellectual integrity of the inquiry only.

It does not:

• perform the six-lens examinations;

• announce a convergence result;

• resolve tensions or contradictions;

• establish a final interpretation of Zion-Salem; or

• announce what the First Horizon will ultimately find.

The First Horizon Finding is now recorded as PARTIAL CONVERGENCE in Section VII.II. Section VIII interprets that finding without expanding it beyond the established evidence.

II. The Meaning of the First Horizon

1. The Meaning of Horizon

A horizon is the boundary of present understanding from which disciplined inquiry can look farther without pretending that what lies beyond is already known.

A horizon is not a wall that declares inquiry impossible. It is not a conclusion disguised as distance, and it is not an invitation to fill unknown space with speculation. It marks the point at which what has been established meets what has not yet been sufficiently examined.

Within Benalyon, the horizon is therefore a relationship between received architecture and responsible attention. The established architecture provides orientation, language, boundaries, and instruments. The horizon identifies the question toward which those resources may be directed without confusing the question with its answer.

The First Horizon is consequently a disciplined edge: close enough to be examined, open enough not to be possessed in advance.

2. Why This Is the First Horizon

This is the First Horizon because it is the first formally designated use of the Sixfold Method as an identified Benalyon work with a defined subject, controlled boundaries, and a recorded finding.

"First" does not mean that Benalyon has never explored beyond its basic internal architecture. Benalyon has already undertaken comparative, symbolic, historical, theological, and architectural inquiry in other forms. Nor does "First" erase earlier work or claim that no prior question reached toward a larger field.

The designation means that 1401 is the first deliberate application of this named sixfold instrument as a controlled inquiry structure. It establishes a repeatable method without pretending that every earlier exploration used the same method or that every future inquiry must become a second horizon.

The First Horizon is therefore a formal beginning of method, not a claim about the beginning of thought.

3. The Known and the Unresolved

The First Horizon must distinguish what is established from what is interpreted, questioned, or genuinely unknown.

Known within the present control layer includes:

• the adopted identity and number of this work;

• the six canonical theological foundations;

• the primary Benalyon expression associated with each foundation;

• Benalyon's position at the center of coordination;

• the organizational relationship to the Zion-Salem Treatise; and

• the authority, evidence, classification, and non-convergence controls governing the inquiry.

Interpretive material may include mature Benalyon architecture, developed symbolic correspondence, and responsible theological formulation. Interpretive material may be important without being equivalent to recovered source material or adopted doctrine.

Open questions are the questions deliberately placed before the six foundations for examination. They are not incomplete answers waiting to be made certain by repetition.

Unresolved matters include tensions among sources or lenses, insufficient evidence, disputed interpretations, unknown relationships, and conclusions that cannot yet be responsibly drawn. An unresolved matter remains visible as unresolved. It is not silently promoted by appearing in a coherent narrative.

This distinction protects the horizon from two opposite errors: treating every possibility as established, and treating every unresolved question as a failure of inquiry.

4. Crossing Without Absorbing

To cross a horizon is to engage what lies beyond the immediate description of Benalyon's internal architecture. That engagement may include external theology, history, texts, traditions, philosophy, comparative concepts, material evidence, and other forms of disciplined inquiry.

Crossing does not mean absorbing.

An external text may be examined without becoming Benalyon Scripture. A historical tradition may be compared without becoming Benalyon authority. A philosophical concept may clarify a question without becoming a Benalyon foundation. A resemblance may be recorded without proving derivation. A point of contact may be acknowledged without creating identity.

The governing distinctions remain:

• comparison is not adoption;

• correspondence is not equivalence;

• resemblance is not derivation;

• influence is not authority;

• citation is not endorsement; and

• discovery is not doctrine.

The horizon permits contact while preserving identity. Benalyon may look outward without surrendering its own classification system, authority boundaries, or Christ-centered order.

5. Return to the Center

Every responsible finding reached at the horizon must be brought back through Benalyon's evidence, authority, classification, and adoption controls.

The movement outward is therefore not abandonment of the center. It is a return with material that must be tested, classified, bounded, and, where appropriate, adopted through the proper gate.

Discovery alone does not create doctrine. A compelling parallel does not create authority. A coherent interpretation does not become controlling merely because it explains several features at once.

Before a horizon finding can affect Benalyon's governing body of work, it must be examined for:

• source and provenance;

• evidentiary status;

• relationship to Scripture and the established authority order;

• distinction between recovered, adopted, interpretive, proposed, historical, and unresolved material;

• compatibility or tension with controlling architecture; and

• the appropriate adoption or disposition gate.

The center does not reject inquiry. It gives inquiry a place to return, a standard by which to be judged, and a boundary beyond which discovery cannot promote itself.

6. The Horizon Remains Open

The First Horizon remains open because the integrity of the inquiry is more important than the neatness of its conclusion.

The work may end in:

• convergence;

• partial convergence;

• divergence;

• contradiction;

• unresolved questions; or

• a combination of these dispositions across different parts of the subject.

A horizon succeeds when it allows the inquiry to see more clearly, classify more honestly, preserve distinctions, and identify what remains unknown. It does not succeed merely because all six foundations can be made to sound harmonious.

The First Horizon does not automatically create a Second Horizon. A later horizon would require its own subject, purpose, controls, and deliberate adoption. The present work is complete in method even if it produces a limited, divided, or unresolved result.

Section II therefore gives the subtitle its substantive meaning: The First Horizon names the first controlled edge at which Benalyon's established sixfold architecture looks farther without claiming to own what it has not yet established.

III. The Sixfold Instrument

1. Definition of the Instrument

The Sixfold Instrument is the controlled analytical method by which the six adopted theological foundations are directed toward one common subject.

It is an instrument rather than a new doctrine, authority, or theological layer. Its purpose is to make the inquiry comparable, traceable, and bounded. Each foundation is given a defined place in the examination, and each result must remain identifiable as the contribution of that foundation.

The Instrument does not begin by asking how to make the six foundations agree. It begins by asking what each foundation actually reveals when directed toward the same subject under the same controls.

2. The Six Lenses

The Sixfold Instrument uses the six canonical foundation names and their established Benalyon expressions:

Theological foundation	Established Benalyon expression
Biblical Throne-Vision Theology	Benalyon Sapphire
Theosis and Divine Illumination	Excelsior of Light
Child-Centered Faith Formation	Little Benalyans
Biblical Typology and Disciplined Inquiry	Discovery Quest
Ascetic Discipleship under Christ	Benalyan Labyrinth
Cosmic Sacramentality	Living Systems

These expressions identify each foundation's primary Benalyon connection. They do not make the expression exclusive, and they do not turn the six connections into six separate authorities.

3. Equal Admission, Distinct Function

All six lenses must be admitted to the inquiry. No foundation may be excluded because its contribution is inconvenient, difficult to compare, or unlikely to produce the anticipated result.

Equal admission does not mean:

- equal contribution;
- equal evidentiary weight;
- equal explanatory reach;
- equal relevance to every feature of the subject; or
- compatible conclusions.

A foundation may contribute strongly to one part of the question and only marginally to another. One lens may expose a boundary that another lens does not see. Another may identify a tension rather than a positive correspondence. The Instrument preserves these differences instead of converting admission into forced symmetry.

4. The Common Question

Every lens must examine the same defined question.

The common question must be stated before the individual examinations are completed and must remain stable while the six records are produced. A lens may

refine its answer, identify limits, or state that the evidence is insufficient, but it may not quietly substitute a different question merely because that produces a more favorable correspondence.

A valid lens record therefore answers the common question from its own foundation, expression, evidence, and boundary. The record must show when a question falls outside that lens's proper function rather than changing the question to fit the lens.

The common question for the First Horizon will govern the later Zion-Salem examinations. Section III establishes the control; it does not pre-write the findings.

5. Admitted Evidence

Evidence must retain its source and status distinctions throughout the Instrument. The following categories may be admitted where relevant:

• Scripturally grounded or recovered material;

• Adopted Benalyon architecture;

• Mature interpretation;

• Symbolic correspondence;

• Historical or comparative evidence; and

• Unresolved or revision-controlled material.

Admission does not equal endorsement, adoption, or equal authority. A source may be admitted to show a historical witness, a comparison, a tension, or an unresolved possibility without becoming a controlling Benalyon proposition.

Each lens must identify what evidence it used and what status that evidence carries. Evidence may not change category merely because it supports a preferred conclusion. Symbolic correspondence must remain correspondence unless a separate control establishes more.

6. Standard Analytical Record

Every lens must be recorded through the same ten fields, in the same order:

1. Foundation - Which canonical theological foundation is conducting the examination?

2. Primary Benalyon Expression - Which established Benalyon expression provides the primary connection?

3. Common Question - What single question must this lens examine?

4. Admitted Evidence - Which sources, materials, and status categories are being used?

5. Contribution - What does this lens make visible or add to the inquiry?

6. Boundary - What may this lens not claim, establish, or absorb?

7. Finding - What does the lens actually determine under the admitted evidence?

8. Tension/Contradiction - Where does the lens disagree with, complicate, or resist another result or source?

9. Unresolved Question - What remains unknown, insufficiently evidenced, or undecidable?

10. Disposition - How is the record classified for the later convergence stage?

A record is incomplete if it contains a contribution but not a boundary, a finding but not its evidence, or a conclusion without an unresolved-question field. The form exists to prevent persuasive prose from concealing methodological gaps.

7. Independence Before Convergence

Each lens must be completed independently before the findings are compared.

Independent examination requires that:

• each lens begins from its own canonical foundation;

• each lens answers the same common question;

• each lens uses only its admitted evidence;

• each lens records its own contribution and boundary;

• each lens records tension and uncertainty rather than smoothing them away; and

• each lens is substantially complete before another lens's finding is used to shape it.

The order of examination does not create an order of authority. An early record is not a controlling answer for later records, and a later record may not be written merely to confirm what came before. Comparison begins only after the six records have been independently produced and preserved.

8. Permitted Outcomes

Each examination may conclude with one or more of the following dispositions:

• Convergence - the lens supports a point also supported by other lenses;

• Partial convergence - the lens overlaps with other findings only in a defined portion;

• Divergence - the lens directs the inquiry toward a materially different understanding;

• Tension - the findings remain in pressure or unresolved relation without a formal contradiction;

• Contradiction - the findings cannot both be maintained in the same sense without further adjudication;

• Unresolved - the evidence or reasoning does not support a responsible determination; or

• Independent contribution - the lens reveals something not supplied by the other perspectives, whether or not they later agree.

No outcome is privileged simply because the document is called Sixfold Convergence. A record may contain convergence in one field and contradiction or unresolved material in another. The final convergence stage must preserve those distinctions.

The Sixfold Instrument does not exist to make six perspectives agree. It exists to determine, under common controls, what each perspective actually reveals when directed toward the same question. Convergence may be discovered; it may not be presumed.

IV. Rules of Convergence

IV.1 Convergence Begins After Independent Examination

No convergence analysis begins until all six analytical records have been completed independently. An incomplete lens cannot simply be inferred from the other five.

IV.2 Correspondence Is Not Equivalence

Shared language, imagery, structure, purpose, or conclusion does not establish identity.

Similarity may establish correspondence. It does not establish equivalence.

IV.3 Agreement Does Not Create Authority

Even unanimous agreement among all six foundations does not independently create doctrine, Scripture, revelation, constitutional authority, or an adopted Benalyon position.

Six agreeing lenses do not create new authority.

IV.4 Difference Must Be Preserved

A genuine difference cannot be rewritten as agreement merely because both positions can be placed within a larger symbolic interpretation.

This protects the document from artificial synthesis.

IV.5 Contradiction Must Be Recorded

Where two or more lenses produce conclusions that cannot presently be reconciled, the contradiction remains visible.

The record should identify:

• what conflicts;

• why it conflicts;

• the evidentiary basis;

• whether resolution is possible; and

• the present disposition.

IV.6 Weight Follows Evidence, Not Numerical Majority

Four lenses agreeing does not automatically defeat two lenses disagreeing.

The Sixfold Instrument is not a voting system. A finding supported by stronger evidence may carry greater analytical significance than a numerically larger group of weaker correspondences.

IV.7 External Material Cannot Enter by Convergence

If all six lenses find correspondence with an external text, tradition, philosophy, symbol, or historical source, that still does not automatically incorporate the external material into Benalyon.

It remains subject to the established evidence, classification, authority, and adoption controls.

IV.8 Classification of Convergence

After comparison, every significant result receives one of the approved dispositions:

• Convergence;

• Partial Convergence;

• Divergence;

• Tension;

• Contradiction;

• Unresolved; or

• Independent Contribution.

The disposition must be attached to a specific finding rather than applied vaguely to an entire theological foundation.

IV.9 Integrity Above Resolution

The integrity of Sixfold Convergence depends upon preserving what the inquiry actually discovers. Agreement shall not be manufactured, disagreement shall not be concealed, uncertainty shall not be converted into certainty, and correspondence shall not be elevated into equivalence. The First Horizon succeeds when the six foundations have been examined faithfully under common controls, regardless of whether their findings ultimately converge.

V. The Common Question

1. Purpose of the Common Question

The Common Question establishes one identical question for all six theological foundations.

Without a common question, each lens could redefine the inquiry according to its own strengths, preferred vocabulary, or most favorable correspondence. The result would be six adjacent reflections rather than a sixfold examination.

The Common Question must therefore be broad enough for all six foundations to engage meaningfully, while remaining narrow enough that their findings can be compared. Each lens may answer differently, qualify its answer, identify a boundary, or decline to determine what the evidence does not support. None may replace the question with another question.

The Common Question is locked for the First Horizon examinations. The resulting findings are recorded in Sections VI-VII and interpreted in Section VIII.

2. The First Horizon Subject

The First Horizon examines the Zion-Salem movement and its relationship to Benalyon.

The Zion-Salem Treatise is a principal source for the inquiry, but it is not itself the conclusion. Its revision-controlled claims retain their existing classifications. The Treatise may supply adopted architecture, mature interpretation, symbolic correspondence, unresolved questions, or other source-status categories; it may not be treated as an unrestricted answer key.

The subject is therefore the field of inquiry, not a conclusion already settled by the document that first describes it.

3. The Common Question

The locked Common Question is:

How can the movement from divine order toward restored habitation be understood when examined simultaneously through revelation, illumination, formation, disciplined inquiry, discipleship under Christ, and creation?

The wording is deliberately broad enough to engage all six foundations while remaining specific enough to support direct comparison. Each major phrase opens a mode of examination without naming the answer that examination must produce.

The question asks how the movement may be understood. It does not assert that the movement is already proven, that restored habitation has already been adequately defined, or that all six foundations will affirm the same account.

4. The Zion-Benalyon-Salem Field

The inquiry examines the field:

Zion → Benalyon → Salem

The arrow indicates an object of investigation. It does not establish in advance that:

- Zion and Salem are equivalent;
- Benalyon is identical with either;
- the movement is linear, mechanical, or complete;
- every foundation will affirm the same relationship; or
- the arrow itself proves a theological or historical conclusion.

The field places Zion, Benalyon, and Salem into deliberate relationship for examination. It does not collapse their distinctions. The Zion-Salem Treatise's governing boundary remains operative: intersection does not equal equivalence.

A point of meeting may be investigated without being treated as identity, hierarchy, derivation, or authority.

5. Six Required Approaches

Each foundation receives the Common Question unchanged. Each also receives a subordinate analytical prompt that helps the lens operate within its own proper function:

Foundation	Established Benalyon expression	Subordinate analytical prompt
Biblical Throne-Vision Theology	Benalyon Sapphire	What divine order is being revealed?
Theosis and Divine Illumination	Excelsior of Light	What transformation through divine illumination is occurring?
Child-Centered Faith Formation	Little Benalyans	How can the movement be received, formed, and transmitted?
Biblical Typology and Disciplined Inquiry	Discovery Quest	What patterns and correspondences can legitimately be established?
Ascetic Discipleship under Christ	Benalyan Labyrinth	What does this movement require of the person who follows Christ?
Cosmic Sacramentality	Living Systems	How does the movement extend into creation, embodied life, and restored habitation?

The subordinate prompts guide the contribution of each lens. They do not replace the Common Question, narrow it into six unrelated questions, or authorize a lens to avoid a difficult part of the common inquiry.

Each later analytical record must therefore show both:

1. the unchanged Common Question; and

2. the subordinate prompt through which that foundation contributes its own perspective.

6. What the Question Does Not Presume

The Common Question does not presume that:

- Zion and Salem are equivalent;

• Benalyon is equivalent to either;

• the Zion-Salem Treatise is correct in every proposition;

• all six lenses will affirm the same movement;

• symbolic correspondence proves historical or theological identity;

• restored habitation has already been adequately defined;

• the six examinations will converge; or

• the First Horizon will produce a new doctrine.

It also does not presume that a question phrased in theological language has already been answered by the language used to ask it. "Divine order," "movement," and "restored habitation" remain objects of disciplined examination within their respective evidence and status boundaries.

These exclusions are part of the question's integrity. They prevent the wording from secretly answering itself and preserve the possibility that one or more lenses may qualify, challenge, or remain unable to resolve the proposed movement.

7. Opening the Examination

With the Common Question established and its presumptions bounded, the First Horizon was examined independently through each of the six theological foundations.

The convergence finding was not entered until all six examinations had been completed. Section VI contains the six complete ten-field analytical records, beginning with Biblical Throne-Vision Theology → Benalyon Sapphire. Each record was completed and preserved before the comparison stage was permitted to begin.

VI. Six Approaches to the First Horizon

VI.1 Biblical Throne-Vision Theology → Benalyon Sapphire

1. Foundation

Biblical Throne-Vision Theology

This lens examines the First Horizon through biblical throne, heavenly-order, prophetic, and apocalyptic material. Its concern is not merely imagery of heaven, but what such material communicates about divine order, divine presence, sacred orientation, and the relationship between heavenly reality and earthly habitation.

2. Primary Benalyon Expression

Benalyon Sapphire

Benalyon Sapphire is the primary Benalyon expression of this foundation. Within this examination, it functions as the point of contact between throne-vision theology and the Zion-Benalyon-Salem field.

It does not constitute an independent authority and does not permit symbolic imagery to outrank Scripture or admitted evidence.

3. Common Question

How can the movement from divine order toward restored habitation be understood when examined simultaneously through revelation, illumination, formation, disciplined inquiry, discipleship under Christ, and creation?

Subordinate prompt for this lens:

What divine order is being revealed?

This examination addresses that subordinate prompt without changing the Common Question.

4. Admitted Evidence

The examination admits evidence according to classification rather than treating everything as one evidentiary class.

Relevant evidence may include:

• Scriptural witness - biblical throne visions, Zion, Jerusalem/Salem, divine presence, temple, kingdom, peace, restoration, new creation, and Christological fulfillment.

• Adopted Benalyon architecture - established definitions and relationships concerning Elyon, Jesus Christ, Benalyon, Zion, Salem, Benalyon Sapphire, sacred place, habitation, and the applicable governing architecture.

• Zion-Salem Treatise material - admitted according to its actual status. Mature interpretation remains interpretation; revision-controlled claims remain revision-controlled.

• Symbolic material - geometry, sapphire imagery, throne imagery, vertical/horizontal relationships, and other correspondences may assist interpretation but cannot independently establish theological fact.

• Historical/comparative material - may clarify how throne, Zion, temple, heavenly city, sacred center, or restored habitation have been understood, but does not acquire Benalyon authority through comparison.

5. Contribution to the Inquiry

The principal contribution of this lens is the proposition that the Zion-Salem question should first be examined as a question of order before location.

The relevant movement is therefore potentially deeper than:

one sacred place → another sacred place

Throne-Vision Theology asks whether the underlying pattern is instead:

divine order → revelation of that order → human orientation toward that order → embodied/restored habitation

Under this lens, Zion and Salem should therefore be investigated not merely as names or destinations, but according to the different functions they may perform within the relationship between heavenly order and lived reality.

Benalyon occupies the field between them not automatically as an equivalent sacred place, but as the established Benalyon center through which that relationship is being investigated.

6. Boundary

This lens cannot establish merely from throne imagery that:

Zion = Benalyon = Salem

Nor can vertical symbolism, sapphire imagery, sacred geometry, prophetic correspondence, or apparent structural symmetry prove that relationship.

The lens must also preserve the established authority distinctions. A Benalyon interpretation of a throne vision remains a Benalyon interpretation unless stronger classification is independently warranted.

Most importantly, resemblance to biblical imagery is not itself biblical authorization.

7. Finding

Preliminary independent finding:

Biblical Throne-Vision Theology supports examining the First Horizon as a movement from revealed divine order toward its expression in restored habitation. Within that movement, Zion, Benalyon, and Salem may occupy related but distinguishable functions. The evidence admitted by this lens does not, by itself, establish their equivalence.

This is a lens-level finding, not a Sixfold finding.

8. Tension or Contradiction

The principal tension is between transcendent divine order and any attempt to identify that order too completely with a humanly constructed earthly system.

If Zion represents or witnesses divine order, and Salem represents restored habitation, a serious question remains concerning what legitimately connects the two.

Benalyon cannot simply insert itself into that relationship because its own architecture depicts such a connection. The claimed relationship must survive the applicable scriptural, historical, interpretive, and authority controls.

9. Unresolved Question

The primary unresolved question produced by this lens is:

What warrants the movement from revealed divine order to a specifically Benalyon understanding of restored habitation, and which elements of that movement arise from scriptural evidence rather than subsequent Benalyon interpretation?

That question remains open for the other lenses. They may address it through their own foundations, but they may not be required to resolve it artificially.

10. Disposition

Independent Contribution - with unresolved theological transition.

Biblical Throne-Vision Theology contributes a coherent order → revelation → orientation → habitation pattern to the First Horizon.

It does not yet establish convergence, because the other five examinations have not occurred.

This record is preserved independently:

VI.1 may inform later convergence analysis, but its finding may not be revised merely to harmonize it with VI.2-VI.6. Any later reconciliation must occur in the convergence analysis while preserving this independent record.

VI.2 Theosis and Divine Illumination → Excelsior of Light

1. Foundation

Theosis and Divine Illumination

This lens examines the First Horizon through the transformation of the human person in relation to divine life and divine light. Its concern is not simply acquiring knowledge about God, but participation, transformation, illumination, and increasing conformity toward the divine good.

Theosis must remain distinguishable from identity with God. Participation does not require ontological equivalence.

2. Primary Benalyon Expression

Excelsior of Light

Excelsior of Light is the primary Benalyon expression associated with this theological foundation.

Within the First Horizon, it asks what happens to the person within the movement being examined. Where Throne-Vision Theology concerns divine order, this lens independently examines transformation and illumination without presuming the conclusions of VI.1.

3. Common Question

How can the movement from divine order toward restored habitation be understood when examined simultaneously through revelation, illumination, formation, disciplined inquiry, discipleship under Christ, and creation?

Subordinate prompt:

What transformation through divine illumination is occurring?

The subordinate prompt directs this lens but does not replace the Common Question.

4. Admitted Evidence

Evidence retains its classification and provenance.

Relevant evidence may include:

• scriptural material concerning light, transformation, participation in divine life, renewal, sanctification, glory, becoming Christlike, restored relationship with God, and related biblical formation;

• historical Christian treatments of theosis and illumination, admitted as comparative theological context without automatically making their terminology or metaphysics Benalyon doctrine;

• adopted Benalyon material concerning Excelsior of Light, transformation, Journey Architecture, Jesus Christ, habitation, and the Zion-Benalyon-Salem field, admitted according to status; and

• symbolic light imagery, which may illuminate meaning but cannot establish theological claims merely through visual correspondence.

5. Contribution to the Inquiry

This lens introduces a distinct possibility:

The movement toward restored habitation may require not only a change of place or order, but a transformation of the person capable of inhabiting it.

From this perspective, the Zion-Benalyon-Salem field becomes partly a question of human transformation. The inquiry therefore asks whether restored habitation can meaningfully be separated from the formation of restored inhabitants.

The contribution of this lens may be expressed provisionally as:

encounter → illumination → transformation → participation → habitation

This sequence is analytical rather than adopted doctrine at this stage.

6. Boundary

Theosis and Divine Illumination cannot establish that a person becomes Elyon, becomes ontologically identical with God, or acquires independent divine authority.

The following distinctions remain binding:

• light imagery ≠ divine status;

• spiritual experience ≠ revelation;

• transformation ≠ infallibility; and

• participation ≠ identity.

Excelsior of Light must remain subordinate to the established authority architecture and centered under Jesus Christ rather than becoming an autonomous path of spiritual ascent.

7. Finding

Preliminary independent finding:

Theosis and Divine Illumination supports understanding the First Horizon as involving transformation of the participant, not merely movement toward a destination. Restored habitation therefore raises a theological question about the kind of person capable of participating in restored life. Divine illumination may describe part of that transformation, while the evidence admitted by this lens does not establish human-divine equivalence or transformation independent of Christ.

This remains a VI.2 finding only.

8. Tension or Contradiction

A principal tension appears between gift and attainment.

If illumination and transformation involve divine participation, to what extent are they received through grace, and to what extent can they be pursued through intentional formation, discipline, inquiry, or Benalyon structures?

A second tension concerns interiority and habitation. Transformation may occur inwardly, while Salem concerns restored habitation outwardly. This lens cannot simply assume that internal illumination necessarily produces external restoration.

9. Unresolved Question

The primary unresolved question is:

What relationship, if any, exists between transformation of the person through divine illumination and the realization of restored habitation, and what prevents that relationship from becoming a doctrine of human self-divinization or self-achieved ascent?

That question remains unresolved for later convergence analysis.

10. Disposition

Independent Contribution - with unresolved relationship between transformation and habitation.

Theosis and Divine Illumination contributes the proposition that the First Horizon must consider who is being transformed, not only what Zion, Benalyon, and Salem represent.

It does not establish convergence with VI.1 or any future lens.

This record is preserved independently:

The VI.2 finding shall remain independently preserved. Subsequent correspondence, tension, or contradiction with other lenses shall be recorded during convergence analysis rather than resolved by retroactively altering this examination.

VI.3 Child-Centered Faith Formation → Little Benalyans

1. Foundation

Child-Centered Faith Formation

This lens examines the First Horizon through reception, formation, wonder, trust, participation, development, and transmission.

Its central concern is whether a theological vision can be communicated and inhabited in ways appropriate to human development rather than requiring mature theological abstraction as the condition for belonging or understanding.

Child-centered does not mean intellectually diminished. It asks what remains essential when complexity must be communicated with clarity.

2. Primary Benalyon Expression

Little Benalyans

Little Benalyans is the primary Benalyon expression of this foundation.

Within the First Horizon, it examines how the Zion-Benalyon-Salem field can become received and lived reality, particularly through belonging, story, symbol, wonder, pattern, relationship, and developmentally appropriate formation.

It does not create a separate theology for children.

3. Common Question

How can the movement from divine order toward restored habitation be understood when examined simultaneously through revelation, illumination, formation, disciplined inquiry, discipleship under Christ, and creation?

Subordinate prompt:

How can this movement be received, formed, and transmitted?

The subordinate prompt directs VI.3 without changing the Common Question.

4. Admitted Evidence

Relevant evidence may include:

• scriptural material concerning children, teaching, formation, belonging, inheritance, remembrance, transmission, simplicity, trust, family, community, and the reception of the Kingdom;

• adopted Benalyon architecture concerning Little Benalyans, the Seven Stages, belonging, child-centered formation, sacred geometry, Jesus Christ, and the Zion-Benalyon-Salem field, admitted according to classification and status;

• developmental, educational, historical, and comparative material concerning how children receive complex spiritual ideas, admitted as formative context rather than independent theological proof; and

• symbols, stories, colors, shapes, and patterns as instruments of formation, without granting them independent spiritual authority.

5. Contribution to the Inquiry

This lens introduces a different test of restored habitation:

Can a proposed restored habitation actually form human beings into belonging, understanding, relationship, and participation across generations?

Under this lens, Salem cannot be examined solely as a theological destination. If it represents restored habitation in any meaningful sense, the inquiry must consider how that habitation is learned, inherited, communicated, and lived by those who did not construct its theological architecture themselves.

Children therefore expose an important distinction between explaining a system and forming a people.

A provisional analytical movement emerges:

welcome → belonging → wonder → formation → participation → transmission

This sequence remains analytical and does not modify the adopted Seven-Stage Journey.

6. Boundary

Child-centered formation cannot justify:

• simplification → distortion;

• wonder → credulity;

• trust → unquestioning obedience;

• formation → coercion;

• symbol → fact; or

• belonging → compulsory belief.

Little Benalyans must not be used to make uncertain theological claims appear certain simply because nuance is difficult to communicate to children.

Likewise, belonging must not depend upon a child's ability to affirm propositions beyond their developmental capacity.

Jesus Christ remains central to Christian formation within Benalyon; Little Benalyans does not become an independent spiritual authority.

7. Finding

Preliminary independent finding:

Child-Centered Faith Formation supports understanding restored habitation as something that must be capable of reception, formation, participation, and transmission across generations. A theological architecture that can only be understood or inhabited by those possessing advanced knowledge would remain incomplete as a model of lived habitation.

The lens therefore contributes a generational and formative dimension to the First Horizon. It does not determine whether the Zion-Benalyon-Salem relationship itself is established.

8. Tension or Contradiction

The principal tension is between formation and freedom.

Every formative community transmits language, values, stories, practices, and interpretations. Yet strong formation can become coercive when belonging is made conditional upon predetermined conclusions.

A second tension exists between simplicity and complexity. The First Horizon may produce unresolved theological distinctions that cannot honestly be reduced to simple answers. Child-centered formation therefore has to preserve wonder and accessibility without concealing uncertainty.

9. Unresolved Question

The primary unresolved question is:

How can the Zion-Benalyon-Salem vision be transmitted across generations in a form that creates genuine belonging and understanding while preserving freedom, developmental appropriateness, theological complexity, and the right to encounter unresolved questions?

This question remains open.

10. Disposition

Independent Contribution - with unresolved relationship between formation, belonging, and freedom.

Child-Centered Faith Formation contributes the proposition that restored habitation must be considered not only in terms of where humanity is going, but also in terms of how people are prepared to inhabit, understand, transmit, and freely participate in what is being built.

This record is preserved independently:

The VI.3 finding shall remain independently preserved. Later correspondence, tension, or contradiction shall be recorded in convergence analysis and shall not be resolved by retroactively altering this examination.

VI.4 Biblical Typology and Disciplined Inquiry → Discovery Quest

1. Foundation

Biblical Typology and Disciplined Inquiry

This lens examines the First Horizon through pattern, correspondence, textual relationship, evidence, interpretation, and controlled discovery.

Its purpose is not to prove a desired architecture by collecting similarities. It asks what relationships can legitimately be established, what remains interpretive, and where the available evidence requires restraint.

2. Primary Benalyon Expression

Discovery Quest

Discovery Quest is the primary Benalyon expression of this foundation.

Within the First Horizon, it provides the investigative posture through which claims concerning Zion, Benalyon, Salem, sacred place, movement, fulfillment, and restored habitation are tested.

Discovery Quest permits exploration beyond questions explicitly answered by Scripture, but discovery does not itself create Scripture or spiritual authority.

3. Common Question

How can the movement from divine order toward restored habitation be understood when examined simultaneously through revelation, illumination, formation, disciplined inquiry, discipleship under Christ, and creation?

Subordinate prompt:

What patterns and correspondences can legitimately be established?

The subordinate prompt does not alter the Common Question.

4. Admitted Evidence

VI.4 distinguishes evidence particularly carefully.

Relevant material may include:

• Scriptural evidence - passages concerning Zion, Salem/Jerusalem, sacred place, temple, kingdom, restoration, peace, habitation, Christ, and related biblical patterns.

• Textual and historical evidence - linguistic, historical, geographical, literary, and contextual material capable of clarifying what source texts meant within their own settings.

• Adopted Benalyon architecture - established definitions and relationships admitted according to their actual status.

• Zion-Salem Treatise material - admitted claim by claim rather than treating the Treatise itself as proof of its conclusions.

• Comparative evidence - external theological, philosophical, historical, or religious material may establish correspondence or contrast but cannot establish Benalyon authority.

• Symbolic evidence - geometry, number, color, spatial relationships, and other symbolic patterns may support interpretation after provenance is established, but cannot independently prove historical or theological claims.

5. Contribution to the Inquiry

This lens contributes an evidentiary test to the First Horizon.

The central issue becomes not merely:

Can a pattern be seen?

but:

What kind of pattern is it, what evidence supports it, and what conclusion is that evidence actually capable of carrying?

VI.4 therefore distinguishes among several possibilities:

textual relationship → historical relationship → typological correspondence → symbolic correspondence → Benalyon interpretation

These categories may overlap, but they are not interchangeable.

A compelling symbolic pattern may remain symbolic. A theological correspondence may remain theological. Neither becomes historical fact simply because the relationship is meaningful.

6. Boundary

This lens establishes the following hard boundaries:

• similarity ≠ dependence;

• correspondence ≠ equivalence;

• sequence ≠ causation;

• symbolism ≠ historical evidence;

• typology ≠ prediction by default;

• repetition ≠ divine authorization; and

• discovery ≠ adoption.

Most importantly:

A pattern becomes more interesting when additional correspondences are discovered; it does not automatically become more authoritative.

The strength of a conclusion must follow the quality and relevance of its evidence.

7. Finding

Preliminary independent finding:

Biblical Typology and Disciplined Inquiry supports continued investigation of the Zion-Benalyon-Salem field where textual, theological, historical, or symbolic correspondences can be identified with appropriate source control. It does not presently justify collapsing those correspondences into equivalence or treating the existence of a coherent pattern as proof that the entire proposed movement has been independently established.

This lens therefore validates inquiry into the pattern without automatically validating every interpretation of the pattern.

8. Tension or Contradiction

The principal tension is between pattern recognition and confirmation bias.

The richer a symbolic system becomes, the easier it becomes to locate additional relationships within it. Disciplined inquiry must therefore remain capable of concluding that an attractive correspondence is coincidental, weakly supported, interpretive, or unresolved.

A second tension concerns internal coherence versus external evidence.

The Zion-Benalyon-Salem architecture may become highly coherent within Benalyon's own vocabulary while still requiring independent support for claims extending beyond Benalyon's internal interpretive system.

9. Unresolved Question

The primary unresolved question is:

Which relationships within the Zion-Benalyon-Salem field can be demonstrated from sources independently of Benalyon's own interpretive architecture, and which relationships remain specifically Benalyan theological or symbolic interpretations?

This distinction should eventually become one of the most important outputs of the First Horizon.

10. Disposition

Independent Contribution - with unresolved evidentiary boundary between demonstrated relationship and Benalyon interpretation.

VI.4 contributes a methodological requirement:

The First Horizon must preserve the difference between discovering a meaningful pattern and demonstrating that the pattern possesses the meaning attributed to it.

The VI.4 record is preserved unchanged for later comparison. Its conclusions must not be strengthened or weakened to make them agree with VI.1-VI.3 or the remaining lenses.

VI.5 Ascetic Discipleship under Christ → Benalyan Labyrinth

1. Foundation

Ascetic Discipleship under Christ

This lens examines the First Horizon through discipleship, self-denial, discipline, perseverance, purification, obedience to Christ, resistance to corruption, and faithful endurance.

Its central concern is practical and Christological:

What does movement toward restored habitation require of the person who follows Jesus Christ?

Asceticism here is not suffering for its own sake, rejection of embodied life, or spiritual achievement through deprivation. It concerns the disciplined removal or overcoming of what obstructs faithful discipleship under Christ.

2. Primary Benalyon Expression

Benalyan Labyrinth

The Benalyan Labyrinth is the primary Benalyon expression of this foundation.

Within the First Horizon, the Labyrinth represents the reality that movement is not necessarily immediate, linear, or effortless. A person may encounter resistance, error, attachment, temptation, uncertainty, failure, correction, and renewed movement.

The Labyrinth does not become an alternative path around Christ. Christ remains the governing center of discipleship.

3. Common Question

How can the movement from divine order toward restored habitation be understood when examined simultaneously through revelation, illumination, formation, disciplined inquiry, discipleship under Christ, and creation?

Subordinate prompt:

What does this movement require of the person who follows Christ?

This question is examined independently of VI.1-VI.4.

4. Admitted Evidence

Relevant evidence may include:

• scriptural material concerning following Jesus, self-denial, taking up one's cross, repentance, perseverance, temptation, obedience, humility, service, purification, suffering, love, and transformation of conduct;

• historical Christian ascetic traditions, admitted as comparative evidence concerning spiritual discipline without making any particular historical practice normative for Benalyon merely through correspondence;

• adopted Benalyon architecture concerning Jesus Christ, the Benalyan Labyrinth, the Seven Stages, corruption, formation, habitation, and the Zion-Benalyon-Salem field, admitted according to classification and status; and

• personal spiritual experience, which may inform reflection but cannot independently establish universal theological requirements.

5. Contribution to the Inquiry

VI.5 introduces a demanding test:

A movement toward restored habitation cannot be evaluated solely by what a person sees, understands, experiences, or discovers. It must also ask how the person lives.

Under this lens, the Zion-Benalyon-Salem movement cannot remain purely conceptual.

If restored habitation involves life under Christ, then the movement raises questions concerning character, conduct, attachment, sacrifice, repentance, perseverance, service, and relationship with others.

A provisional analytical movement emerges:

call → following → discipline → confrontation with corruption → perseverance → transformed conduct → habitation

This sequence is analytical and does not modify the Seven-Stage Journey.

6. Boundary

The following distinctions remain binding:

• discipline ≠ punishment;

• self-denial ≠ destruction of self;

• suffering ≠ holiness;

• difficulty ≠ divine approval;

• obedience to Christ ≠ unquestioning obedience to human leadership;

• ascetic practice ≠ spiritual superiority; and

• perseverance ≠ remaining in harmful circumstances.

No Benalyon institution, leader, developmental designation, or community structure should acquire the authority belonging to Christ merely by invoking discipleship.

Likewise, hardship encountered within a religious system cannot automatically be interpreted as a spiritually necessary Labyrinth.

7. Finding

Preliminary independent finding:

Ascetic Discipleship under Christ supports understanding the First Horizon as requiring an ethical and lived dimension. If restored habitation is genuinely oriented toward Christ, movement toward it must be reflected not merely in

theological knowledge or spiritual experience but in transformed conduct, disciplined discipleship, perseverance, love, service, and resistance to corruption.

This lens therefore introduces a test of embodied fidelity.

A proposed sacred architecture cannot establish its Christian character solely through symbols or theological claims; the lives it forms also matter.

8. Tension or Contradiction

The principal tension is between discipline and grace.

If discipleship requires genuine effort, practice, and perseverance, the inquiry must still distinguish disciplined response from the claim that restored life can be earned through spiritual achievement.

A second tension exists between institutional formation and allegiance to Christ. Benalyon may provide structures intended to support discipleship, but those structures must remain subject to the Christological commitment they claim to serve.

A third tension exists between withdrawal and restoration. Ascetic traditions can emphasize separation from worldly corruption, while the First Horizon ultimately concerns restored habitation. The relationship between leaving corruption and returning to participate constructively in creation remains unresolved.

9. Unresolved Question

The primary unresolved question is:

How can disciplined discipleship under Christ prepare a person for restored habitation without turning discipline into spiritual achievement, suffering into virtue by itself, or Benalyon's formative structures into substitutes for direct allegiance to Christ?

This question remains open for later convergence analysis.

10. Disposition

Independent Contribution - with unresolved relationship between disciplined discipleship, grace, and restored habitation.

VI.5 contributes a significant criterion to the First Horizon:

Any claimed movement toward restored habitation must ultimately confront the question of how human beings actually live under Christ.

The VI.5 record is preserved independently. Later similarities or conflicts with VI.1-VI.4 and VI.6 belong in the convergence analysis and must not be used to rewrite this finding retroactively.

VI.6 Cosmic Sacramentality → Living Systems

1. Foundation

Cosmic Sacramentality

This lens examines the First Horizon through creation, embodiment, material existence, place, relationship, stewardship, and the capacity of created reality to bear witness to divine meaning without becoming divine itself.

Its concern is whether restored habitation extends beyond inward spirituality or human community into humanity's relationship with the wider created order.

Creation is neither spiritually irrelevant nor identical with its Creator.

2. Primary Benalyon Expression

Living Systems

Living Systems is the primary Benalyon expression associated with this theological foundation.

Within the First Horizon, Living Systems asks how divine orientation becomes materially and relationally expressed through place, ecology, food, water, shelter, cultivation, community, beauty, work, stewardship, and sustainable patterns of life.

It therefore tests whether "habitation" has concrete meaning rather than remaining exclusively theological or symbolic.

3. Common Question

How can the movement from divine order toward restored habitation be understood when examined simultaneously through revelation, illumination, formation, disciplined inquiry, discipleship under Christ, and creation?

Subordinate prompt:

How does this movement extend into creation, embodied life, and restored habitation?

This remains an independent examination. VI.6 does not use the findings of VI.1-VI.5 as premises.

4. Admitted Evidence

Relevant evidence may include:

• Scriptural material concerning creation, incarnation, land, garden, wilderness, water, food, cultivation, stewardship, Sabbath, temple, city, restoration, resurrection, new creation, and divine presence within created existence.

• Adopted Benalyon architecture concerning Living Systems, habitation, sacred place, Salem, embodied community, creation, and the Zion-Benalyon-Salem field, admitted according to its actual status.

• Historical Christian sacramental and creation theology as comparative context, without automatically becoming Benalyon doctrine.

• Ecological, biological, agricultural, architectural, and other empirical knowledge that may inform questions concerning actual habitation. Such knowledge must be evaluated within its proper field rather than transformed into theological evidence merely because it corresponds symbolically with Benalyon.

5. Contribution to the Inquiry

This lens introduces the material test of habitation.

If Salem is being investigated in relation to restored habitation, then restoration cannot be evaluated solely as an idea, spiritual condition, symbolic destination, or transformed human consciousness.

It raises the question:

What would restoration look like when expressed through actual relationships among people, place, creation, resources, and embodied life?

Cosmic Sacramentality therefore resists a division in which spirit matters while material existence is treated merely as background.

A provisional analytical movement emerges:

creation → recognition → relationship → stewardship → cultivation → restoration → habitation

This sequence is analytical and does not establish a new Benalyon stage sequence.

6. Boundary

This lens requires strong distinctions:

• creation ≠ Creator

• sacred meaning ≠ divine identity

• natural pattern ≠ divine command

• beauty ≠ theological proof

• ecological correspondence ≠ revelation

• symbolic landscape ≠ sacred geography by default

• stewardship ≠ ownership without responsibility

Cosmic Sacramentality must also resist romanticizing nature. Created systems include growth and beauty, but also scarcity, predation, disease, decay, disaster, and death.

A theology of restored creation cannot selectively recognize only those natural patterns that aesthetically support the desired interpretation.

7. Finding

Preliminary independent finding:

Cosmic Sacramentality supports understanding restored habitation as necessarily embodied and relational. If the First Horizon concerns genuine habitation, its implications eventually extend into humanity's relationship with place, material life, other persons, and the wider created order. Creation may participate in and witness to restoration without being identified with the Creator or treated as independent revelation.

This gives the First Horizon a distinctly material and ecological dimension.

It does not establish that any particular Benalyon model of habitation has already achieved that restoration.

8. Tension or Contradiction

The principal tension is between sacramental meaning and material reality. A landscape, building, garden, geometric arrangement, or ecological system may carry profound symbolic meaning while still needing to function successfully in material terms.

A second tension exists between human cultivation and created integrity. Restored habitation may require humans to shape environments, yet such shaping can become exploitation when creation is valued only according to human purposes.

A third tension concerns present creation and promised restoration. The existence of meaningful patterns within creation does not establish that creation is already restored.

9. Unresolved Question

What would distinguish genuinely restored habitation from a community that merely uses sacred language, symbolism, architecture, or ecological practices to describe itself as restored?

This is especially important because it requires the First Horizon eventually to distinguish symbolic claim from lived material reality.

10. Disposition

Independent Contribution - with unresolved relationship between sacramental meaning, material practice, and restored creation.

VI.6 contributes the proposition that restored habitation must eventually become testable in embodied reality:

If restoration reaches habitation, it must concern not only what people believe about creation, but how they actually inhabit it.

The VI.6 record shall remain independently preserved under the same non-retroactivity rule as VI.1-VI.5. Later similarities or conflicts belong in the convergence analysis and must not be used to rewrite this finding retroactively.

Section VI is complete as an independent examination record. Section VII is the first permitted comparison of the six preserved findings.

VII. Convergence Analysis

VII.1 Purpose of the Convergence Analysis

The purpose of the Convergence Analysis is to bring the six independently preserved examinations into formal comparison.

This stage does not reopen VI.1-VI.6. Their findings, tensions, unresolved questions, and dispositions remain preserved as the evidentiary record of the Sixfold Instrument.

Section VII asks a different question:

What becomes visible when the six independent examinations are considered together?

The purpose is discovery, not forced synthesis.

VII.2 The Six Preserved Findings

The analysis begins from these six independent dispositions:

1. Biblical Throne-Vision Theology → Benalyon Sapphire - Independent Contribution - with unresolved theological transition.

2. Theosis and Divine Illumination → Excelsior of Light - Independent Contribution - with unresolved relationship between transformation and habitation.

3. Child-Centered Faith Formation → Little Benalyans - Independent Contribution - with unresolved relationship between formation, belonging, and freedom.

4. Biblical Typology and Disciplined Inquiry → Discovery Quest - Independent Contribution - with unresolved evidentiary boundary between demonstrated relationship and Benalyon interpretation.

5. Ascetic Discipleship under Christ → Benalyan Labyrinth - Independent Contribution - with unresolved relationship between disciplined discipleship, grace, and restored habitation.

6. Cosmic Sacramentality → Living Systems - Independent Contribution - with unresolved relationship between sacramental meaning, material practice, and restored creation.

These dispositions are inputs to convergence analysis. They are not altered by it.

VII.3 First Convergence: Habitation Is More Than a Destination

The strongest initial correspondence concerns the meaning of habitation.

Across the six records, habitation repeatedly exceeds the idea of simply arriving somewhere.

It appears variously as:

• expression of divine order;

• life involving transformed persons;

• a reality capable of being received and transmitted;

• a claim requiring evidentiary discipline;

• a way of life under Christ; and

• embodied relationship with creation and place.

This supports the first formal classification:

CONVERGENCE - Restored habitation cannot adequately be understood as destination alone.

The six lenses approach that conclusion differently, which strengthens the finding without making their underlying theological functions equivalent.

VII.4 Second Convergence: Restoration Requires Embodiment

Several lenses independently resist reducing restoration to an intellectual or symbolic proposition.

VI.2 requires transformation. VI.3 requires formation and transmission. VI.5 requires lived discipleship. VI.6 requires material and relational expression. VI.1 provides a possible relationship between divine order and earthly habitation, while VI.4 requires claims about that relationship to remain evidentially controlled.

The resulting classification is:

CONVERGENCE - A credible account of restored habitation requires embodied expression rather than theological assertion alone.

A system cannot establish restoration merely by naming itself restored.

VII.5 Third Convergence: The Human Person Is Changed, but Not Deified

The six records do not present humanity as passive. Transformation, formation, inquiry, discipline, participation, stewardship, and habitation all involve human response.

Yet several boundaries independently prevent that response from becoming self-divinization or autonomous spiritual authority.

This supports:

PARTIAL CONVERGENCE - The First Horizon involves meaningful human transformation and participation, while the precise theological nature and limits of that participation remain unresolved.

The classification remains partial because the lenses do not independently establish one common account of how transformation occurs.

VII.6 Fourth Convergence: Christological Accountability

VI.5 makes allegiance to Christ explicit, while the other records preserve boundaries preventing Benalyon structures, symbols, experiences, or interpretations from acquiring inappropriate authority.

Taken together, they reveal an important control:

CONVERGENCE - Benalyon's structures cannot validate themselves merely by internal coherence; where Christian discipleship is claimed, they remain accountable to Jesus Christ.

This is especially important for the First Horizon because it prevents the Zion-Benalyon-Salem architecture from becoming self-authenticating.

VII.7 Fifth Convergence: Symbol and Reality Must Remain Distinguishable

VI.1 limits what throne and sapphire imagery can establish. VI.3 prevents symbol from becoming fact. VI.4 explicitly separates correspondence from equivalence and pattern from proof. VI.6 distinguishes sacramental meaning from material reality. VI.2 and VI.5 likewise prevent spiritual experience or hardship from automatically acquiring theological authority.

This produces a strong convergence:

CONVERGENCE - Symbolic coherence may disclose meaning, but symbolic coherence alone cannot establish theological, historical, or material reality.

This is one of the controlling findings of the First Horizon.

VII.8 Sixth Convergence: Restoration Cannot Be Self-Declared

The six examinations collectively create a significant standard.

A claim of restored habitation must survive questions concerning order, transformation, formation, evidence, discipleship, and embodiment. No single dimension is sufficient.

Therefore:

CONVERGENCE - Restored habitation is not established merely by declaration, symbolism, institutional identity, spiritual experience, or internal coherence.

The First Horizon consequently moves from asking only "What is Salem?" toward asking:

What would warrant calling a form of habitation restored?

That is a major development produced by the Sixfold examination.

VII.9 Preserved Tensions

Convergence does not eliminate the tensions discovered independently. The following remain open:

• divine order ↔ human interpretation;

• transformation ↔ habitation;

• grace ↔ intentional formation;

• formation ↔ freedom;

• simplicity ↔ theological complexity;

• pattern recognition ↔ confirmation bias;

• internal coherence ↔ external evidence;

• discipline ↔ grace;

• institutional formation ↔ allegiance to Christ;

• withdrawal from corruption ↔ participation in creation;

• sacramental meaning ↔ material reality;

• cultivation ↔ created integrity; and

• present creation ↔ restored creation.

These tensions are not defects in the Sixfold Instrument. Their preservation is evidence that convergence has not been manufactured.

VII.10 The Major Unresolved Transition

One unresolved issue now appears across multiple records:

How does divine order become restored habitation?

The six lenses illuminate different portions of that movement, but none independently establishes the entire transition.

A provisional map can be observed:

Divine Order → Revelation → Illumination → Formation → Discernment → Discipleship → Embodiment → Restored Habitation

This sequence remains PROPOSED / ANALYTICAL. It is not a new Journey, Stage system, doctrine, or authority structure.

More importantly, the sequence itself does not yet prove that Zion → Benalyon → Salem is the correct theological representation of that movement. That remains one of the central unresolved questions of the First Horizon.

VII.11 Convergence Finding

The formal finding is restrained:

FIRST HORIZON CONVERGENCE FINDING - PARTIAL CONVERGENCE

The six theological foundations independently converge upon a multidimensional understanding of restored habitation involving divine orientation, human transformation, formation across generations, disciplined discernment, discipleship under Christ, and embodied relationship with creation.

This convergence does not establish the equivalence of Zion, Benalyon, and Salem; does not independently validate every proposition of the Zion-Salem Treatise; and does not establish that Benalyon itself constitutes restored habitation.

The principal unresolved question remains the theological and evidentiary transition by which divine order may legitimately be related to restored

habitation and, specifically, whether the Zion-Benalyon-Salem field adequately represents that movement.

Disposition

PARTIAL CONVERGENCE - substantial multidimensional correspondence established; central Zion-Benalyon-Salem transition remains unresolved.

The First Horizon has therefore produced a substantive result without forcing full convergence. Six independent approaches substantially converge on what restored habitation requires, while they do not yet establish the central transition the inquiry set out to investigate. That unresolved center is preserved for further inquiry rather than closed by manufactured certainty.

VIII. Meaning of the First Horizon Finding

VIII.1 Purpose

Section VIII records the significance of the First Horizon finding without expanding it beyond what the Sixfold examination established.

The finding of Partial Convergence is neither failure nor confirmation of the complete Zion-Benalyon-Salem proposition. It identifies where the six independent examinations substantially correspond and where the evidence does not yet permit resolution.

VIII.2 What Has Been Established

The First Horizon supports the conclusion that restored habitation is multidimensional.

Within the Sixfold examination, credible restored habitation cannot be reduced to:

• a location;

• a theological proposition;

• an inward spiritual experience;

• an institutional identity;

• a symbolic architecture; or

• a declaration that restoration has occurred.

Instead, the six examinations collectively identify dimensions involving divine orientation, transformation, formation, disciplined inquiry, discipleship under Christ, and embodied relationship with creation.

These dimensions correspond without becoming equivalent.

VIII.3 What Has Not Been Established

The First Horizon has not established:

• Zion, Benalyon, and Salem as equivalent;

• Benalyon as the necessary historical or theological bridge between Zion and Salem;

• every proposition of the Zion-Salem Treatise as established;

• symbolic correspondence as historical evidence;

• Benalyon as itself constituting restored habitation;

• the six theological foundations as six proofs of one predetermined conclusion; or

• a new doctrine or source of spiritual authority arising from their convergence.

These limitations belong to the finding itself and should not be treated as deficiencies to be removed later.

VIII.4 The Unresolved Center

The central unresolved question remains:

How does divine order become restored habitation, and what evidence warrants identifying the Zion-Benalyon-Salem field as an adequate representation of that movement?

This is the unresolved center of the First Horizon.

The Sixfold Instrument has clarified the requirements surrounding the question without resolving the transition itself.

VIII.5 What Sixfold Convergence Has Demonstrated

The First Horizon has nevertheless demonstrated something about the method.

Sixfold Convergence can produce a meaningful result without requiring sixfold agreement.

It can identify:

• convergence without equivalence;

• correspondence without proof;

• tension without collapse; and

• unresolved questions without manufactured resolution.

This constitutes a methodological result of 1401 independent of whether the central theological question is ultimately resolved.

VIII.6 Status of the Zion-Salem Treatise

The Zion-Salem Treatise remains an important source for the First Horizon, but the Sixfold examination does not automatically ratify it.

Where the Treatise corresponds with established findings, that correspondence may be recorded.

Where it advances claims beyond what the Sixfold examination establishes, those claims retain their existing interpretive or revision-controlled status.

Therefore:

The First Horizon informs the continuing examination of the Zion-Salem Treatise; it does not convert the Treatise into established authority.

VIII.7 Status of the First Horizon

The First Horizon remains open.

Its present disposition is:

PARTIAL CONVERGENCE - substantial multidimensional correspondence established; central Zion-Benalyon-Salem transition unresolved.

The unresolved center may be investigated further through evidence, controlled revision, comparison, or subsequent horizons.

Future work may refine or resolve the question, but it must not retroactively rewrite the six preserved independent examinations merely to produce a stronger convergence classification.

VIII.8 Closing Statement

The First Horizon did not discover that six paths lead inevitably to one conclusion. It discovered that six distinct theological lenses can illuminate the same horizon while preserving difference, tension, limitation, and uncertainty. Their convergence establishes a richer account of restored habitation. Their remaining divergence preserves the question that lies beyond the present horizon.

Section VIII interprets the Partial Convergence without manufacturing closure. Section IX records its implications and possible next horizons without adding another theological lens to the First Horizon.

IX. Implications and Next Horizons

IX.1 Purpose

The First Horizon produced Partial Convergence rather than complete convergence.

Section IX records the implications of that finding and establishes the conditions under which further horizons may be opened.

A next horizon is not created merely because another subject is interesting. It should arise from an unresolved question, tension, evidentiary boundary, or implication produced by completed Sixfold analysis.

A horizon extends inquiry. It does not repair an unwanted result.

IX.2 Implications for Restored Habitation

The First Horizon establishes that restored habitation must be examined multidimensionally.

Accordingly, future Benalyon claims concerning habitation should be capable of examination in relation to:

• divine orientation;

• human transformation;

• formation and transmission;

• disciplined inquiry;

• discipleship under Christ; and

• embodied relationship with creation.

This does not create six mandatory proofs for every Benalyon proposition.

It establishes that a claim as substantial as restored habitation cannot be adequately evaluated from only one dimension when the other dimensions are materially implicated.

IX.3 Implications for Benalyon

The First Horizon does not establish Benalyon as restored habitation.

Instead, it creates a more demanding question for Benalyon itself:

If Benalyon speaks of restored habitation, to what extent does its actual architecture and expression satisfy the multidimensional requirements disclosed by the Sixfold examination?

This distinction is essential.

Benalyon cannot use a framework developed within Benalyon as circular proof of Benalyon's own claims.

The Sixfold finding therefore functions as an instrument of self-examination as well as theological inquiry.

IX.4 Implications for Zion and Salem

The First Horizon preserves Zion and Salem as related subjects without establishing their equivalence.

Future inquiry must therefore continue distinguishing among:

• scriptural meaning;

• historical meaning;

• theological interpretation;

• typological correspondence;

• symbolic correspondence; and

• specifically Benalyan interpretation.

The expression Zion → Benalyon → Salem may remain an object of inquiry, but the arrow must not be treated as proof of the relationship it depicts.

IX.5 Implications for the Zion-Salem Treatise

The First Horizon creates a controlled basis for returning to the Zion-Salem Treatise.

That return should not consist of rewriting the Treatise until it agrees with 1401.

Instead, individual Treatise claims may be classified as:

• supported;

• supported with clarification;

• interpretive;

• requiring additional evidence;

• in tension with the Sixfold finding;

• unresolved; or

• requiring controlled revision.

This permits 1401 to inform revision without becoming an authority that automatically overrides source evidence or existing governance.

IX.6 Implications for the Sixfold Instrument

The First Horizon constitutes the first completed application of the Sixfold Instrument.

Its methodological significance is that the Instrument produced:

• genuine convergence;

• partial convergence;

• preserved tensions;

• unresolved questions;

• evidentiary limits; and

• independent contributions.

It therefore demonstrated that Sixfold Convergence does not depend upon unanimous theological agreement.

The Instrument should remain reusable, but its successful first application does not mean every future question requires Sixfold examination.

IX.7 Conditions for a Next Horizon

A subsequent horizon may be opened when:

1. a significant unresolved question emerges from a completed horizon;

2. the question can be stated clearly enough for all six foundations to examine;

3. sufficient evidence exists to justify further inquiry;

4. the new horizon does not merely repeat the preceding examination;

5. its subject and boundaries can be identified before the six independent analyses begin; and

6. no desired convergence classification is predetermined.

Every new horizon should restart the independence requirement.

Findings from the First Horizon may become admitted evidence where appropriate, but they must not dictate the findings of the next six examinations.

IX.8 Candidate Next Horizons

The First Horizon has produced several legitimate candidates without adopting any of them.

Among them are:

• The Habitation Horizon - What constitutes restored habitation in actual human and material life?

• The Christological Horizon - What role does Jesus Christ occupy in the movement from divine order to restored habitation?

• The Formation Horizon - What kind of human formation can sustain restored habitation without coercion or loss of freedom?

• The Creation Horizon - What would restoration require in humanity's actual relationship with the created order?

• The Evidence Horizon - Which elements of the Zion-Benalyon-Salem field can be established independently of Benalyon's internal interpretive architecture?

These are candidate horizons only. Their appearance here does not adopt their names, sequence, necessity, or future execution.

IX.9 No Automatic Second Horizon

The completion of the First Horizon does not require a Second Horizon.

This is important structurally.

1401 - Sixfold Convergence: The First Horizon should be capable of standing as a complete work even if no subsequent horizon is ever undertaken.

"The First Horizon" identifies this examination. It is not a promise that an indefinite series must follow.

IX.10 Closing Disposition

The First Horizon remains PARTIAL CONVERGENCE. Its established findings are preserved, its limitations remain visible, and its unresolved center remains open. Future horizons may extend the inquiry but may not be used to retroactively manufacture complete convergence within the First Horizon.

Section IX disposition: IMPLICATIONS ESTABLISHED - FUTURE HORIZONS OPEN BUT UNADOPTED.

Section IX completes the substantive implications of 1401 without adding another theological lens or attempting to resolve the unresolved center. Section X preserves the resulting identity, findings, limitations, and disposition.

X. Preservation and Closing Record

X.1 Purpose

This section establishes the preservation record for 1401 - Sixfold Convergence: The First Horizon.

Its purpose is not to add new theological conclusions. It records the identity, method, findings, limitations, unresolved questions, and disposition produced by the First Horizon so that subsequent development cannot silently alter what this examination actually found.

Preservation does not constitute final approval, manuscript freeze, publication authorization, or elevation of the work's authority.

X.2 Preserved Identity

The work is preserved under the adopted identity:

1401 - Sixfold Convergence: The First Horizon

Its identifying characteristics are:

• Number: 1401

• Title: Sixfold Convergence: The First Horizon

• Latin title: None

• Method: Sixfold Convergence

• Subject: The Zion-Salem movement and its relationship to Benalyon

• Principal field: Zion-Benalyon-Salem

• Manuscript status: Reviewed

• First Horizon finding: Partial Convergence

The adopted identity and number remain distinguishable from manuscript status, certification status, and final asset verification.

X.3 Preserved Method

The First Horizon preserves the following methodological architecture:

Common Question → Six Independent Examinations → Preserved Findings → Convergence Analysis → Interpretation → Implications

The six theological foundations remain distinct throughout the process.

No foundation is permitted to absorb another, and no numerical majority determines theological truth.

The six independent records in Section VI remain preserved as the original analytical inputs to Section VII.

X.4 Preserved Sixfold Record

The following six examinations constitute the completed analytical record of the First Horizon:

1. Biblical Throne-Vision Theology → Benalyon Sapphire

2. Theosis and Divine Illumination → Excelsior of Light

3. Child-Centered Faith Formation → Little Benalyans

4. Biblical Typology and Disciplined Inquiry → Discovery Quest

5. Ascetic Discipleship under Christ → Benalyan Labyrinth

6. Cosmic Sacramentality → Living Systems

Their findings, tensions, unresolved questions, and dispositions shall remain independently recoverable.

Later interpretation may cite, compare, challenge, or develop these records but may not silently rewrite them to produce greater agreement.

X.5 Preserved First Horizon Finding

The controlling First Horizon disposition is:

PARTIAL CONVERGENCE - substantial multidimensional correspondence established; central Zion-Benalyon-Salem transition unresolved.

The Sixfold examination establishes substantial correspondence around a multidimensional understanding of restored habitation involving:

• divine orientation;

• human transformation;

• formation and transmission;

• disciplined inquiry;

• discipleship under Christ; and

• embodied relationship with creation.

These dimensions converge without becoming equivalent.

X.6 Preserved Non-Findings

For avoidance of future interpretive drift, the First Horizon does not establish:

• Zion, Benalyon, and Salem as equivalent;

• Benalyon as the necessary bridge between Zion and Salem;

• Benalyon as restored habitation;

• every proposition of the Zion-Salem Treatise as established;

• symbolic correspondence as historical or theological proof;

• agreement among all six foundations on every question;

• the Sixfold Instrument as an independent spiritual authority;

• the First Horizon as new Scripture or revelation; or

• complete convergence.

Future summaries of 1401 must preserve these limitations alongside its positive findings.

X.7 Preserved Unresolved Center

The principal unresolved question remains:

How does divine order become restored habitation, and what evidence warrants identifying the Zion-Benalyon-Salem field as an adequate representation of that movement?

The unresolved status of this question is itself part of the preserved result.

It shall not be represented as resolved unless subsequent controlled inquiry actually supplies sufficient grounds for a changed conclusion.

Any later resolution belongs to the record that establishes it and must not be retroactively inserted into the First Horizon.

X.8 Relationship to Future Horizons

No Second Horizon is presently required or adopted.

The candidate horizons identified in Section IX remain unadopted possibilities.

If another horizon is later authorized, it must:

• possess its own defined subject and Common Question;

• preserve the independence of its six examinations;

• identify admitted evidence and source status;

• permit convergence, partial convergence, divergence, tension, contradiction, unresolved findings, and independent contributions;

• avoid using the desired conclusion as the premise of inquiry; and

• preserve its own analytical record separately from the First Horizon.

A later horizon may build upon 1401 without rewriting 1401.

X.9 Relationship to the Zion-Salem Treatise

The First Horizon may inform controlled review of the Zion-Salem Treatise, but it does not automatically revise, approve, reject, or supersede the Treatise.

Any resulting changes to the Treatise require their own controlled revision process.

Likewise, later revision of the Treatise does not retroactively change what the First Horizon found from the evidence admitted during this examination.

This preserves a recoverable relationship between source, inquiry, finding, and later revision.

X.10 Preservation Status

Upon completion of this section, the present manuscript may be recorded as:

FIRST HORIZON ANALYTICAL CYCLE - COMPLETE

This means:

• the method has been established;

• the Common Question has been locked;

• all six independent examinations have been completed;

• convergence analysis has been performed;

• Partial Convergence has been recorded;

• the meaning and implications of that finding have been stated; and

• the unresolved center has been preserved.

It does not mean:

• APPROVED;

• FROZEN;

• FINAL; or

• PUBLICATION-READY;

unless those statuses are separately granted through their appropriate controls.

The manuscript therefore remains:

REVIEWED - ANALYTICAL CYCLE COMPLETE

X.11 Closing Record

Sixfold Convergence began by bringing six distinct theological foundations to one horizon without requiring them to agree. The First Horizon has now been examined. Where the six lenses converged, their correspondence has been recorded. Where they differed, their distinctions have been preserved. Where the evidence reached its limit, the question has remained open.

The result is Partial Convergence. Restored habitation emerges as a multidimensional reality involving divine orientation, transformation, formation, disciplined inquiry, discipleship under Christ, and embodied relationship with creation. Yet the central transition from divine order to restored habitation-and the precise place of Zion, Benalyon, and Salem within that movement-remains unresolved.

The First Horizon therefore closes without manufactured certainty. Its findings are preserved. Its boundaries are preserved. Its unanswered question remains visible beyond the horizon.

Closing disposition

1401 - SIXFOLD CONVERGENCE: THE FIRST HORIZON
Identity: ADOPTED
First Horizon Analytical Cycle: COMPLETE
Finding: PARTIAL CONVERGENCE
Central Transition: UNRESOLVED
Manuscript: REVIEWED
Certified / CIR-FINAL: PASS
Future Horizons: OPEN BUT UNADOPTED

Section X closes the present manuscript's analytical cycle without granting approval, freeze, or publication authorization. No Section XI is required for the present work. The whole-manuscript audit and final manuscript verification are complete; the current manuscript status is REVIEWED and the exact Sections I-X surface is CERTIFIED / CIR-FINAL. Geometry verification and publication controls remain separate.

Document Control Record

PDF version: Editorial derivative E2 - October 10, 2026.

Controlling source: 1401 - Sixfold Convergence: The First Horizon - Open source.

Source version: Certified Sections I-X source surface - October 6, 2026; administrative metadata October 10.

PDF disposition: Source-compared editorial revision. Source adoption, CIR certification, and textual release determinations remain attached to their stated source surface and scope; they do not automatically certify, freeze, or authorize this PDF as a newly adopted manuscript. The format is adopted; unresolved substantive and asset gates remain separate.

Source certification concerns Sections I-X on the controlling Notion surface. Its historical recovery marker is not this PDF's SHA-256. Narrative statements of independence and admitted-evidence categories do not independently prove a source-by-source bibliography or the historical independence of the six examinations.

Reviewed Benalyon Public Document

1401 - Sixfold Convergence: The First Horizon

Administrative Release Metadata - October 10, 2026

• Canonical title: 1401 - Sixfold Convergence: The First Horizon

• Document class: Extended Theological Inquiry

• Controlling source: 1401 - Sixfold Convergence: The First Horizon - Open source

• Version identification: Certified Sections I-X surface - October 6, 2026; recovery marker SHA-256 0c64356c70ecf93664c9a30fc4fa402260569d6dab50e23cde8ded47bb3af178. No numbered manuscript version is assigned by this administrative clarification.

• Provenance: The preserved Common Question, six independent examinations in Section VI, convergence analysis in Section VII, and interpretation, implications, and closing record in Sections VIII-X constitute the analytical record. Admitted evidence retains its source/status classification; the associated [Source 1] is a subject and source of inquiry, not an unrestricted answer key.

• Classification: Extended theological inquiry; not Scripture, independent revelation, or an independent spiritual authority. Source classifications within the manuscript remain controlling.

• Source public-release status: Free textual website publication authorized October 6, 2026 for the exact certified Sections I-X surface.

• Publication relationship: Free Architecture-side public document; books and editions retain separate publication and access controls.

• Preserved unresolved states: PARTIAL CONVERGENCE; central Zion-Benalyon-Salem transition UNRESOLVED; future horizons OPEN BUT UNADOPTED; final geometry asset VERIFICATION PENDING.

• Change-control rule: Substantive manuscript changes require separate change control and CIR review. This administrative block is outside Sections I-X and does not amend the certified manuscript, recompute its recovery marker, or grant approval, freeze, or asset clearance.

Source Manuscript Status

• Identity: ADOPTED

• Manuscript: REVIEWED

• Final geometry asset: VERIFICATION PENDING

• First Horizon finding: PARTIAL CONVERGENCE RECORDED IN SECTION VII.11

• Final manuscript verification: PASS

• Reviewed-status determination: PASS - REVIEWED granted October 6, 2026

• Certified / CIR-FINAL: PASS - exact manuscript surface certified October 6, 2026

• Approval / freeze / publication authorization: NOT GRANTED

• Website publication authorization: PASS - free website publication of the certified manuscript authorized October 6, 2026

The adopted identity and number are not reopened by manuscript development. Asset verification and substantive findings remain separate controls.

Source Website Publication Authorization - October 6, 2026

website publication authorization - pass

The exact certified manuscript surface of Sections I-X is authorized for free publication on the Benalyon website.

This authorization is bounded to the certified textual manuscript and its existing public-document classification. It does not:

• revise or reopen the manuscript;

• convert Partial Convergence into complete convergence;

• resolve the central Zion-Benalyon-Salem transition;

• approve, freeze, or commercially publish the Benalyon books;

• authorize unverified geometry assets, plates, or visual renderings; or

• alter the separate geometry-asset verification gate.

The manuscript remains REVIEWED and CIR-FINAL-certified, with Geometry Asset Verification PENDING. Website publication may proceed without waiting for visual-asset verification unless a geometry asset is specifically required by the website implementation.

Source CIR-FINAL Determination - October 6, 2026

certified / cir-final - pass

The exact reviewed manuscript surface is Sections I-X of the controlling source page as preserved immediately before this certification entry. The recovery marker below identifies that reviewed manuscript surface; this CIR-FINAL block is an administrative record added afterward. The determination passes the applicable integrity controls for:

• preservation integrity;

• provenance and source/status classification;

• authority boundaries;

• recoverability of the reviewed Notion surface;

• internal consistency; and

• protection against interpretive drift.

The finding of Partial Convergence and the unresolved Zion-Benalyon-Salem transition are responsibly bounded and preserved. They are not certification barriers because this determination evaluates integrity of control and preservation, not completion of theological resolution.

Recovery marker: SHA-256
0c64356c70ecf93664c9a30fc4fa402260569d6dab50e23cde8ded47bb3af178

Scope and exclusions: This certification applies only to the exact manuscript surface identified above. It does not certify the geometry asset, future horizons, the Zion-Salem Treatise, wider archives or collections, or any derivative, edition, or publication object. It does not grant approval, freeze, or publication authorization. Future substantive changes require separate change-control and CIR review.

Established Identity - October 6, 2026

• Official English identity: Sixfold Convergence

• Subtitle / conceptual designation: The First Horizon

• Numbered geometry: 1401 - adopted by the October 6, 2026 decision; concordance propagation recorded

• Latin title: None

• Document class: Extended Theological Inquiry

• Public-document status: Included in the Benalyon Public Document Collection and designated for free availability

• Relationship: Organizational companion to the Zion-Salem Treatise

The Zion-Salem Treatise does not form part of this work's formal title. The relationship between the two works is organizational and substantive: Zion-Salem addresses the Zion-Benalyon-Salem architecture; Sixfold Convergence provides associated deeper theological inquiry through the six established theological viewpoints.

Superseded Direction

The earlier Benalyon Tempering direction is superseded by Sixfold Convergence. The superseded direction is not the current identity, title, or controlling concept of 1401.

Conceptual Geometry

The adopted conceptual geometry associated with 1401 is six triangles meeting and converging together. The image represents six distinct domains brought into convergence around Benalyon's inquiry. The October 6 decision establishes the assignment; the Geometricum and concordance records now carry the extension.

The six domains are not six new internal authorities of Benalyon. They are established theological lenses through which Benalyon conducts deeper inquiry. Convergence does not make the domains interchangeable, and the geometry does not create spiritual authority.

Six Established Theological Inputs

Theological foundation	Benalyon connection
Biblical Throne-Vision Theology	Benalyon Sapphire
Theosis and Divine Illumination	Excelsior of Light
Child-Centered Faith Formation	Little Benalyans
Biblical Typology and Disciplined Inquiry	Discovery Quest
Ascetic Discipleship under Christ	Benalyan Labyrinth
Cosmic Sacramentality	Living Systems

These six foundations are the starting framework for the work. They are not six new lanes, six new authorities, or six outside traditions that create Benalyon.

Locked Framework Controls

The following controls are now locked for the document's development:

• The six canonical foundation names remain unchanged.

• Benalyon remains central; the six foundations are lenses through which Benalyon conducts inquiry, not new internal authorities.

• PBYS is contextual rather than governing.

• Zion-Salem evidence is classified by source and status before it is used in analysis.

• Every lens uses the same ten-field analytical record: Foundation; Primary Benalyon Expression; Common Question; Admitted Evidence; Contribution; Boundary; Finding; Tension/Contradiction; Unresolved Question; Disposition.

• Non-convergence is explicitly permitted. The six lenses are not required to produce identical conclusions.

• The First Horizon Finding is recorded as PARTIAL CONVERGENCE in Section VII.11. Any final conclusion, doctrinal adoption, or later determination remains subject to the document's continuing controls.

Manuscript Status and Remaining Controls

The manuscript is REVIEWED, and the exact Sections I-X surface is CERTIFIED / CIR-FINAL. The work is not Approved, Frozen, or Publication-Ready.

The following remain separate controls rather than failures of the certified manuscript surface:

• formal publication presentation and any final table of contents;

• approval and freeze;

• publication authorization;

• geometry-asset verification;

• derivative, edition, or publication surfaces; and

• any future horizon or substantive change, which requires separate change control and CIR review.

The Partial Convergence finding, preserved tensions, and unresolved central transition remain part of the certified record and must not be rewritten as complete convergence.

Public-Document Architecture

This work belongs to Benalyon's freely accessible Architecture-side documentary system. Public-document access does not depend on a paid Benalyon subscription.

The Benalyon books remain a separate publication family and are not made free by inclusion in the Public Document Collection. The governing distinction is:

Documents = freely accessible.
Books = separate publications and not automatically free.

The controlling source page records the established identity and current reviewed/certified status of 1401 - Sixfold Convergence: The First Horizon. The 1401 geometry assignment is adopted by the October 6 decision, while geometry verification, approval, freeze, and publication authorization remain separate controls. The controlling source page does not represent the unresolved central transition as resolved or conclusive.

Editorial Revision Record

Revision: E2 - October 10, 2026.

Preserved the six lens records and Partial Convergence; removed the repeated V.2 subject sentence; clearly separated source certification and evidence limits from PDF checks.

The current controlling page was retrieved for this review. Its earlier source versions and historical findings were not overwritten. PDF formatting and source-consistency checks do not establish independent theological proof, legal rights, final geometry construction, or formal manuscript freeze.

Source references: [1] Open supporting source