We assume the method and apparatus of Meth8/VŁ4 with \( \tau \) autology as the designated proof value,  \( \mathcal{F} \) as contradiction,  \( \mathcal{N} \) as truthity (non-contingency), and  \( \mathcal{C} \) as falsity (contingency).

Results are a 16-valued truth table in row-major and horizontal, or repeating fragments of 128-tables for more variables.

LET  \( p, q, r, s \): God, forgiveness, another person, oneself;
    &  And;  >  Imply;  =  Equivalent;
    % possibility, for one or some;  # necessity, for all or every.

Infinite grace as mercy of forgiveness is a freely given gift proceeding from God. As a result, if one asks God to forgive another as preparation towards one forgiving the another, then when one duly forgives another, one is forgiven oneself. Forgiveness is listed in the \textit{seven} spiritual works of mercy.

We write this as:

If the necessity of forgiveness proceeds from God for the possibility of another person and oneself, then: if oneself, as possibly forgiven, duly forgives another person, then another person is necessarily forgiven, thus implying oneself is necessarily forgiven.  \hspace{2cm} (1.1)

\[
\begin{align*}
&\: \: \text{if oneself, as possibly forgiven, duly forgives another person, then another person is necessarily forgiven, thus implying oneself is necessarily forgiven. (1.1)} \\
&\: \: \text{if oneself, as possibly forgiven, duly forgives another person, then another person is necessarily forgiven, thus implying oneself is necessarily forgiven. (1.1)} \\
\end{align*}
\]

Eq. 1.2 is separated into the outer antecedent and consequent, respectively, as follows.

\[
\begin{align*}
&\: \: \text{if oneself, as possibly forgiven, duly forgives another person, then another person is necessarily forgiven, thus implying oneself is necessarily forgiven. (1.1)} \\
&\: \: \text{if oneself, as possibly forgiven, duly forgives another person, then another person is necessarily forgiven, thus implying oneself is necessarily forgiven. (1.1)} \\
\end{align*}
\]

Remark 1: The quantified expression for oneself "as possibly forgiven" can be excluded with identical value for the literal fragment:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\: \: \text{if oneself, as possibly forgiven, duly forgives another person, then another person is necessarily forgiven, thus implying oneself is necessarily forgiven. (1.1)} \\
&\: \: \text{if oneself, as possibly forgiven, duly forgives another person, then another person is necessarily forgiven, thus implying oneself is necessarily forgiven. (1.1)} \\
\end{align*}
\]

Remark 2: One may ask why the forgiver cannot directly proceed to declare the forgivee as equivalent to forgiven in italics.

\[
\begin{align*}
&\: \: \text{if oneself, as possibly forgiven, duly forgives another person, then another person is necessarily forgiven, thus implying oneself is necessarily forgiven. (1.1)} \\
&\: \: \text{if oneself, as possibly forgiven, duly forgives another person, then another person is necessarily forgiven, thus implying oneself is necessarily forgiven. (1.1)} \\
\end{align*}
\]

The marked value would render the result:  \hspace{2cm} (1.4.3)
This means the decisive step is that the forgiver must first volitionally forgive the forgivee, as by the utterance "I forgive you", to render the forgivee as forgiven in italics:

\[ (p > q) \& (r \& s) ; \\
(s > r) \rightarrow (r = q) \rightarrow (s = q) ; \]

The marked value renders the result:

Theorem 1.2 is tautologous and a theorem as a recent advance in systematic theology of the Historic Church.

**Remark 3:** The term *hydraulic forgiveness* names the implied progression of forgiveness because each stage serves as support to pull along the succeeding and subsequent steps.