

Roman Catholic Church: Tradition above scripture

© Copyright 2017 by Colin James III All rights reserved.

Logical evaluation of infallibility in the formula for the Historic Church

We previously evaluated infallibility using the Meth8 modal logic model checker as follows in words:

"Both Peter appointed the chief apostle as equivalent to apostolic primacy, and apostolic primacy as equivalent to holding the keys of a papacy imply the existence of a papacy as equivalent to Peter." (1.1)

or

"Both Peter appointed the chief apostle as equivalent to apostolic primacy, and apostolic primacy as equivalent to holding the keys of a papacy imply a papacy as equivalent to the existence of Peter." (1.2)

with

LET: p Papacy; q Apostolic primacy; r Peter
> Imply; & And; = Equivalent to; ~ Not
necessarily, the universal quantifier \forall ;
% possibly, the existential quantifier \exists

for

$((r=q) \& (q=p)) > (\%p=r)$; N T T T T T T T (1.1.1)

or

$((r=q) \& (q=p)) > (p=\%r)$; N T T T T T T T (1.2.1)

We noted a stronger refutation replaces the existential quantifier % as "the existence of" with the universal quantifier # as "the necessity of", with the same net effect where explicitly:

$((r=q) \& (q=p)) > (\#p=r)$; T T T N T T T T (1.3.1)

For the formula of the Historic Church we include additional items:

LET: s Scripture; t Tradition; u Church

We are careful to define the Church as the Body of Christ, viz, pre-existent as to physical scripture, tradition, or ecclesiastical infallibility.

The formula we test in words is as follows:

"If both Peter appointed the chief apostle as equivalent to apostolic primacy, and apostolic primacy as equivalent to holding the keys of a papacy imply the existence of a papacy as equivalent to Peter, then if both the Church implying scripture and scripture implying tradition imply the existence of a Church as equivalent to scripture and tradition." (2.1)

where

$((((r=q) \& (q=p)) > (\%p=r)) = u) > (((u > s) \& (s > t)) > (\%u = (s \& t)))$;
N T T T T T T T T T T T T T (2.1.1)

Eq 2.1 is not validated as true because the Church as equivalent to the definition of infallibility was not validated as true in Eqs 1.1.1 or 1.2.1.

A definition of the Church as the Body of Christ in terms of scripture and tradition is in words as follows:

"If both the Church implying scripture and scripture implying tradition imply a Church implies the existence of both Scripture and Tradition." (3.1)

$((u \supset s) \& (s \supset t)) \supset (u \supset (s \& t))$;
TTTT TTTT TTTT TTTT (3.1.1)

However, the consequent in Eq 2.1 above reads:

"[I]f both the Church implying scripture and scripture implying tradition imply the existence of a Church as equivalent to scripture and tradition." (2.1)

A difference between Eq 2.1 and 3.1 is in Eq 3.1 where the existential quantifier is applying to the Church and not to scripture and tradition. This is because the object is to prove the existence of the Church as previously evaluated in terms of infallibility in the antecedent of Eqs 1.1.1 and 1.2.1, but with additional terms in Eq 3.1.

Another difference is in Eq 2.1 where the existence of a Church is held equivalent to both scripture and tradition, a higher level of truth than in Eq 3.1 where there is not equivalency but an implication.