

Refutation of Roman Catholic canon law and by silence a presence of the Holy Ghost at epiclesis

© Copyright 2018 by Colin James III All rights reserved.

Abstract: The conjecture that traditional Church teaching can not contradict itself, from the Roman Catholic Church (RCC) catechism, is refuted. From silence in the 1983 Code of Canon Law (CCL), this leads to the absence of the Holy Ghost in the epiclesis and a null priest host.

We assume the method and apparatus of Meth8/VL4 with Tautology as the designated *proof* value, **F** as contradiction, **N** as truthity (non-contingency), and **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. (See ersatz-systems.com.)

LET p, q, r, s : canon law, Holy Ghost, epiclesis, consecrated host;
 \sim Not; $>$ Imply; $<$ Not imply; $=$ Equivalent;
 $(p=p)$ Tautology as designated *proof* value.

From: nregister.com/blog/astagnaro/traditional-church-teaching-can-never-contradict-itself
[The author is known as a professional stage magician.]

Traditional Church teaching can never contradict itself, catholic catechism (94-100) :
"Neither the pope nor any individual Christian has the right to change God's law." (1.0)

We write this as expressed in *one* variable.

If canon law implies itself as a theorem, then it cannot be dis-asserted as such. (1.1)

$(p > (p=p)) > \sim (p > \sim (p=p))$; **F T F T F T F T F T F T** (1.2)

Eq. 1.2 as rendered in not tautologous, meaning canon law of the RCC can be dis-asserted as such and hence is fallible and thus subject to contradiction.

Remark: The antecedent as "canon law implies proof of itself" for $p > (p=p)$ means p as a non-tautology implying itself as a tautology. In other words, **F T F T** $>$ **T T T T** = **T T T T**. The consequent as "not (canon law implies not proof of itself)" is also **F T F T**. Hence, **T T T T** $>$ **F T F T** = **F T F T**, not a theorem.

From: Coriden, J.A. (2007). "Holy Spirit and Church governance". New Theology Review. theophilusjournal.org/index.php/ntr/article/download/216/389

What does the 1983 Code of Canon Law (CCL) have to say about the Spirit's influence and activity in the church? Almost nothing. The Code simply does not reflect the church's beliefs about the Holy Spirit found in the New Testament and the documents of the Second Vatican Council. The Code mentions the Holy Spirit in seven canons [with sections]: 206[1]; 369; 573[1]; 605; 747[1]; 869.

We write CCL to mean: If the Holy Ghost is truthful, then epiclesis invocation of the Holy Ghost implies a validly consecrated Host. (2.1)

$$(q=(p=p))>((r>q)>(s=(p=p))) ; \quad \text{TTFF TTFF TTTT TTTT} \quad (2.2)$$

We apply Eqs. 1.1 as antecedent to imply 2.1 as consequent. In words:

If canon law implies itself as a theorem, then it cannot be dis-asserted as such, then if the Holy Ghost is truthful, then epiclesis invocation of the Holy Ghost implies a validly consecrated Host. (3.1)

$$((p>(p=p))>\sim(p>\sim(p=p)))>((q=(p=p))>((r>q)>(s=(p=p)))) ; \quad \text{TTTF TTF TTTT TTTT} \quad (3.2)$$

Remark 3.1: If Eq 3.1 is weakened to read :

If canon law implies itself as a theorem, then it cannot be dis-asserted as such, then if the Holy Ghost *implies* truthfulness, then epiclesis invocation of the Holy Ghost implies a validly consecrated Host. (3.3.1)

$$((p>(p=p))>\sim(p>\sim(p=p)))>((q>(p=p))>((r>q)>(s=(p=p)))) ; \quad \text{TFTF TTF TTTT TTTT} \quad (3.3.2)$$

Eqs. 3.3.2 is further from tautology by one value of **F** for contradiction, than 3.2.

What follows from Eqs. 3.1 and 3.3.1 is this question: What happens when Pope Francis as the Vicar of Jesus Christ, that is the stand-in personification of the Holy Ghost, is silent (on such matters as the clergy abuse exposed in courts of law and widely reported in the media). (4.0)

We write this question as: If the Holy Ghost who implies truthfulness is silent, implying neither affirmation nor denial, then the Holy Ghost implies a Host which is not equivalent to validity or invalidity, that is, equivalent to a nullity. (4.1)

$$((q>(p=p))>\sim((p=p)+(p@p)))>(q>(s@((p=p)+(p@p)))) ; \quad \text{TTTT TTTT TTTT TTTT} \quad (4.2)$$

Remark 4.2: Eq. 4.2 is tautologous, meaning if the Holy Ghost is silent, then what is conected is a nullity, that is, the result is void of the Holy Ghost.

The results from Eqs. 1.2, 2.2, 3.2, and 4.2 as rendered are that: the CCL is not infallible; the Holy Ghost implies valid Sacramental Host; regardless of the CCL, the Holy Ghost implies a valid Sacramental Host; when the Bishop of Rome as a personification of the Holy Ghost is silent on any matter, then any result derived therefrom is a nullity. It is the last point that proves the Bishop of Rome is incapable of speaking ex cathedra in any capacity for the Holy Ghost, thereby relegating encyclicals as fallible opinions du jour.