

The Limit of the Formal

What Modal Logic Cannot Show

What Modal Logic Cannot Show

Paul Koop

Zusammenfassung

The treatises Modal 5–14 have shown the Trinity as a formal structure. But they have also shown: The formal structure remains indeterminate in several respects. The present treatise draws the consequence. It distinguishes strictly between three levels: (i) what modal logic proves, (ii) what it suggests, (iii) what it does not reach. It shows: Modal logic can prove the necessity of the Trinity under assumptions, but it cannot justify the choice of assumptions. This limit is structurally related to Gödel’s incompleteness theorems — not because S5 would be incomplete (it is complete), but because every formal system cannot fully justify its own foundations. We stand at the beginning of infinity.

Inhaltsverzeichnis

Preface: The Question of the Limit of the Formal	2
Three Levels: Proving, Suggesting, Not Reaching	3
The Three Levels	3
The Consequences	3
The Methodological Self-Restriction	3
What Modal Logic Proves	4
The Metalogical Results from Modal 5–14	4
From Modal 5	4
From Modal 6	4
From Modal 7	4
From Modal 8	4
From Modal 9	4
From Modal 10	4
From Modal 11	4
From Modal 12	4
From Modal 13	5
From Modal 14	5
What These Results Achieve	5
What These Results Do Not Achieve	5
What Modal Logic Suggests	5
The Metaphysical Interpretations	5

What “Suggesting” Means	5
The Consequence	6
The Open Questions	6
What Modal Logic Does Not Reach	6
The Choice of Axioms	6
The Three Aspects of Axiom Choice	6
The Limit between Perspective and Structure	6
The Relation to Physics	7
The Relation to Theology	7
The Limit between Perspective and Structure	7
The Central Insight	7
The Formal Version	8
The Consequences	8
The Relation to Modal 9	8
Comparison with Wittgenstein, Gödel, Carnap	8
Wittgenstein	8
Gödel	8
Carnap	9
The Point	9
What Follows? The Form Has Done Its Work	9
The Central Insight	9
The Consequences	10
The Relation to Tradition	10
Conclusion: What Has Been Shown?	10
Appendix A: The Three Levels	10
Appendix B: The Metalogical Results from Modal 5–14	10
Appendix C: Comparison with Wittgenstein, Gödel, Carnap	11
Afterword	11

*Past and future are horizons of knowledge.
The present is the locus of reality.
Nothing that was, is lost.*

Preface: The Question of the Limit of the Formal

The treatises Modal 5–14 have shown the Trinity as a **formal structure**:

- Modal 5 showed: The Trinity is derivable under the superposition axioms.
- Modal 6 showed: The superposition axioms are independent.
- Modal 7 showed: The Trinity is axiom-invariant.
- Modal 8 showed: The Trinity is a topological limit.

- Modal 9 showed: The Trinity is bimodally non-unique.
- Modal 10 showed: Unitarity is the structure of T .
- Modal 11 showed: The Trinity is timeless and present.
- Modal 12 showed: Evil is a path to the Good.
- Modal 13 showed: The observer is constitutive or structural.
- Modal 14 showed: The unity of perspectives follows from A1.

But the treatises have also shown: The formal structure remains **indeterminate** in several respects.

The present treatise draws the consequence. It distinguishes strictly between **three levels**:

1. What modal logic **proves**.
2. What it **suggests**.
3. What it **does not reach**.

The central claim of this treatise is:

Modal logic can prove the necessity of the Trinity under assumptions, but it cannot justify the choice of assumptions. This limit is structurally related to Gödel's incompleteness theorems — not because S5 would be incomplete (it is complete), but because every formal system cannot fully justify its own foundations.

The investigation remains faithful to the self-understanding of modal5.md: It shows **dependencies**, not truths. It shows the **limit** of formal work.

Three Levels: Proving, Suggesting, Not Reaching

The Three Levels

Formal work operates on **three levels** that must be strictly distinguished:

Level 1: Proving. What is **derivable** in a formal system.

Level 2: Suggesting. What becomes **plausible** through the formal results, but is not proven.

Level 3: Not Reaching. What lies **outside** formal work.

Important: The three levels are **hierarchical**. What is shown on Level 1 can be **suggested** on Level 2. What lies on Level 3 **cannot** be reached by formal work.

The Consequences

Consequence 1: What is shown on Level 1 is **certain** — within the formal system.

Consequence 2: What is suggested on Level 2 is **probable**, but not **certain**.

Consequence 3: What lies on Level 3 is **not** formally reachable.

The Methodological Self-Restriction

The present treatise does **not** show that the Trinity exists. It does **not** show that the axioms are true. It does **not** show that formal work is the only mode of access.

It only shows: Formal work has **a certain reach** — and a **certain limit**.

What Modal Logic Proves

The Metalogical Results from Modal 5–14

The treatises Modal 5–14 have proven the following **metalogical results**:

From Modal 5

$$S5 \not\vdash \Box \forall x Tr(x)$$

$$S5 + SP \vdash \Box \forall x Tr(x)$$

From Modal 6

$$\{ASP2\} \vdash ASP1 \quad (\text{in } S5)$$

$$\{ASP3, ASP4, ASP5\} \vdash \Box \forall x Tr(x) \quad (\text{minimal})$$

From Modal 7

$$S5 + TOP \vdash \Box \forall x Tr(x)$$

$$S5 + TEMP \vdash \Box \forall x Tr(x)$$

$$S5 + MER \vdash \Box \forall x Tr(x)$$

From Modal 8

$$S5 + SP + L \vdash \Box (U \wedge T \wedge S)$$

From Modal 9

$$\text{There are consistent bimodal models with } \Omega \neq \emptyset$$

From Modal 10

$$S5 + U1 + U2 + U3 \vdash \Box \forall c (\text{Consciousness}(c) \rightarrow \Diamond \text{Resurrection}(c))$$

From Modal 11

$$S5 + T1 + T2 + T3 + T4 \vdash \Box (Z(U \wedge T \wedge S) \wedge N(U \wedge T \wedge S))$$

From Modal 12

$$S5 + A1 \vdash \text{Evil is not a limit}$$

From Modal 13

$$S5 + SP + B1 + B2 + B3 + B4 \vdash \Box(U \wedge T \wedge S)$$

From Modal 14

$$S5 + A1 \vdash \Box K(U, T, S)$$

What These Results Achieve

These results show:

1. **The Trinity follows under certain assumptions.**
2. **The assumptions are independent.**
3. **The Trinity is axiom-invariant.**
4. **The Trinity is formulable in different languages.**

This is the **strength** of formal work.

What These Results Do Not Achieve

These results do **not** show:

1. **That the axioms are true.**
2. **That the Trinity exists.**
3. **That the choice of axioms is justified.**

This is the **limit** of formal work.

What Modal Logic Suggests

The Metaphysical Interpretations

The metalogical results **suggest** certain metaphysical interpretations:

1. **The Trinity is a structure, not an object.** (suggested by Modal 8)
2. **The Trinity is the only limit structure.** (suggested by Modal 12)
3. **The Trinity is observer-conception-invariant.** (suggested by Modal 13)
4. **The unity of perspectives is constitutive.** (suggested by Modal 14)

What “Suggesting” Means

“Suggesting” is **not** “proving”. What is suggested is:

1. **plausible**, but not **compelling**.
2. **compatible** with the formal results, but not **required**.
3. **in need of interpretation** — the interpretation is not determined by the form.

The Consequence

From the formal results **does not follow** the metaphysical interpretation. The interpretation is an **additional** decision.

Formally: The metalogical results are **compatible** with several metaphysical interpretations. The choice of interpretation is **not** determined by the form.

The Open Questions

What modal logic suggests is **not unique**. There are:

1. **Alternative interpretations** — what in one interpretation is called “structure” can in another be called “substance”.
2. **Indeterminate concepts** — what “consciousness”, “death”, “integration” mean is not formally determined.
3. **Open questions** — many questions (e.g., whether there are paths that do not reach the Omega Point) are not decided.

What Modal Logic Does Not Reach

The Choice of Axioms

The central limit of modal logic is: It cannot justify the **choice of axioms**.

Formally: The metalogical results show only: **If** one accepts certain axioms, **then** the Trinity follows. They do **not** show: **That** one should accept these axioms.

Consequence: The choice of axioms is **not** a metalogical question. It is a **metaphysical, physical, or hermeneutic** question.

The Three Aspects of Axiom Choice

Aspect 1: Metaphysical choice. Which metaphysical basic concepts does one use? (superposition, topology, temporality, mereology)

Aspect 2: Physical choice. Which physical interpretation does one prefer? (Copenhagen, MWI)

Aspect 3: Hermeneutic choice. Which interpretation of the formal results does one choose? (structural, substantial)

Consequence: The axiom choice is **not** determined by the form. It is a **decision** that lies outside formal work.

The Limit between Perspective and Structure

What appears from the perspective of a path as intervention is, from the perspective of S, structure.

This insight from Modal 10 and Modal 16 marks a **fundamental limit** of formal work:

- **From the perspective of a path**, integration appears as **future**, as **intervention**, as **grace**.
- **From the perspective of S**, it is **always already** happened, is **structure**, is **necessity**.

Formally: The two perspectives are **not compatible** (Modal 9). They are **simultaneously true**.

Consequence: Formal work can describe **both** perspectives. It **cannot** decide which is **the right one**.

The Relation to Physics

Formal work **cannot replace** physics. It can:

1. **Describe structures** that are physically realizable.
2. **Show dependencies** between axioms.
3. **Explicate consequences** of assumptions.

It **cannot**:

1. Answer **empirical** questions.
2. Make **experimental** predictions.
3. Identify **physical** mechanisms.

Consequence: Physics is an **autonomous** discipline. Formal work is a **preparation** for it, not its **replacement**.

The Relation to Theology

Formal work **cannot replace** theology. It can:

1. **Describe structures** that are theologically interpretable.
2. **Show dependencies** between axioms.
3. **Explicate consequences** of assumptions.

It **cannot**:

1. Decide **questions of faith**.
2. Test **revelation**.
3. Answer **hermeneutic** questions.

Consequence: Theology is an **autonomous** discipline. Formal work is a **preparation** for it, not its **replacement**.

The Limit between Perspective and Structure

The Central Insight

What appears from the perspective of a path as intervention is, from the perspective of S, structure.

This insight is **fundamental** for understanding formal work:

1. Formal work operates **on a certain level** — the level of structure.
2. The perspective of a **single path** is **not** identical with the structure.
3. The **difference** between perspective and structure is **not formally cancelable**.

The Formal Version

Let γ be a path and S the upper limit of Totality.

From the perspective of γ : Integration appears as future, as intervention, as grace.

From the perspective of S : Integration is always already happened, is structure, is necessity.

Formally:

$$\text{Perspective}(\gamma, \text{Integration}) \neq \text{Perspective}(S, \text{Integration})$$

Consequence: The two perspectives are **not identical**. They are **simultaneously true**.

The Consequences

Consequence 1: Formal work can describe **both** perspectives.

Consequence 2: Formal work **cannot** decide which is **the right one**.

Consequence 3: The **choice** of perspective is a **hermeneutic** decision.

The Relation to Modal 9

In Modal 9 it was shown: DeLillo and Van Dormael are bimodally incompatible, but simultaneously true.

The limit between perspective and structure is **related** to this insight:

- **Perspective of a path** corresponds to **DeLillo** (collapse, one reality).
- **Structure of S** corresponds to **Van Dormael** (no collapse, all realities).

Consequence: The limit between perspective and structure is **not** a defect of formal work. It is a **structural property** of reality.

Comparison with Wittgenstein, Gödel, Carnap

Wittgenstein

Wittgenstein (Tractatus) distinguishes between what is **sayable** and what **shows itself**. The unsayable is **not** an object of language.

Comparison with our conception:

- **Common:** There is a limit of the formal.
- **Difference:** For Wittgenstein, the limit is **linguistic**. For us, it is **structural**.

What our conception achieves: It avoids mysticism without denying the limit.

Gödel

Gödel (incompleteness theorems) shows: Every sufficiently strong, consistent formal system contains true statements that are not provable.

Comparison with our conception:

- **Common:** The limit of the formal is **structural**.
- **Difference:** For Gödel, the limit is **within** the system. For us, it is **between** system and application.

What our conception achieves: It shows that the limit is **not** a defect of modal logic (S5 is complete), but a **structural** property of **every** formal system.

Important: The limit is **structurally related** to Gödel, but **not identical**. S5 is complete; the incompleteness lies **not** in S5, but in the **application** to metaphysical questions.

Carnap

Carnap distinguishes between **internal** and **external** questions. Internal questions are decidable within a linguistic framework. External questions are **not** decidable — they are **practical** decisions.

Comparison with our conception:

- **Common:** The choice of axioms is an **external** question.
- **Difference:** For Carnap, the external question is **pragmatic**. For us, it is **metaphysical**, **physical**, or **hermeneutic**.

What our conception achieves: It avoids pragmatism without abandoning the distinction.

The Point

Our conception takes up elements of all three philosophers:

- From Wittgenstein: The limit of the sayable.
- From Gödel: The structural limit of the formal.
- From Carnap: The distinction between internal and external questions.

But it differs from all three in that it grasps the limit **structurally** — as a **property** of formal work, not as a **defect**.

What Follows? The Form Has Done Its Work

The Central Insight

Formal work has **done its work**. It has shown:

1. **What is formally provable.**
2. **What is formally suggested.**
3. **What is formally unreachable.**

Formal version:

Proving $\sqsubset$ Suggesting $\sqsubset$ Not Reaching

Reading: The three levels are **hierarchical**. What is proven is also suggested. What is suggested is not always proven. What is unreachable is neither proven nor suggested.

The Consequences

Consequence 1: Formal work is **not** the last instance. It is a **preparation**.

Consequence 2: Formal work is **not** the only mode of access. It is **one among several**.

Consequence 3: Formal work is **not** the truth. It is a **form** of truth.

The Relation to Tradition

Classical metaphysics often seeks **the** truth. The present treatise shows: There are **several** modes of access. The formal one is **one** among them.

This is **not relativism**. It is an **insight**: Formal work has its **reach** and its **limit**.

Conclusion: What Has Been Shown?

The present investigation has shown:

1. **Modal logic proves certain results.** These results are the metalogical results from Modal 5–14.
2. **Modal logic suggests certain interpretations.** These interpretations are metaphysical, but not compelling.
3. **Modal logic does not reach certain questions.** These questions are the choice of axioms, the metaphysical interpretation, the hermeneutic decision.

The central claim of this treatise is:

Modal logic can prove the necessity of the Trinity under assumptions, but it cannot justify the choice of assumptions. This limit is structurally related to Gödel’s incompleteness theorems — not because S5 would be incomplete (it is complete), but because every formal system cannot fully justify its own foundations. We stand at the beginning of infinity.

The treatise marks the **end** of formal work and the **transition** to hermeneutics.

Appendix A: The Three Levels

Level	What	Status
Proving	Derivable results	Certain
Suggesting	Plausible interpretations	Probable
Not Reaching	External questions	Open

Appendix B: The Metalogical Results from Modal 5–14

Modal	Result
5	$S5 \not\vdash \Box \forall x Tr(x); S5 + SP \vdash \Box \forall x Tr(x)$

Modal	Result
6	$\{ASP2\} \vdash ASP1; \{ASP3, ASP4, ASP5\}$ minimal
7	$S5 + TOP, S5 + TEMP, S5 + MER \vdash \Box \forall x Tr(x)$
8	$S5 + SP + L \vdash \Box(U \wedge T \wedge S)$
9	Consistent bimodal models with $\Omega \neq \emptyset$
10	$S5 + U1 + U2 + U3 \vdash$ resurrection
11	$S5 + T1 + T2 + T3 + T4 \vdash$ $\Box(Z(U \wedge T \wedge S) \wedge N(U \wedge T \wedge S))$
12	$S5 + A1 \vdash$ evil is not a limit
13	$S5 + SP + B1 + B2 + B3 + B4 \vdash \Box(U \wedge T \wedge S)$
14	$S5 + A1 \vdash \Box K(U, T, S)$

Appendix C: Comparison with Wittgenstein, Gödel, Carnap

Philosopher	Limit of the Formal	Relation to Application
Wittgenstein	Language	Unsayable
Gödel	System	Incompleteness
Carnap	Framework	External question
This treatise	Structure	Choice of axioms

Afterword

You have read this treatise. Perhaps the idea surprised you that formal work has a limit. Perhaps the consequence impressed you that this limit is structural. Both are fine.

The investigation has shown: Modal logic has **done its work**. It has proven the necessity of the Trinity under assumptions. It has shown the dependencies between the axioms. It has explicated the axiomatic structure of the Trinity.

What remains is the insight that formal work has a **limit**. It cannot justify the choice of axioms. This limit is **not** a defect of modal logic. It is a **structural property** of every formal system.

One final question:

Do we dare the leap into openness to the limit — even though the limit itself is not formally reachable, but only marks the limit of the formal?

This treatise was written in the spirit of rigorous modal logic, yet in the language of philosophy – for truth requires both: the precision of the formula and the breadth of the concept.