

УДК 16+17+2+51-7
DOI: 10.17223/1998863X/47/9

V.O. Lobovikov

ANALYTICAL THEOLOGY: GOD'S OMNIPOTENCE AS A FORMAL-AXIOLOGICAL LAW OF THE TWO-VALUED ALGEBRA OF FORMAL ETHICS (DEMONSTRATING THE LAW BY "COMPUTING" RELEVANT EVALUATION-FUNCTIONS)¹

The paper submits a significantly new method for analytical theology – mathematical representing and solving knotty problems of theology by means of constructing and investigating their discrete mathematical models at the level of artificial language of algebraic system of formal ethics. For the first time God's omnipotence is formulated by the artificial language and demonstrated as a formal-axiological law by "computing" relevant evaluation-functions².

Keywords: *algebra-of-formal-ethics, formal-axiological-equivalence, formal-axiological-contradiction, formal-axiological-law, omnipotence-of-God³.*

We proceed thus to the Third Article: It seems that God is not omnipotent. ... Further, sin is an act of some kind. But God cannot sin, nor deny Himself, as it is said II Tim. 2. 13. Therefore He is not omnipotent. ... On the contrary, it is said: No word shall be impossible with God (Luke I. 37). I answer that, All confess that God is omnipotent; but it seems difficult to explain in what His omnipotence consists...

*Thomas Aquinas. Summa Theologica
(Part I. Question 25. Article 3)*

1. Introduction

The knotty paradoxical problem of omnipotence came to us from ancient times: Augustine [1]; Pseudo-Dionysius [2]; Aquinas [3]; Descartes [4]; Leibniz [5]. Today there are plenty of profound theological and philosophical writings devoted to this problem [6–33]. Therefore, publishing a new article on this topic can be justified only if it submits a really new nontrivial attitude missed by the others.

¹ **Заголовок (рус.):** Аналитическая теология: всемогущество Бога как формально-аксиологический закон в двузначной алгебре формальной этики (Обоснование этого закона "вычислением" соответствующих ценностных функций).

² **Аннотация (рус.):** предлагается качественно новый метод для аналитической теологии – математическое моделирование и разрешение сложных проблем теологии посредством конструирования и исследования дискретных математических моделей этих проблем на уровне искусственного языка алгебраической системы формальной этики. Впервые всемогущество бога формулируется на этом искусственном языке и обосновывается как формально-аксиологический закон путем «вычисления» соответствующих ценностных функций.

³ **Ключевые слова (рус.):** алгебра формальной этики, формально-аксиологическая эквивалентность, формально-аксиологическое противоречие, формально-аксиологический закон, всемогущество Бога.

I think that this is just the case. The above-mentioned authors have concentrated almost all their attention on proper logic semantics of the natural language used in discussing the omnipotence problem. As a rule, theologians and philosophers have discussed *statements of being or non-being* (or possibility or impossibility) of the omnipotence. *Statements of (moral) value* of the omnipotence are presumed but they do not undergo a systematical *formal-axiological* analysis using discrete mathematics. Therefore, the submitted paper is targeted at rational filling in this blank in the literature on the topic. To make the text understandable first of all it is indispensable to introduce, precisely to define, and to instantiate the minimal set of basic definitions necessary and sufficient for proving strictly that God's omnipotence is a *formal-ethical law* of the *algebraic system of formal ethics*. Therefore, let us introduce the novel conceptual apparatus (new terms) systematically to be used below for obtaining the result.

2. A Two-Valued Algebraic System of Formal Ethics (A Set of Basic Definitions Necessary-And-Sufficient for Proving Strictly That God's Omnipotence Is a Formal-Ethical Law of the Algebraic System)

In this part of the paper, I make the reader aware of the basic definitions of algebra of formal ethics which are already published, for instance, in [34–42]. Starting with this already published set of basic definitions is necessary for understanding the substantially novel nontrivial result submitted in this article. The paper's novel statement of provability of the formal-ethical law of omnipotence of God by computing relevant moral-evaluation-functions is still not published elsewhere.

Two-valued algebra of formal ethics is based upon the set A of either moral acts or moral agents (persons). By definition, moral acts are such and only such operations, which are either good, or bad ones in the moral meaning of the words "good" and "bad". In general, any elements of A (and, in particular, any moral agents) are such and only such entities which are either good, or bad ones in the moral meaning of the words "good" and "bad". The set A is homogenized by accepting such an identity-abstraction according to which an agent (person) is identified with the compound moral action uniting all moral acts of that person in his conduct as a whole. Thus, a moral agent is nothing but his complex moral act (called his moral life as a whole) made up by all his moral acts.

Algebraic operations defined on the set A are moral-evaluation-functions (or moral-value-ones). Moral-evaluation-variables of these functions take their values from the set $\{g, b\}$. Here the symbols "g" and "b" stand for the moral values "good" and "bad", respectively. The functions take their values from the same set. The symbols: "x" and "y" stand for moral-forms of acts (or agents). Elementary moral-act-or-agent-forms deprived of their contents are independent moral-evaluation-variables. Compound moral-act-or-agent-forms deprived of their contents are moral-evaluation-functions determined by these variables.

Let symbol Σ stand for the *moral evaluator*, i.e. the person (individual or collective one – it does not matter), in relation to whom all evaluations are generated. In the moral-evaluation-relativity theory, Σ is a variable: changing values of the variable Σ can result in changing moral evaluations of concrete acts and agents. However, if a value of the variable Σ is fixed, then moral evaluations of concrete acts and agents are definite.

Speaking of moral-value functions in this paper, I mean the following mappings (in the proper mathematical meaning of the word “mapping”): $\{g, b\} \rightarrow \{g, b\}$, if one speaks of the moral-value functions determined by *one* moral-value variable; $\{g, b\} \times \{g, b\} \rightarrow \{g, b\}$, where “ \times ” stands for the Cartesian multiplication of sets, if one speaks of the moral-value functions determined by *two* moral-value variables; $\{g, b\}^N \rightarrow \{g, b\}$, if one speaks of the moral-value functions determined by *N* moral-value variables, where *N* is a finite positive integer.

Below let us consider some concrete examples of mathematically elementary moral-value-functions immediately related to the theme of this article. Let us start with the functions determined by *one* moral-value variable.

The *glossary* for the below-submitted moral-value-table 1: Let the symbol *Bx* stand for the moral-value function “*being (existence), life of (what, whom) x*”. *Nx* stands for the moral-value function “*non-being (nonexistence), death of (what, whom) x*”. *Gx* stands for the moral-value function “*God of (what, whom) x in monotheistic world religion*”. *Ix* stands for the moral-value-function “*god¹ of (what, whom) x in polytheistic local (barbaric) religion*”. *Dx* means the moral-value-function “*daemon of x in polytheistic local religion*”. *Ax* – “*Anti-God (God’s Enemy) of (what, whom) x in monotheistic world religion*”. *Zx* means the moral-value function “*self-destruction, self-extermination, suicide of (what, whom) x*”. *Px* means the moral-value function “*self-preservation, self-conservation, self-protection, self-defense of (what, whom) x*”. The introduced functions are defined by the following Table 1. (This tabular definition may be found in [41; 42].)

Table 1. The Unary Functions

<i>x</i>	<i>Bx</i>	<i>Nx</i>	<i>Gx</i>	<i>Ix</i>	<i>Dx</i>	<i>Ax</i>	<i>Zx</i>	<i>Px</i>
<i>g</i>	<i>g</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>g</i>	<i>g</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>g</i>
<i>b</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>g</i>	<i>g</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>g</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>g</i>

The *glossary* for the below-submitted moral-value-table 2: Let the symbol *L₂xy* stand for the moral-value-function “*necessity of y for x*”. (The lower numerical index 2 informs that the indexed capital letter stands for a moral-value-function determined by *two* arguments.) *The symbol M₂xy* stands for the moral-value-function “*possibility of y for x*”. *I₂xy* stands for the moral-value-function “*impossibility of y for x*”. *F₂xy* – “*x’s freedom from y*”, i.e. “*nonbeing of necessity of y for x*”. These functions are defined by Table 2. (The tabular definition may be found in [34; 35; 37–39; 43; 44].)

Table 2. The Binary Functions

#	<i>x</i>	<i>y</i>	<i>L₂xy</i>	<i>M₂xy</i>	<i>I₂xy</i>	<i>F₂xy</i>
1	<i>g</i>	<i>g</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>g</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>g</i>
2	<i>g</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>g</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>g</i>
3	<i>b</i>	<i>g</i>	<i>g</i>	<i>g</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>b</i>
4	<i>b</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>g</i>	<i>g</i>

¹ In the glossary for Table 1 in one sentence the word “God” starts with the capital letter “G” but in another sentence the word “god” starts with the small letter “g”. Here it is worth emphasizing that this is not a mistake by negligence: this is implemented on principle. The deliberately implemented difference indicates to the important difference of formal-axiological meanings of the word in *monotheistic world religions* and *polytheistic local ones*. It is easy to see the significant difference between the two formal-axiological meanings of the word, i.e. between the two moral-value-functions *Gx* and *Ix*, by attentive comparing their tabular definitions (see Table 1).

Definition 1 (of *formal-ethical-equivalence*-relation): in two-valued algebraic system of formal ethics, moral-evaluation-functions (moral-forms of human activity) Ω and Ψ are *formally-ethically equivalent* (this is represented by the symbol “ $\Psi = + = \Omega$ ”), if and only if they acquire identical moral values (from the set $\{g$ (*good*), b (*bad*) $\}$) under any possible combination of moral values of their moral-evaluation-variables.

Definition 2 (of *formal-ethical law*): in two-valued algebra of formal ethics, a moral-evaluation-function (moral activity form) is called *formally-ethically (or invariantly) good* one (or a *law* of algebra of formal ethics), if and only if it acquires the moral value g (*good*) under any possible combination of moral values of its variables.

Definition 3: (of *formal-ethical contradiction*): in two-valued algebra of formal ethics, a moral-evaluation-function is called *formally-ethically (or invariantly) bad* one, if and only if it acquires the moral value b (*bad*) under any possible combination of moral values of its variables.

Now the set of basic definitions necessary and sufficient for constructing the above-promised proof (of God’s omnipotence as the formal-ethical law of the algebraic system) is already presented. Therefore, let us start proving.

3. Proving the Formal-Ethical Law of God’s Omnipotence by Computing Moral-Evaluation-Functions and Systematic Using the Above-Given Definitions

As (according to the table 1) it is true that $Gx = + = g$, only Rows 1 and 2 of Table 2 are relevant to the main theme of the article. Attentively looking at these rows one can see that the following four equations are true.

1) $L_2gy = + = b$.

2) $I_2gy = + = b$.

3) $F_2gy = + = g$.

4) $M_2gy = + = g$.

From the above four equations it is easy to obtain the below four ones, respectively, by substituting Gx for g (as according to the table 1 it is true that $Gx = + = g$).

5) $L_2Gxy = + = b$: *necessity* of some (any) y for God (of x) is a *formal-axiological contradiction*.

6) $I_2Gxy = + = b$: *impossibility* of some (any) y for God (of x) is a *formal-axiological contradiction*.

7) $F_2Gxy = + = g$: the *formal-axiological law of God’s freedom*: any y is *not-necessary* for God (of x).

8) $M_2Gxy = + = g$: the *formal-axiological law of God’s omnipotence*: any y (i.e. everything) is *possible* for God (of x).

Thus, constructing the proof is finished. Here you are. From the purely mathematical technical viewpoint the submitted proof is surprisingly elementary, but I think that from the conceptual metaphysical viewpoint it is quite nontrivial. In any way, it is worth recognizing that accepting all the above-given nontrivial definitions necessarily results in accepting God’s omnipotence as the *formal-ethical law*.

His omnipotence is not the only *law of algebra of formal ethics* important for mathematical theology as a system of the laws. According to the following equation also *God’s existence is the formal-ethical law*.

9) $BGx = + = g$.

Consequently, the existence and omnipotence of God are quite compatible. Moreover, according to the below equation, they are equivalent.

10) $BGx = + = M_2Gxy$.

However, it is quite natural to expect that normal human creatures equipped with commonsense, formal logic, and empirical knowledge of facts can generate a lot of alleged objections against the above-submitted seemingly paradoxical equations 1–10. Also, it is quite natural that, in fact, many of such objections are already generated, presented, and discussed in the literature, for instance, in works of Englebretsen [7], Frankfurt [8], Mavrodes [22], Rosenkrantz and Hoffman [25; 26], Ramsey [27], Savage [29], Schlesinger [31] et al.

Nevertheless, I think that often the so-called refutations of God's omnipotence are not proper refutations but illusions of the ones naturally produced by the ambiguity and homonymy of the words "is", "means", "implies", "entails", "equivalence", "compatibility", "inconsistency", etc. in the natural language [42]. I think so because often the refutations invented (artificially constructed on purpose) and submitted by the sophisticated critics contain a well-camouflaged and hence not-recognized violation of the principle of logic autonomy of moral-values (evaluations) and facts. According to this principle, it is strictly forbidden to make up a formal logic inference from purely evaluative *a priori* statements to purely factual *a posteriori* ones and conversely. Generally speaking, it is not logical to go from empirical "what is" to "what is good" and from "what is good" to empirical "what is". In general, the gap is unbridgeable by means of formal logic-inference rules. Forbidden attempts to bridge up this gap by logic-inferences generate various paradoxes which could be dissolved by systematical using the logic-autonomy principle. In accordance with this principle the above equations 1–10 *only seem* paradoxical from the empirical viewpoint because they are not logic connections of empirical statements about facts but *a priori* formal-ethical statements about formal-axiological relations between moral-value-functions.

References

1. Augustine, St. (1994) *The Confessions. The City of God. On Christian Doctrine*. In: Adler, M. (ed.). *Great Books of the Western World*. Vol. 16. Chicago; Auckland; London; Madrid: Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc.
2. Pseudo-Dionysius, Areopagite. (1980) *The Divine Names and Mystical Theology*. Milwaukee: Marquette University Press.
3. Aquinas, St. Thomas. (1994) *The Summa Theologica*. V.I. In: Adler, M. (ed.) *Great Books of the Western World*. Vol. 17. Chicago; Auckland; London; Madrid: Encyclopaedia Britannica.
4. Descartes, R. (1994) *Meditations on First Philosophy*. In: Adler, M. (ed.) *Great Books of the Western World*. Vol. 28. Chicago; Auckland; London; Madrid: Encyclopaedia Britannica. pp. 295–519.
5. Leibniz, G.W. (1952) *Theodicy: Essays on the Goodness of God, the Freedom of Man, and the Origin of Evil*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
6. Conee, E. (1991) The Possibility of Power Beyond Possibility. *Philosophical Perspectives*. 5. pp. 447–473. DOI: 10.2307/2214105
7. Englebretsen, G.F. (1971) The Incompatibility of God's Existence and Omnipotence. *Sophia*. 10. pp. 28–31.
8. Frankfurt, H.G. (1964) The Logic of Omnipotence. *Philosophical Review*. 73. pp. 262–263. DOI: 10.2307/2183341
9. Geach, P.T. (1973) Omnipotence. *Philosophy*. 48. pp. 7–20.
10. Grave, S.A. (1956) On Evil and Omnipotence. *Mind*. 65. pp. 259–262. DOI: 10.1093/mind/65.1.259

11. Hill, D.J. (2005) *Divinity and Maximal Greatness*. London: Routledge.
12. Hoffman, J. (1979) Mavrodes on Defining Omnipotence. *Philosophical Studies*. 35. pp. 311–313. DOI: 10.1007/BF00357701
13. Hoffman, J. (1979) Can God Do Evil? *Southern Journal of Philosophy*. 17. pp. 213–220. DOI: 10.1111/j.2041-6962.1979.tb00238.x
14. Hoffman, J. & Rosenkrantz, G. (1988) Omnipotence Redux. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*. 49. pp. 283–301.
15. Hoffman, J. & Rosenkrantz, G. (2002) *The Divine Attributes*. Oxford: Blackwell.
16. Hoffman, J. & Rosenkrantz, G. (2010) Omnipotence. In: Taliaferro, C., Draper, P. & Quinn, P. (eds). *A Companion to Philosophy of Religion*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell. pp. 243–250.
17. Hoffman, J. & Rosenkrantz, G. (2014) Omnipotence. In: Zalta, E. (ed.) *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. [Online] Available from: <https://plato.stanford.edu/>. (Accessed: 16 February 2016.)
18. Kenny, A. (1979) *The God of the Philosophers*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
19. Khamara, E.J. (1978) In Defense of Omnipotence. *Philosophical Quarterly*. 28. pp. 215–228. DOI: 10.2307/2218842
20. Mackie, J.L. (1955) Evil and Omnipotence. *Mind*. 64. pp. 200–212. DOI: 10.1093/mind/LXIV.254.200
21. Mackie, J.L. (1962) Omnipotence. *Sophia*. 1. pp. 13–25.
22. Mavrodes, G.I. (1963) Some Puzzles Concerning Omnipotence. *Philosophical Review*. 72. pp. 221–223. DOI: 10.2307/2183106
23. Pike, N. (1969) Omnipotence and God's Ability to Sin. *American Philosophical Quarterly*. 6. pp. 208–216.
24. Plantinga, A. (1974) *God, Freedom, and Evil*. New York: Harper and Row.
25. Rosenkrantz, G. & Hoffman, J. (1980) The Omnipotence Paradox, Modality, and Time. *Southern Journal of Philosophy*. 18. pp. 473–479. DOI: 10.1111/j.2041-6962.1980.tb01400.x
26. Rosenkrantz, G. & Hoffman, J. (1980) What An Omnipotent Agent Can Do. *International Journal for Philosophy of Religion*. 11. pp. 1–19. DOI: 10.1007/BF00138761
27. Ramsey, I.T. (1956) The Paradox of Omnipotence. *Mind*. 65. pp. 263–266.
28. Rowe, W.L. (2004) *Can God be Free?* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
29. Savage, W. (1967) The Paradox of the Stone. *Philosophical Review*. 76. pp. 74–79.
30. Schlesinger, G. (1965) Omnipotence and Evil: An Incoherent Problem. *Sophia*. 4. pp. 21–24.
31. Swineburne, R. (1973) Omnipotence. *American Philosophical Quarterly*. 10. pp. 231–37.
32. Urban, L. & Douglass, W. (eds) (1978) *The Power of God: readings on Omnipotence and Evil*. New York: Oxford University Press.
33. Wierenga, E.R. (1989) *The Nature of God: An Inquiry into Divine Attributes*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
34. Lobovikov, V.O. (2007) Aristotelian and Juridical Modalities: A New Theory of Their Unity (A Two-Valued Algebra of Formal Natural-Law Philosophy of Modalities as Moral-Legal Evaluation-Functions Determined by Two Variables – A Complement to G. H. Wright's Deontic Logic Interpretation of G. W. Leibniz's Idea about the Unity of the Two Kinds of Modalities). *Revista da Faculdade de Direito de Conselheiro Lafaiete*. 3. pp. 181–187.
35. Lobovikov, V.O. (2007) *Matematicheskaya etika, metafizika i estestvennoe pravo (Algebra metafiziki kak algebra formal'noy aksiologii)* [Mathematical ethics, metaphysics and natural law (Algebra of metaphysics as an algebra of formal axiology)]. Ekaterinburg: Institute of Philosophy and Law.
36. Lobovikov, V.O. (2009a) Mathematical Logic as a Particular Case of Mathematical Ethics: Algebra of Formal Ethics as a Generalization of Algebra of Formal Logic. In: Drossos, C., Peppas, P. & Tsinakis, C. (eds). *Proceedings of the 7th Panhellenic Logic Symposium (PLS7)*. Patras University, Greece. July 15–19, 2009. Patras: Patras University Press. pp. 109–111.
37. Lobovikov, V.O. (2009b) Modal Logic and Formal Axiology of Alethic and Epistemic Modalities. In: Drossos, C., Peppas, P. & Tsinakis, C. (eds). *Proceedings of the 7th Panhellenic Logic Symposium (PLS7)*. Patras University, Greece. July 15–19, 2009. Patras: Patras University Press. pp. 112–116.
38. Lobovikov, V.O. (2010) Between Writing and Picturing: The Square of Opposition in Formal Logic and Formal Axiology of Alethic and Deontic Modalities. In: Nemeth, E., Heinrich, R. & Pichler, W. (eds). *Image and Imaging in Philosophy, Science, and the Arts*. Papers of the 33rd International Wittgenstein Symposium. Kirchberg am Wechsel, Lower Austria. August 8–14, 2010. Vol. XVIII. Kirchberg am Wechsel: Austrian Ludwig Wittgenstein Society. pp. 183–185.

39. Lobovikov, V.O. (2011) Discrete Mathematical Representing G. W. Leibniz' Philosophy of Law, Morals and Theology by Means of Two-Valued Algebra of the Natural Law (Studying Moral-legal Evaluation-Functions Determined by Two Variables in Algebra of Formal Axiology). In: Breger, H., Herbst, J. & Erdner, S. (eds). *XI International Leibniz-Congress "Nature and Subject" under the Auspices of Federal President*. Hannover. September 26 – October 1, 2011). Vol. 2. Berlin: Akademie Verlag; Bahlsen GmbH & Co. KG. pp. 611–615.

40. Lobovikov, V.O. (2014) Algebra of Morality and Formal Ethics. In: Bronk, K. (ed.) *Looking Back to See the Future: Reflections on Sins and Virtues*. Oxford, UK: Inter-Disciplinary Press. pp. 17–41.

41. Lobovikov, V.O. (2015a) The principle of compositionality in formal axiological semantics of the natural language (evaluation-functions determined by a finite number of evaluation-variables in two-valued algebraic system of formal axiology as meanings of words and complex word. *Izvestiya Ural'skogo Federal'nogo universiteta. Seriya 3: Obshchestvennye nauki – Izvestia Ural Federal University Journal. Series 3. Social and Political Sciences*. 10(2). pp. 84–97. (In Russian).

42. Lobovikov, V.O. (2015b) The Trinity Triangle and the Homonymy of the Word "Is" in Natural Language (A Logically Consistent Discrete Mathematical Representation of the Trinity by Means of Algebra of Morality and Formal Ethics). *Philosophy Study*. 5(7). pp. 327–341. DOI: 10.17265/2159-5313/2015.07.001

Vladimir O. Lobovikov, Institute of Philosophy and Law of the Ural Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences (Yekaterinburg, Russian Federation).

E-mail: vlobovikov@mail.ru

Vestnik Tomskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Filosofiya. Sotsiologiya. Politologiya – Tomsk State University Journal of Philosophy, Sociology and Political Science. 2019. 47. pp. 87–94.

DOI: 10.17223/1998863X/47/9

ANALYTICAL THEOLOGY: GOD'S OMNIPOTENCE AS A FORMAL-AXIOLOGICAL LAW OF THE TWO-VALUED ALGEBRA OF FORMAL ETHICS (DEMONSTRATING THE LAW BY "COMPUTING" RELEVANT EVALUATION-FUNCTIONS)

Keywords: algebra-of-formal-ethics; formal-axiological-equivalence; formal-axiological-contradiction; formal-axiological-law; omnipotence-of-God.

The paper submits a significantly novel method for analytical theology – discrete mathematical representing and solving knotty problems of theology by means of constructing and investigating their models at the level of the artificial language of the algebraic system of formal ethics. For the first time in the world literature, the religion tenet of omnipotence-of-God is formulated by the artificial language and proved as a formal-axiological law by computing relevant moral-evaluation-tables in two-valued algebra of formal ethics. From the viewpoint of pure mathematics, the submitted demonstration of the moral-value-functional law in question is quite elementary but from the conceptual theological point of view God's omnipotence as a formal-axiological-law of mentioned algebra is quite nontrivial and psychologically unexpected one. After a short historical-philosophical introduction into the philosophical theology problem, the author gives a set of basic definitions necessary-and-sufficient for accomplishing, testing, and perfect understanding the submitted original proving by "computing". Among the given basic definitions, one can find precise definitions of the notions "two-valued algebra of formal ethics", "moral-value-form-(of-actions)", "moral-evaluation-function", "formal-ethical-(axiological)-equivalence-of-evaluation-functions", "formal-ethical-contradiction", "formal-ethical-law". In addition to these definitions, which are basic ones for the two-valued algebraic system of formal ethics in general, by means of moral-value-tables, the author gives tabular definitions of the specific philosophical-theology notions involved in formulating and solving the problem in question. Namely, by means of moral-value-tables, moral-value-functional meanings of the terms "God (of x)", "necessity of y for x ", "possibility of y for x ", "impossibility of y for x ", "contingency of y for x ", etc., are defined precisely. Thus, a hitherto non-recognized possibility is created to construct and investigate various compositions of the unary and binary moral-value-functions within the algebraic system of formal ethics. For the first time in the world literature on philosophical theology, this possibility is realized in the paper, namely, relevant compositions of moral-value-functions ["God (of x)", "necessity of y for x ", "possibility of y for x ", "impossibility of y for x ", "contingency of y for x "] are constructed and studied systematically. By means of accurate "computing" the relevant compositions of moral-value-functions, it is demonstrated in the paper that "God is almighty: everything is possible for Him; nothing is impossible for Him" is the law of algebra of formal ethics.