

Metaphysical problem of why there is something instead of nothing

© Copyright 2018 by Colin James III All rights reserved.

We assume the method and apparatus of Meth8/VL4 with τ as the designated *proof* value, F as contradiction, N as truthity (non-contingency), and C as falsity (contingency). The 16-valued truth table is row-major and horizontal.

LET \sim Not; $\&$ And; $>$ Imply, greater than; $=$ Equivalent; $@$ Not Equivalent;
necessity, for all; % possibility, for one or some;
($p=p$) thing, tautology; ($p@p$) nothing, contradiction; $\%(p=p)$ some thing.

From: en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_unsolved_problems_in_philosophy
en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Problem_of_why_there_is_anything_at_all

"Why there is something rather than nothing." (1.0)

We rewrite Eq. 1.0 as a logical expression of "Nothing implies something." (1.1)

$(p@p)>\%(p=p)$; TTTT TTTT TTTT TTTT (1.2)

"Why there is anything rather than nothing." (2.0)

We rewrite Eq. 2.0 as a logical expression of "Nothing implies anything". (2.1)

The difference from Eq. 1.1 is in the modal or quantified operator in the consequent going from possibility to necessity or from one/some to all.

$(p@p)>\#(p=p)$; TTTT TTTT TTTT TTTT (2.2)

Eqs. 1.2 and 2.2 as rendered are tautologous, meaning anything comes from nothing.

The problem is resolved in the answer that nothing can *not* come from anything.

Remark: By contrast in classical logic, the negation of Eq. 1.1 as $\text{Not}(\text{Eq. 1.1})$ is "nothing can not come from something". In other words, "something cannot imply nothing". This is because contradiction on the implication connective is where truth implies false, disallowed as a proof.