Refutation of "some thing" from "non thing"

© Copyright 2018 by Colin James III All rights reserved.

(1.0)

Abstract:

A variable implies itself in

 $p \rightarrow p$ or $\sim p \rightarrow \sim p$ as "Thing implies thing" or "Non thing implies non thing" but *not* when mixed with its negation in

 \sim p \rightarrow p or p \rightarrow \sim p as "Non thing implies thing" or "Thing implies non thing".

This means creation out of nothing "ex nihilo" is not supported in

 $\sim p \rightarrow p$ as "Non thing implies thing",

or by introducing modal operators in

 $\sim \diamond p \rightarrow \diamond p$ as "Not some thing implies some thing" equivalent to

 $\neg p \rightarrow p$ as "All non things imply some thing".

What follows is that

"ex nihilo" is not equivalent to "a nullo"

and that

"ex nihilo" is not synonymous with God and hence not an ontological proof of God.

We assume the method and apparatus of Meth8/VŁ4 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, ~p, %p, ~%p: thing, non thing, some thing, not some thing ~ Not; > Imply, →; % possibility, for one or some, ⋄; # necessity, for all or every, □.

Remark: The word "nothing" is rendered here as "non thing" to preserve the distinction of the negation of "thing". To equate "nothing" with "not a thing" is also inexact because "a thing" is "some thing", as "one thing", as opposed to just "thing".

From: scottmsullivan.com/articles/NihilCh1.pdf

"[O]ut of nothing, nothing comes," as

Non thing implies non thing. ~p>~p;	TTTT TTTT TTTT TTTT	(1.1) (1.2)
Thing implies thing. p> p;	TTTT TTTT TTTT TTTT	(2.1) (2.2)
Non thing implies thing. $\sim p > p$;	FTFT FTFT FTFT FTFT	(3.1) (3.2)
Thing implies non thing. $p > p$;	TFTF TFTF TFTF TFTF	(4.1) (4.2)

Remark 1-4: Eqs. 1-4 deal with the variable "thing" and its negation "non thing". Only Eqs. 1.2 and 2.2 are tautologous. Eqs. 3.2 and 4.2 as opposites attempt to imply thing from non thing or vice versa. Using Eq. 3.2 to support creation via "ex nihilo" is a mistake because God pre-existed and hence was *some* thing below.

We further refine "thing" to mean "at least one thing "or "some thing".

Not something implies not something.

$$\sim \% p > \% p$$
; CTCT CTCT CTCT CTCT (7.2)

(5.1)

Remark 7.2: Eq. 7.2 reduces to # p > % p, as All non things imply some thing.

Some thing implies not some thing. (8.1)
$$p > p > p$$
; NFNF NFNF NFNF NFNF (8.2)

Remark 8.2: Eq. 8.2 reduces to %p>#~p, as Some thing implies all non things.

Remark 5-8: Eqs. 5-8 introduce modal operators. Only Eqs. 5.2 and 6.2 are tautologous. Eqs. 7.2 and 8.2 as opposites attempt to imply some thing from not some thing or vice versa. Using Eq. 7.2 to support creation via ex nihilo is a mistake because God pre-existed and hence already was *some* thing and not null as "a nullo".