
Formalizing Absence: Ontological Framework Between Zero, \emptyset , and Symbolic Non-being Toward a Symbolic Metaphysics of Absence and Unrepresentability

[Orhan Oguz Yilmaz](#)*

Posted Date: 8 July 2025

doi: 10.20944/preprints202506.1590.v2

Keywords: Nothingness; Ontology; Absence; Zero (0); Empty Set (\emptyset); Symbolic Logic; Metaphysical Syntax; Ontological Matrix; Potentiality; Void; Negation; Apophatic Theology; Computational Metaphysics; Limits of Representation; Being



Preprints.org is a free multidisciplinary platform providing preprint service that is dedicated to making early versions of research outputs permanently available and citable. Preprints posted at Preprints.org appear in Web of Science, Crossref, Google Scholar, Scilit, Europe PMC.

Copyright: This open access article is published under a Creative Commons CC BY 4.0 license, which permit the free download, distribution, and reuse, provided that the author and preprint are cited in any reuse.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions, and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions, or products referred to in the content.

Article

Formalizing Absence: Ontological Framework Between Zero, \emptyset , and Symbolic Non-Being Toward a Symbolic Metaphysics of Absence and Unrepresentability

Orhan Oğuz YILMAZ

Independent Researcher; orhanoguzyilmaz@hotmail.com

Abstract

This paper examines the ontological and symbolic dimensions of absence and nothingness through a multi-layered analysis spanning classical philosophy, existentialism, and contemporary metaphysics. It distinguishes between three conceptual modalities: the absence within being, the metaphysical zero as a formal placeholder, and the unrepresentable \emptyset as a limit-concept. Drawing from ancient sources such as Parmenides and Democritus, and extending through Heidegger, Sartre, and modern symbolic logic, the study proposes an ontological model wherein \emptyset is not a void but a pre-representational fold—neither being nor non-being. The paper further engages with thermodynamic entropy and mathematical nullity to support its thesis that symbolic nothingness functions as a condition of potentiality rather than negation. The aim is to bridge metaphysical abstraction with formal semantics, suggesting a new philosophical grammar for understanding absence beyond binary opposition. Implications for the philosophy of language, cosmology, and negative theology are briefly discussed. Final construction offers not a closure, but a topology. Each symbol—1, 0, \emptyset —represents not a quantity, but a horizon. What follows is not a definition, but a diagram of metaphysical tension.

Keywords: nothingness; ontology; absence; zero (0); empty set (\emptyset), symbolic logic; metaphysical syntax; ontological matrix; potentiality; void; negation; apophatic theology; computational metaphysics; limits of representation; being

I. Introduction: The Problem of Nothingness

The sections that follow trace this distinction across classical philosophy, existential thought, symbolic formalism, and metaphysical abstraction—culminating in a proposed ontological matrix that outlines the boundaries of formal representation.

In ordinary language, the word “*nothing*” is often used in a pragmatic sense—to indicate the absence of a particular thing or condition. One might say, “There are no eggs in the refrigerator,” and another would reply, “There’s nothing,” without giving pause to the ontological implications of that claim. In such contexts, the absence is always tethered to a **known referent**—something that once was or could reasonably be expected to exist. Thus, this type of “nothing” is always **relational**: it refers to the lack of something within a meaningful system.

However, when we move from everyday speech to **philosophical analysis**, this casual clarity collapses. The distinction between *non-existence* and *nothingness* becomes not merely semantic, but **metaphysical**. Non-existence is still bound to **possibility**—It is the absence of presence, but not the absence of potential. *Nothingness*, in contrast, entails the absence of even potentiality¹. It is **not the**

¹ In traditional metaphysics, especially in the lineage from Parmenides to classical Scholastic thought, *nothingness* is conceived as a total negation—not only of being, but of potentiality itself. Heidegger, however, offers a decisive turn: in his 1929 lecture *What is Metaphysics?*, he argues that *das Nichts* (the Nothing) is not simply the opposite of being, but that which reveals being by withdrawing it—an ontological condition that

opposite of being, nor a form of lack —it is that which lies **outside** of being and becoming, outside even negation.

What we call “the absence of eggs” still invokes memory, language, and structure. It belongs to a system of symbolic presence. But *nothingness* cannot be recalled, pointed to, or even properly imagined. It does not lack being, it **precludes it**. And yet, paradoxically, we attempt to speak of it, to think it, and even to give it form —albeit through metaphor, abstraction, and paradox. It is no coincidence that thinkers from Parmenides to Heidegger have regarded this as a near-impossible task. As **Parmenides** famously warned, “*What is not cannot be thought.*”².

This essay aims to approach *nothingness* not as a void or vacuum, nor as an existential absence, but as a **condition of total undifferentiation** —a conceptual space **prior to presence, prior to possibility**, where neither being nor non-being has yet emerged. This view challenges the conventional metaphysical spectrum that places being and nothingness at opposite ends. We argue that this spectrum is incomplete. Between being and non-being lies **absence**, but beyond both lies **nothingness** —not as a quantity, but as a **limit-concept** (*Grenzbegriff*) in the Kantian sense³.

This paper draws a strict ontological distinction between **being**, **non-being**, and **nothingness**. **Being** refers to presence, form, and actuality. **Non-being** refers to the **absence of presence** —it still implies a possible referent. But **nothingness** is neither presence nor absence, neither potential nor negation. It is not form, not emptiness, not even possibility. It is a condition without conditions⁴: a **pre-formal field that cannot be thought, represented, or coded**. **Zero** is not identical with nothingness. Rather, it belongs to the **ontological interval between being and non-being** —that fleeting Aristotelian space where actuality has not yet arrived, and potentiality has not yet collapsed.

Rather than attempting to define or formalize nothingness—which would violate its very nature—we propose to **trace its periphery** through symbolic means. It is not that nothingness can be represented, but that it exerts pressure on the very structures that fail to contain it. Among these symbolic thresholds stands **zero**, not as a mirror of nothingness, but as a **boundary-marker** that indicates where **presence ends**, and **absence begins**. Zero is not a metaphysical void; it is the **lowest structural register** of presence—a **liminal syntax**, a **pause**, before actual being unfolds. In this sense, zero **mediates absence**, but does not *embody* nothingness.

This paper, therefore, does not claim to encode nothingness—such a gesture would be metaphysically incoherent. Instead, it argues that the symbolic systems we employ—language, mathematics, logic—are all **haunted by the outer contour of nothingness**, even though they cannot admit it directly. Zero functions not as the cipher of the void, but as a **codified silence**: a point of stasis in a world otherwise saturated by being and meaning. It lies not between being and nothingness, but precisely **within the ontological interstice between being and non-being** —a

cannot be derived from logic alone. Building on this, the paper treats \emptyset not as a mere lack or negation, but as a pre-formal horizon: a region anterior to both actuality and potentiality, where form has not yet differentiated and possibility has not yet crystallized. In this sense, \emptyset precedes the ontological polarity of being and non-being—it is not absence of potentiality, but absence *prior* to potentiality.

² Parmenides. “On Nature.” In G.S. Kirk, J.E. Raven, and M. Schofield, *The Presocratic Philosophers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

³ Kant, Immanuel. *Critique of Pure Reason*. Translated by Paul Guyer and Allen W. Wood. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.

⁴ This notion of a “condition without conditions” resonates with certain apophatic and transcendental traditions in metaphysics, where the origin or ground of being is said to be beyond all categories, including possibility. Similar formulations appear in Meister Eckhart’s notion of the “groundless ground,” or Kant’s *Grenzbegriff* (“limit-concept”)—where the condition of thought is not itself thinkable. In this paper, such a condition is termed \emptyset : a pre-symbolic domain that precedes all determinations and categorial predications.

temporary suspension that permits **thought, form, and measure**, while remaining ontologically distinct from both full presence and radical absence.

In doing so, this study aims to articulate a symbolic grammar for absence—one that distinguishes between ontological categories and repositions nothingness not as a logical negation, but as a metaphysical outside that destabilizes all representational frameworks.

The subsequent sections elaborate this framework through an interdisciplinary trajectory—beginning with classical metaphysical positions, advancing through existential philosophy, and culminating in symbolic formalism and a proposed ontological matrix mapping the boundaries of representational structure.

II. Classical Foundations: From Eleatics to Atomists

The Eleatic school, notably through Parmenides and his successor Melissus, introduced a radical principle that would reverberate throughout the history of metaphysics: only being is; non-being is not. In his didactic poem *On Nature*, Parmenides maintains that "what is, is", and "what is not, cannot be thought"⁵. This proposition, at once tautological and absolute, forms the basis of an ontological rationalism that denies the reality of change, becoming, or multiplicity. According to this framework, reality is a singular, unchanging, indivisible whole, and any perception of transformation is attributed to illusion or *doxa*.

Melissus extends this reasoning even further, asserting that if being is infinite, it must also be eternal, immobile, and incapable of suffering division⁶. Any attribution of movement or plurality implies a transition from being to non-being—an impossibility if non-being is excluded from rational discourse. What emerges from this logic is a doctrine of radical identity, one that privileges internal consistency over empirical observation.

However, this Eleatic logic, grounded in the law of non-contradiction, encounters substantial challenges when applied to the phenomenal world. The pre-Socratic atomists, notably Leucippus and Democritus, contested this rigid unity by positing the *void* as a structural necessity for motion and differentiation⁷. Later, Aristotle, in *Metaphysics*, critiques Parmenides for conflating ontological and logical categories, asserting that "being is said in many ways"⁸. For Aristotle, potentiality and actuality offer a more nuanced account of change, one that does not violate logical coherence.

In modern philosophy, Immanuel Kant reframes this tension through the concept of the *noumenon*: the "thing-in-itself" that exists independently of perception yet remains inaccessible to human cognition⁹. Kant acknowledges the limits of rational categories when applied beyond the bounds of experience, suggesting that ontological claims must be synthetically grounded in the conditions of appearance. In this sense, the Eleatic denial of non-being finds an echo in Kant's insistence that reason cannot reach beyond phenomena without contradiction.

Similarly, Baruch Spinoza, in his *Ethics*, advances a monistic ontology in which everything that exists is a modification of one infinite substance¹⁰. For Spinoza, there is no room for contingency or negation; nothing happens *ex nihilo*, and non-being has no reality. Yet, unlike Parmenides, Spinoza's God-substance is dynamic, immanent, and expressive—reality is not static unity but eternal causality.

What these engagements show is that the Eleatic commitment to the impossibility of non-being—while foundational—requires reinterpretation. In a dialectical or phenomenological frame, non-being may not exist, but functions relationally as a horizon, a negation, or an absence that gives form to presence. Hegel, for instance, treats being and nothing as dialectical moments—sublated in

⁵ Parmenides, *On Nature*.

⁶ Melissus. "Fragments." In McKirahan, *Philosophy Before Socrates*.

⁷ Leucippus and Democritus. In Kirk, Raven, and Schofield, *The Presocratic Philosophers*, 1983.

⁸ Aristotle. *The Complete Works of Aristotle: The Revised Oxford Translation*. 2 vols. Edited by Jonathan Barnes. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984.

⁹ Kant, *Critique of Pure Reason*.

¹⁰ Spinoza, Baruch. *Ethics*. In *The Collected Works of Spinoza*, vol. 1, edited and translated by Edwin Curley. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985.

the movement of becoming¹¹. And Heidegger, centuries later, will reassert that the question of Being must begin with a reckoning with *das Nichts*—the Nothing itself¹².

Thus, what begins as an ontological axiom in Parmenides evolves into a series of epistemic, logical, and existential tensions in modern thought. The law of non-contradiction may forbid non-being from being said, but it cannot prevent it from being felt, imagined, or invoked as a necessary boundary. In this way, the logic of being is never self-contained—it is shaped by the very limits it seeks to exclude.

To better understand how this theoretical tension gave rise to alternative metaphysical models, we must return to the earliest counterproposal offered in response to Parmenides.

Parmenides' denial of non-being and his insistence on the unity and immutability of being provoked one of the earliest ontological counterarguments in Western philosophy. In direct response to his static and monistic worldview, the atomist philosophers Leucippus and Democritus proposed a radically different ontological model—one that incorporated void (*kenon*, or vacuum) as a necessary condition for motion and multiplicity. Their innovation was not merely physical but metaphysical: the universe, they argued, consists of indivisible atoms that move within a backdrop of emptiness¹³. Without such a void, they contended, motion would be impossible, and Parmenides' world would remain a frozen totality.

Democritus famously declared that “what is” consists of both being (atoms) and non-being (the void)¹⁴. This formulation reintroduced nothingness into the philosophical conversation—not as an absolute absence, but as a structural condition that allows for the organization, rearrangement, and emergence of all forms. In atomist thought, nothingness becomes not the antithesis of being, but its enabling space. Atoms, though indivisible, can move, combine, and reconfigure only because they are suspended in a non-substantial matrix: the void is the hidden medium of all motion.

This conceptual shift represents a major departure from Parmenides' logic. While Parmenides refused to grant ontological status to non-being, atomists reframed the void as something that, although devoid of substance, still participates. Yet this move is not without contradiction. To assert that the void “exists” is to confer upon it a form of being, thereby undermining its status as nothing. As Bertrand Russell would later put it: “If the void exists, then it is not nothing; it is something, and hence not void¹⁵.” The atomist solution solves the problem of motion, but at the cost of creating a paradoxical category: a being of non-being.

The metaphor of a tree¹⁶ may be repurposed to illustrate this shift in thought. If a tree contains within its form the potential to become thousands of matchsticks, this transformation depends on both material structure (the atoms of the tree) and the void through which these atoms may be rearranged. Potentiality, in this framework, is inseparable from emptiness—not because emptiness has power, but because it grants being the freedom to become other. Void is no longer a negation, but a condition for transformation.

¹¹ Hegel, G.W.F. *Science of Logic: Book I – Being*. Translated by George di Giovanni.

¹² Martin Heidegger. “What is Metaphysics?” In *Pathmarks*, edited by William McNeill, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

¹³ Leucippus and Democritus, *The Presocratic Philosophers*.

¹⁴ Democritus. “Fragments.” In *The Presocratic Philosophers*, edited by Jonathan Barnes, London: Routledge.

¹⁵ Russell, Bertrand. *A History of Western Philosophy*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1945.

¹⁶ This metaphor of the tree appears in an earlier form in Orhan Oğuz Yılmaz's book *Eterna: The Myth of All Ages*, where a tree is not merely described as a material entity, but as a locus of layered potentiality. In that work, the tree stands for ontological latency: though presently a tree, it can become paper, furniture, fuel, or even ash—depending on the contextual unfolding of its form. Thus, the tree functions as an emblem of being-in-potential, suspended between actuality and transformation. The present essay recontextualizes this metaphor within an atomist framework to illustrate how void (*kenon*) enables not negation, but ontological freedom.

This echoes the more general theme of this paper: that absence is not mere lack, but structural latitude. Zero does not equal nothingness, but it opens a syntactic space within which the logic of absence can operate. In this way, Democritus' void is the ancestor of zero—a symbolic threshold that enables the mobility of meaning, form, and existence.

In sum, the atomists expanded the ontological map by formalizing the role of absence as a kind of existential infrastructure. Their contribution would later be echoed in fields as diverse as physics, metaphysics, and information theory, where the void—or structural emptiness—remains a precondition for emergence, distinction, and relation. And yet, their conceptual leap does not fully escape Parmenides' haunting logic: to speak of the void is still, in some sense, to speak of something.

III. Contextual Absence and Logical Mediation

In contrast to Parmenides' radical exclusion of non-being from the domain of thought, Plato offered a more nuanced and context-sensitive understanding of absence. While he does not fully endorse the concept of absolute nothingness, he also avoids collapsing all absence into being. Instead, in the *Sophist*, Plato introduces the concept of "otherness" (*heteron*) to preserve the intelligibility of non-being without contradicting the principle of being itself¹⁷. Through this formulation, Plato reframes non-being not as total negation, but as relational differentiation: to be not something is to be something else.

This reconfiguration is significant. Rather than conceiving nothingness as a void beyond all comprehension, Plato positions it within a logical and linguistic framework. What is not does equate to what absolutely is not but rather denotes an entity or condition that fails to appear in a specific referential or ontological context. Thus, absence becomes contingent upon a frame of reference. When one asserts, "There are no eggs in the refrigerator," one does not deny the existence of eggs in an absolute sense but rather signals their absence within a particular space and time. The potential for those eggs to exist elsewhere—perhaps still under the hen—remains intact.

In this way, Plato's conception of non-being anticipates relational ontologies, in which identity and existence are defined not in isolation, but in relation to other entities or conditions. Non-being, then, becomes a dynamic category, not a static void. It is shaped by context, and as such, it remains embedded within the very structure of thought and speech. Plato thus rescues the concept of absence from the metaphysical exile imposed by Parmenides and reintroduces it into philosophical discourse through a logic of differentiation rather than annihilation.

By preserving non-being as other-being, Plato establishes the groundwork for later developments in dialectical reasoning and linguistic philosophy. In doing so, he reopens the possibility of speaking meaningfully about absence—not as sheer nothingness, but as relative invisibility, or what might be called contextual negation. This insight forms a conceptual bridge between the ontology of being and the phenomenology of absence, offering a stable midpoint between presence and void.

While Plato relocates absence into the terrain of logical and linguistic structure, theological traditions approached nothingness from an entirely different vantage point—not as a relational differentiation, but as a divine prerogative.

The enduring philosophical challenge posed by the concept of nothingness ultimately migrated into the realm of theology, where it was reinterpreted not as an impossibility or logical paradox, but as a divine prerogative. Within this framework, nothingness is not an empty negation but the very condition that only the divine can overcome. The theological tradition reframes creation from nothing (*creatio ex nihilo*) as an act of absolute sovereignty—a gesture that lies beyond the reach of finite beings¹⁸.

¹⁷ Plato. (1997). *Complete Works* (J. M. Cooper & D. S. Hutchinson, Eds.). Hackett Publishing Company.

¹⁸ Peters, Ted. *God—The World's Future: Systematic Theology for a Postmodern Era*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2000.

Augustine of Hippo articulates this view with remarkable clarity. He argues that God not only created the world *ex nihilo* but also brought time itself into existence¹⁹. In this system, temporality is not an eternal backdrop but a byproduct of divine intention. Thus, the question “What existed before creation?” loses its coherence, for the very notion of before presupposes time, which did not yet exist. God, in Augustine’s theology, is not bound by temporal succession; all moments are present to Him simultaneously. This vision situates the divine as radically transcendent, both spatially and temporally, and thereby uniquely capable of generating being from absolute non-being.

Moreover, this act of creation from nothing is deemed inimitable. No creature—be it human, angelic, or otherwise—possesses the capacity to bring forth being *ex nihilo*²⁰. Created agents can transform, combine, or cultivate that which already exists, but the origination of substance from void belongs solely to the divine. Augustine’s well-known analogy likens human activity to the act of sowing seeds, while divine creation resembles the generation of the very ground in which such seeds might be planted.

While Christian theology framed creation *ex nihilo* as an expression of divine sovereignty, Islamic philosophy developed a more graded and nuanced account of divine causality. Influenced by Neoplatonism yet deeply rooted in Qur’anic ontology, thinkers such as al-Fārābī and Avicenna (Ibn Sīnā) proposed an emanationist metaphysics. Here, being flows from the Necessary Existent (*wājib al-wujūd*) through successive levels of intellect²¹, without implying creation from nothing in the absolute sense. Nothingness, in this view, is not the raw material of creation, but the absence of actualization in contingent essences.

Avicenna distinguishes between essence (*māhiyya*) and existence (*wujūd*), arguing that all contingent beings are merely possible until actualized by the Necessary²². While this appears like Augustine’s metaphysical hierarchy, it eliminates temporal creation in favor of ontological dependence. In this schema, nothingness resides in the realm of potentiality—not as an absolute void but as a condition of non-actualized being.

Later, Ibn ‘Arabī extends this metaphysical vision through a mystical lens. For him, the Divine is the only true being (*al-Ḥaqq*), and the world is a series of self-disclosures (*tajalliyāt*) veiled by relative non-being (*‘adam*). He writes, “The Real is hidden by the very intensity of His manifestation.”²³ In this way, what appears as absence or non-being is the veil of overwhelming presence. Here, nothingness becomes not the absence of God, but the condition that enables God’s knowability.

Such mystical and hierarchical visions, however, would later be challenged by a radically rationalist approach—most notably by Spinoza—who rejected both creation from nothing and divine transcendence in favor of immanent necessity.

¹⁹ Time is not an objective continuum that unfolds independently of consciousness; it is a condition of experience, emergent only in the presence of a perceiving subject. Without a conscious observer—whether human, divine, or otherwise—time would not be merely unmeasured; it would be metaphysically uninstantiated. In this view, time is not a universal backdrop, but a relational construct rooted in observation, memory, and change. The notion of ontological latency, explored here in connection with zero and nothingness, finds resonance in the idea that in the absence of witness, even temporality collapses into a silent field of potential.

²⁰ Thomas Aquinas. *Summa Theologica*. Translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province. New York: Benziger Bros., 1947. Book I, Question 45, Articles 5–7.

²¹ Fakhry, Majid. *A History of Islamic Philosophy*. 2nd ed. New York: Columbia University Press, 1983.

²² Avicenna. *The Metaphysics of the Healing*. Translated by Michael Marmura. Provo, UT: Brigham Young University Press, 2005.

²³ Ibn Arabi. (2013). *Fütühat-ı Mekkiyye* (Çev. E. Demirli). Litera Yayınları.

This view, dominant throughout the medieval period, stands in contrast to the rationalist metaphysics of Baruch Spinoza, who radically reconfigures the relationship between being, causality, and divinity. In Spinoza's system, nothingness has no ontological footing whatsoever. Reality, he contends, consists of a single infinite substance—*Deus sive Natura*—from which all things necessarily follow. There is no void, no rupture, no emergence from absence. Everything that exists does so as an expression of the one eternal substance. To speak of non-being is, for Spinoza, a misunderstanding: whatever can be conceived, is; and whatever cannot be, is not part of the order of nature.

Thus, where Augustine affirms the miraculous possibility of being arising from nothing through divine will, Spinoza denies the metaphysical relevance of nothingness entirely, grounding all existence in a closed system of necessary causes. For him, the statement “nothing comes from nothing” is not merely a logical axiom—it is the cornerstone of a rational universe.

These two theological paradigms—creation *ex nihilo* and immanent necessity—offer divergent responses to the same metaphysical dilemma. Yet in both systems, nothingness is not left unexamined; it is either suspended in divine transcendence or dissolved in ontological immanence. In either case, the human mind is confronted not with a void, but with a principle—whether miraculous or mechanical—that shapes the structure of reality itself.

Yet the question of nothingness is not limited to cosmology or divinity. It extends inward, into the mechanics of human cognition—where the absence of certainty becomes a philosophical dilemma of its own.

The problem of nothingness intersects not only with logic and metaphysics but also with the limits of human cognition—particularly in relation to perception and belief. A mind constrained by the illusion of linear time is susceptible to misinterpreting the data it receives through the senses²⁴. What is taken to be a perception of reality may in fact be a projection, distortion, or hallucination. Under the influence of external substances or internal states, the human subject can easily lose the capacity to distinguish between what appears to be and what is. A familiar taste, an ambient sound, or a fleeting scent can induce an experience so vivid that it rivals, or even overrides, the clarity of verifiable reality.

In the face of such perceptual uncertainty, the human intellect attempts to anchor sense impressions in rational structures. It is through this need for validation that the problem of absence arises—not as a lack of stimulus, but as a crisis of meaning. Bertrand Russell, addressing this issue from an epistemological standpoint, argued that information derived purely from sensory experience cannot be reliably categorized as knowledge²⁵. Sensory data, by itself, yields only beliefs, which remain subjective and fallible unless corroborated by reason or intersubjective verification.

To illustrate: one might assert having seen or touched an egg. While such statements rely on sense experience, they remain embedded in personal interpretation. For this impression to attain the status of knowledge, it must be externally confirmed—measurable, repeatable, or at least communicable within a shared framework. Otherwise, what is perceived may well be illusory. Thus, absence, understood through this lens, becomes not merely a lack of presence, but the absence of epistemic certainty.

This reframing of absence has profound implications. While presence may offer the comfort of sensory validation, absence exposes the mind's dependency on prior categories and contextual anchors. It reminds us that our awareness of “what is not” is always mediated by a remembered or anticipated “what is.”²⁶ As such, even absence is a mode of presence—not of the object itself, but of the idea of the object, lingering in cognition.

The concept of nothingness, then, cannot be fully explained through sensory or empirical means. It does not arise from a failed perception, but from the awareness that perception itself is never

²⁴ Husserl, Edmund. *Ideas Pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology and to a Phenomenological Philosophy*. Translated by F. Kersten. Dordrecht: Springer, 1982.

²⁵ Russell, Bertrand. *The Problems of Philosophy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1912.

²⁶ Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *Phenomenology of Perception*. Translated by Colin Smith. London: Routledge, 2002.

absolute. Knowledge may begin in sensation, but it achieves its form through interpretation, coherence, and justification. In this sense, absence does not signify a metaphysical void, but rather the cognitive limits of immediacy, reminding us that even when the world appears empty, the mind remains full of its own constructs.

IV. Theological Thresholds: Between Ex Nihilo and Emanation

As previously noted, absence may be explained through knowledge, if knowledge remains grounded in verifiable presence. But as one moves toward the conceptual frontier of nothingness, knowledge itself begins to destabilize, reverting into belief. At this epistemic threshold, Aristotle offers an alternative route one that bypasses both absolute non-being and radical void. Rather than attempting to conceive nothingness directly, Aristotle introduces the concept of potentiality (*dynamis*) to explain change, emergence, and transformation²⁷.

In his *Metaphysics*, Aristotle famously asserts that “nothing comes from nothing.”²⁸ However, unlike Parmenides, who took this to mean that all change is illusory, Aristotle reinterprets it to mean that becoming is never *ex nihilo*—but always the actualization of what was already potentially present. This formulation allows him to preserve the logical rigor of Parmenidean ontology while also accounting for the empirical reality of change.

As Mortimer J. Adler observes, Aristotle’s solution hinges on the distinction between potential being and actual being²⁹. The former refers to a capacity or tendency that exists within a given substance, while the latter is the full realization of that capacity. A seed is potentially a tree; an unlit match is potentially fire. In this schema, what emerges is never born from nothing, but from the unseen readiness of something to become.

Applied to the metaphor of the absent egg, the transition from presence to absence—and potentially back to presence—can be interpreted as a movement between actualization and latency. The absence of eggs in the refrigerator does not negate the possibility of their future presence; it merely signals a temporarily unfulfilled potential, contingent on causality and context.

Aristotle thus avoids the void by filling it with potential being. In his framework, there is no such thing as true nothingness—only delayed emergence. Change is not the passage from non-being to being, but a transformation within being itself. This view not only secures ontological continuity but also aligns with scientific and metaphysical observations about how things arise, evolve, and decay.

Yet this elegant solution is not without limitations. While Aristotle offers a coherent mechanism for natural processes, he does not directly engage with the existential weight of nothingness—the sense of ontological finitude, the confrontation with total erasure, the dread of non-return. His model is robust within the bounds of logic and biology, but it stops short of addressing the human condition’s emotional encounter with annihilation. In this respect, Aristotle’s interval between potential and actual may be read not only as a metaphysical mechanism but as a psychological buffer—a protective veil the mind casts over the abyss of absolute absence.

Even as existential philosophy posits nothingness as a condition for freedom, the lived experience of many individuals reveals that this freedom is often illusory confined by the limitations of material conditions, social hierarchies, and existential exhaustion. The subject, seeking to shape their identity through available choices, inevitably confronts the insufficiency of those very choices. When the tools of self-construction are unevenly distributed—or absent altogether—even a fleeting moment of existence can resemble a metaphysical imprisonment.

²⁷ Owens, Joseph. *The Doctrine of Being in the Aristotelian Metaphysics*. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1978.

²⁸ *Complete Works of Aristotle*.

²⁹ Adler, Mortimer J. *Aristotle for Everybody*. New York: Touchstone, 1997.

In this context, nothingness does not emerge simply as a negation or threat, but as a threshold to a higher kind of liberation—one that transcends worldly possibility and defies rational formulation. Sartre argued that freedom arises not from essence, but from its absence. Yet this absence, when pushed beyond personal autonomy, begins to resemble not a path to self-realization, but a void into which meaning dissolves.

While much of classical and modern metaphysics seeks to stabilize the meaning of nothingness through logic or ontology, another current emerges—one that treats nothingness not as a conceptual impasse, but as an existential confrontation.

This existential turn is embodied in the thought of Søren Kierkegaard. Rather than viewing nothingness solely through the lens of freedom or rational negation, Kierkegaard frames it as the precondition for spiritual confrontation. In his theology-infused existentialism, nothingness becomes not the absence of meaning, but the space in which one is compelled to face God. The experience of existential anxiety (*Angest*)³⁰ is not simply dread at the loss of being, but a revelation of the abyss between the finite self and the infinite divine.

Kierkegaard does not suggest that this anxiety is pathological. On the contrary, it is a necessary passage: the soul must confront nothingness to perceive the magnitude of the divine call³¹. In this framing, freedom is no longer a secular project of self-definition but a sacred challenge, marked by uncertainty, dependency, and faith. The question shifts from “What shall I become?” to “Who—or what—makes me capable of becoming at all?”

While Kierkegaard approaches the abyss of nothingness as a space of divine calling, the Kyoto School philosopher Nishitani Keiji offers a parallel yet distinct path—reframing nothingness through the Buddhist lens of *śūnyatā*, not as dread but as a ground of true selfhood attained through the dissolution of ego³². In *Religion and Nothingness*, he argues that the nihilism encountered in modern Western thought must be passed through—emptied out—so that a more profound nothingness, free from the self, can emerge.

Returning to the earlier metaphor: if the egg is no longer in the refrigerator, its return depends not merely on natural processes, but on a creative force beyond comprehension. If the chicken creates the egg, then who or what creates the chicken? This recursive question exposes the limitations of causal reasoning and gestures toward a transcendent origin—an ontological source that cannot be reduced to empirical terms. In Kierkegaard’s thought, nothingness thus becomes a veil that conceals the divine, a spiritual trial through which the soul is summoned toward higher awareness.

In this way, Kierkegaard reorients the discourse on nothingness from existential absence to theological encounter. Nothing is not only that which terrifies; it is that which demands faith.

V. Existential Horizons: Heidegger, Sartre, and Beyond

The human struggle with the concept of nothingness is not merely intellectual—it is existential. It may well be humanity’s refusal to accept total annihilation, its deep-seated resistance to the idea of eternal nonexistence, that prompted Martin Heidegger to reconceptualize nothingness not as a mere void, but as a phenomenological space wherein being reveals its significance. In *Being and Time*, Heidegger argues that it is precisely in confronting nothingness—particularly in moments of anxiety—that one gains access to the truth of one’s existence. Anxiety, in this context, is not simply

³⁰ Kierkegaard, Søren. *The Concept of Anxiety*. Translated by Reidar Thomte. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980.

³¹ Kierkegaard, Søren. *Fear and Trembling*. Translated by Alastair Hannay. London: Penguin Classics, 2003.

³² Nishitani, Keiji. *Religion and Nothingness*. Translated by Jan Van Bragt. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982.

fear of death or loss, but an ontological opening in which the familiar world withdraws, and the self becomes exposed to the groundlessness of being.

Through this encounter with nothingness, Heidegger contends, human beings are compelled to ask questions they would otherwise suppress. The loss of everyday meaning triggers a metaphysical reevaluation. Nothingness, far from being an external absence, becomes internalized—a background against which meaning can appear. In this view, it is the experience of nothingness that gives rise to the search for authenticity.

Yet Heidegger is not alone in linking nothingness with freedom. Jean-Paul Sartre, writing in *Being and Nothingness*, redefines the relationship between the human subject and the void by asserting that “man is the being through whom nothingness comes into the world.” For Sartre, the human capacity for negation—for saying no, for imagining what is not, for rejecting what is—marks the emergence of nothingness within being itself. This act of negation is not merely a linguistic gesture but the foundation of human freedom. The subject is not determined by essence or function; it is defined by absence, by a lack that enables self-definition.

Sartre’s existential framework thereby positions nothingness as a productive force, a precondition for ethical agency and creative choice. However, this radical freedom is also fraught with ambiguity. While the ability to shape one’s essence may seem liberating, it is constrained by the material and social structures into which one is thrown. One may be free to choose, but not to choose under equal conditions. Thus, nothingness becomes not only the ground of freedom but also the measure of its limitation.

If Sartre locates nothingness within the ontological structure of the subject, de Beauvoir demonstrates that this void is not merely existential but sociopolitical—that some are systematically made into nothing.

For de Beauvoir, woman is not granted access to nothingness as freedom but is *thrown* into it as absence—defined through lack, reduced to silence, and denied metaphysical authorship. Simone de Beauvoir, a central yet often underrecognized figure in existentialism, extends this insight by emphasizing the lived experience of embodied absence—particularly in the context of gendered subjectivity. In *The Second Sex*, she explores how the female body is constructed as “the other,”³³ defined not by its own essence but through relational negation. Here, nothingness is not an abstract ontological category, but a concrete historical condition imposed upon subjects.

While Sartre and de Beauvoir emphasize nothingness as a condition for freedom and negation, other existential thinkers approach the void as an irreconcilable tension—one that neither liberates nor resolves but endures.

In contrast to Sartre’s radical emphasis on ontological freedom, Albert Camus reframes the existential encounter with nothingness not as liberation but as confrontation with the absurd. For Camus, the absurd emerges from the human desire for meaning clashing with a silent, indifferent universe. In *The Myth of Sisyphus*, he describes the human condition as a paradoxical revolt: we recognize the void and yet persist in defiance. This rebellion is not a search for transcendence, but a lucidity within finitude—a dignity carved out of metaphysical hopelessness.

Likewise, Miguel de Unamuno explores this ontological ache in *The Tragic Sense of Life*, where the fear of nonexistence becomes the seed of spiritual struggle. For Unamuno, human dignity lies not in overcoming death, but in suffering it consciously. These thinkers present nothingness not as a philosophical abstraction, but as a lived crisis—a horizon of despair out of which ethical selfhood must be continually forged.

The metaphors that appear throughout this discourse—whether the egg that vanishes or the absence that follows its consumption—serve to underscore a recurring tension: the fragility of being, the inevitability of absence, and the yearning for ontological continuity. These thinkers attempt to reclaim nothingness as a space of transformation—not a destination, but a threshold. It is the abyss

³³ Beauvoir, Simone de. *The Second Sex*. Translated by Constance Borde and Sheila Malovany-Chevallier. New York: Vintage, 2011.

that simultaneously terrifies and emancipates, a silent terrain upon which the drama of human existence unfolds.

VI. Formal Abstraction of Absence: The One, Zero, and \emptyset

The recursive question of origin—who creates the creator—elevates nothingness beyond the dichotomy of existence and non-existence. It becomes not a mere metaphysical curiosity, but one of the most profound conceptual thresholds in humanity's search for meaning. It is at this ontological limit that Plotinus, building upon Parmenidean monism, proposes a radically mystical reinterpretation of being and non-being through his concept of The One.

For Plotinus, The One transcends all categories, including existence itself³⁴. It is neither being nor non-being, but a supranumerical, ineffable principle—the ultimate source from which all emanations arise. Crucially, Plotinus associates The One with a form of metaphysical nothingness: a generative void that lies beyond comprehension, differentiation, or attribution. It is the condition of all that is, yet it is not in any ordinary sense. The One is not composed, not divisible, and not multiple—yet all multiplicity flows from it.

This paradox—that the foundation of everything is not a thing—mirrors the tension found throughout the philosophical tradition. Plotinus resolves it not by denying nothingness, but by divinizing it: The One becomes an invisible principle of order, both wholly empty and wholly sufficient. Every number, every form, and every structure arise from its repetition—yet The One remains untouched by what it generates. In this way, nothingness becomes the hidden face of unity, a shadowless origin that contains within itself the infinite potential of all becoming.

Plotinus' framework profoundly influenced subsequent mystical and metaphysical traditions, including early Islamic thought. For instance, the Brethren of Purity (Ikhwān al-Ṣafā') echoed his vision in their own synthesis of number, ontology, and divine unity, interpreting the Quranic phrase "Say: He is Allah, the One" as not merely monotheistic assertion, but as numerical metaphysics³⁵. The One, they argue, carries nothing but itself—yet from its repetition, the universe unfolds.

Still, as conceptually potent as it is, Plotinus' One remains bound by the limits of metaphor. It gestures toward the ineffable, but it must do so in the language of number, structure, and emanation. In this sense, The One is not quite nothingness, but rather a cosmic abstraction of it—a placeholder for that which thought cannot reach but must circle endlessly.

Thus, Plotinus does not discard the language of absence. Instead, he transmutes it into transcendence, offering a vision of reality in which nothingness is not annihilation but creative silence—the groundless ground from which all things arise, and into which all must return.

While The One represents an ineffable unity beyond multiplicity, its very abstraction raises the question of how such transcendence might be rendered within symbolic or operational systems. If The One cannot be counted, how then do we begin to represent the unrepresentable? In contrast to this supranumerical metaphysics, the notion of zero offers a more formalized—yet no less profound—way of encoding absence. What Plotinus expresses through mystical emanation, zero articulates through structural precision.

While the concept of The One offers a philosophical abstraction of unity and transcendence, there exists another concept—zero—that is both mathematically precise and symbolically profound. Often dismissed as a mere placeholder in numerical systems, zero, upon closer inspection, reveals itself to be a metaphysical symbol of absence, potentiality, and existential transition. Unlike The One, which posits unity as an ineffable principle beyond multiplicity, zero embodies the very threshold between being and non-being.

³⁴ Plotinus. *The Enneads*. Translated by Stephen MacKenna. London: Penguin Classics, 1991.

³⁵ Nasr, Seyyed Hossein. *An Introduction to Islamic Cosmological Doctrines*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1993.

The formalization of zero in mathematics began with Brahmagupta in 7th-century India³⁶, where it functioned not merely as a numeral, but as a conceptual marker of emptiness. Later transmitted through Arabic scholarship, it gained the name *ṣifr*, meaning “empty” or “void,” and was introduced to the Western world through the work of al-Khwārizmī³⁷. In both linguistic and logical terms, zero represents not only the absence of quantity, but the structural space in which value emerges.

Philosophically, zero is more than a number—it is a conceptual aperture. To speak of “zero income” or “zero motivation” is not simply to state a lack, but to imply the possibility of change—that a shift from zero to one remains imaginable. This makes zero not an end, but a latent beginning, a point of origin suspended in stillness.

Unlike nothingness in its absolute form—which defies cognition and language—zero is domesticated absence: it can be written, calculated, and even given place value. It renders the invisible visible, encoding lack as intelligible. But zero’s real metaphysical power lies in its function as a boundary object—an axis upon which positive and negative values rotate. It not only separates but connects opposites. It is the pivot between absence and presence, between what has been and what could be.

When placed beside the number one, zero becomes exponentially powerful: it multiplies one into ten, one hundred, or a thousand. Yet on its own, it signifies emptiness without annihilation. In this way, zero preserves the logic of nothingness while making it operable. It is both a placeholder and a gateway—holding open the space through which being can pass.

Thus, zero functions not only as a mathematical tool but as a philosophical cipher—one that encodes the fragile balance between presence and void. It embodies potential without actualization, silence with the possibility of sound, space without content. As such, zero becomes the axis of metaphysical rhythm, the still point around which time, value, and existence themselves are allowed to turn.

VII. Metaphysical Dynamics: Entropy and the Threshold Form

The transitional quality of zero, as a metaphysical boundary between being and non-being, finds a striking analogue in the laws of thermodynamics, where energy, order, and disorder shape the conditions for emergence. Far from being a purely numerical concept, zero—when situated within physical theory—becomes a lens through which the limits of existence and the irreducibility of nothingness can be reexamined.

According to the First Law of Thermodynamics, energy can neither be created nor destroyed; it merely transforms³⁸. This principle denies the possibility of creation *ex nihilo* in a physical sense, reinforcing the philosophical maxim that nothing comes from nothing. The conservation of energy reflects a closed causal system—resonating with Spinoza’s view of a self-contained universe governed by necessity rather than contingency.

The Second Law of Thermodynamics introduces the concept of entropy—a measure of disorder within a system. In an isolated system, energy naturally disperses from regions of high concentration to low, leading to an overall increase in entropy. Yet this increase is not purely entropic decay; it also creates the conditions for new forms of order to arise³⁹. This paradox—the simultaneous proliferation of disorder and the potential for reorganization—mirrors the dual nature of zero: as both negation and origination.

³⁶ Joseph, George Gheverghese. *The Crest of the Peacock: Non-European Roots of Mathematics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2011.

³⁷ Ifrah, Georges. *The Universal History of Numbers: From Prehistory to the Invention of the Computer*. Translated by David Bellos et al. New York: Wiley, 2000.

³⁸ Clausius, Rudolf. *The Mechanical Theory of Heat*. Translated by T. Archer Hirst. London: Macmillan, 1879.

³⁹ Schrödinger, Erwin. *What is Life?*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1944.

This dynamic can be metaphorically illustrated through the earlier image of a hen sitting on an egg. The hen's body heat does not merely warm the egg; it initiates a thermodynamic transfer that reorganizes the internal structure of the egg, triggering biological formation. The entropy generated in this process does not lead to collapse but to gestation—a movement from potential toward actuality. In this framework, entropy becomes the grammar through which zero speaks: it is the silent transformation that links nothingness to becoming.

Yet thermodynamics also outlines a boundary that zero can never fully cross: absolute zero (0 Kelvin), a state in which all molecular motion ceases. According to the Third Law of Thermodynamics, this point is theoretically definable but practically unreachable⁴⁰. No system can attain absolute stillness. Even at the edge of total emptiness, some residue of being remains—a pulse, a possibility, a delay. Zero, then, is not a destination but an asymptote, a limit that structures reality without ever fully manifesting.

In this light, entropy and zero converge not as mere scientific abstractions, but as philosophical constants: each denotes a boundary between order and chaos, being and non-being, presence and dissolution. What emerges is not the void of nihilism, but a deeper understanding of nothingness as a structured, dynamic field—one in which the grammar of existence is always already at work.

VIII. Conclusion: \emptyset as a Limit-Concept in Representation

In the structure of modern mathematics, zero occupies a pivotal role—dividing positive integers, aligned with being, from negative ones, often associated with absence or negation. The number “one,” as the first act of individuation, marks the threshold of presence, a discrete event in the field of multiplicity. Yet it casts its own shadow across the void: for something to be, it must be surrounded—bordered—by what is not.

This dialectic between presence and absence, being and non-being, is not merely logical; it is ontological. **Zero emerges as a hinge**, a fulcrum where dualities coalesce, collapse, and reconfigure. It mediates form and formlessness, sound and silence, memory and loss. It is a black hole in arithmetic—a place of disappearance—and yet also a seedbed of order.

But even as zero takes on these metaphysical functions, we must remember: **zero is not \emptyset** . It is not the pure nothingness beyond structure, but the **trace of that nothingness** in symbolic space. It is the point at which being begins to tremble—a moment, as Heidegger asserts, where the question of Being must pass through the experience; not as a void, but as the groundlessness that calls thought into being.⁴¹

To illustrate this distinction, we propose an Ontological Matrix, outlining the three principal domains—Being, Non-being, and Nothingness—across their potential, actual, and negated modes.

This tripartite matrix is not constructed *ex nihilo* but echoes longstanding metaphysical frameworks. The distinction between *potential* and *actual* modes of being parallels Aristotle's account of *dynamis* and *energeia*, where being unfolds not statically, but as a continuum of realization and limitation.⁴² The category of non-being, particularly its latency and nullified forms, recalls Heidegger's treatment of *das Nichts*—not as mere emptiness, but as that which makes the question of being possible in the first place.⁴³ As for the domain of \emptyset , the unthinkable pre-condition of structure, its silence finds resonance in Plotinus' *One*—beyond being and intellect, without division or predicate.⁴⁴ In this sense, $\emptyset(a)$, the actualized nothingness, aligns with the *via negativa* of Dionysius the Areopagite, where the divine is protected from profanation by negation itself.⁴⁵ Finally, the

⁴⁰ Atkins, Peter. *Four Laws That Drive the Universe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

⁴¹ What is Metaphysics?

⁴² *The Complete Work of Aristotle*.

⁴³ What Is Metaphysics?

⁴⁴ The Enneads.

⁴⁵ The Mystical Theology.

unstable zone of \emptyset as *différance*—the suspension of structure and delay of meaning—bears striking affinity with Derrida’s logic of non-presence.⁴⁶

The ontological matrix proposed above offers more than a classification—it reframes how presence and absence interact within symbolic systems. If being (1) and non-being (0) occupy representable domains, nothingness (\emptyset) marks the boundary where such representations collapse. It is the space where logic is suspended but not destroyed—where language falters but meaning is not yet born. In this unstable zone, perception turns metaphorical, and philosophy turns poetic.

Ontological Mode	Potential	Actual	Negation	Temporal Symbolism
Being (1)	1(p) – <i>dynamis</i>	1(a) – <i>energeia</i>	-1 – contradiction	Presence → unfolding presence
Non-being (0)	0(p) – latency/lack	0(a) – absence	-0 – nullity	Zero-point of emergence
Nothingness (\emptyset)	\emptyset (p) – pre-formal silence	\emptyset (a) – unthinkable/ineffable	- \emptyset – transcendental rupture	\emptyset as the <i>outside of time itself</i>

Here, \emptyset (p) refers to a pre-formal condition: a latent, undifferentiated field that precedes all representation, measurement, or negation. It is not merely empty, but unmarked—uninscribed by presence or absence. It does not reside within being, nor even within the logical grammar of non-being. To negate \emptyset is not to contradict a thing, but to rupture the very frame within which contradiction is possible—a metaphysical collapse of ontology itself.

To exist, then, is not simply to be—it is to dwell within a suspension, a liminal threshold between negation and emergence. This threshold is marked by zero—not as a numerical quantity, but as a temporal fold, a fleeting “now” between what has receded and what has not yet arrived. It is the aperture of time: a hinge between entropy and intention.

Consider a painting on the wall. To the casual viewer, it appears as a surface—an image fixed in a singular moment. But for the one who painted it, or for the one whose memory it evokes, that surface conceals strata of memory, intention, loss, and desire. Each pixel is a portal to another dimension. Likewise, zero is not the absence of image, but the hidden geometry of potential worlds suspended in symbolic silence—what Derrida might call a *trace*, neither present nor absent, but the echo of form before it becomes manifest—what Derrida frames as *différance*, a spacing that births meaning by delay and dislocation.⁴⁷

Just as a framed photograph is more than an image—more than lines and pigments fixed in time—it is also a portal. For the casual observer, it is a moment frozen in aesthetic stillness. But for the one who lived it, that stillness is saturated with what was, and haunted by what could have been. It is, in effect, a metaphysical event: a singularity of memory and meaning, holding the entire arc of a life within a suspended instant. In that moment, the forward motion of time gives way to something deeper—a radial stillness. This is not movement halted, but meaning crystallized.

In thermodynamic terms, one might say it mirrors absolute zero: a state of maximal order and minimal entropy, where potential energy lies dormant yet intact. If time is born from motion, then perhaps zero is the pre-motion—what exists before the world is set in motion, before potential becomes kinetic. And just as the universe began with a singular disruption of symmetry, with energy cascading into matter, form, and time, so too does zero mark the hinge between unformed totality and structured unfolding. Not a point on the timeline, but the axis around which time itself spins.

To experience this zero is not to escape time by moving faster than light, but to dissolve into the symbolic architecture of time. Past, present, and future do not vanish—they converge. The image on

⁴⁶ Jacques Derrida, *Margins of Philosophy*, trans. Alan Bass (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982).

⁴⁷ Jacques Derrida, *Of Grammatology*, trans. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1976).

the wall is not merely a record of what was; it is a threshold. For the one who remembers, it contains the fullness of before and the ache of what followed. A love that ended, a life that departed. To them, the moment in the image is $\emptyset(p)$ —not yet articulated, but profoundly real. It is a window not into memory, but into the ontological interstice where memory, presence, and absence coexist.

And here, \emptyset emerges. Not merely as zero's antecedent, but as its negative space—what zero cannot hold. In mathematical metaphysics, zero is still something: a symbol, a measure, a placeholder. But \emptyset is not a mark within the structure—it is the limit of structure itself. It resists enumeration. It cannot be remembered, located, or described. It is not nothing, but rather what makes the idea of nothing possible. It is not absence; it is the abyss from which absence and presence both derive.

Mystical traditions have long danced on the edge of this paradox. Neoplatonism speaks of the One beyond Being. As Plotinus describes it, the One is not the first being, but the very possibility of being. It emanates without division, without will, and its “beyondness” echoes $\emptyset(p)$ —the unstructured silence before form.⁴⁸ Christian apophatic theology names God through negation. The *via negativa* of Dionysius the Areopagite, for instance, does not seek to erase God, but to shield the divine from finite description.⁴⁹ Similarly, $\emptyset(a)$ resists symbolization—not because it is meaningless, but because it exceeds the grammar of presence and absence. Sufi metaphysics envisions the divine as a veil over essence. Ibn Arabi's *dhat* is not an entity, but a withdrawal—an ungraspable horizon. In Jewish mysticism, the *Olam HaBa* is not simply the “afterlife,” but a rejoining with the divine source—beyond time, beyond duality. This union is not represented; it is undergone. And what is undergone cannot be named.

Thus, \emptyset becomes the eschatological cipher—the horizon of unknowing. It is the symbolic crack through which the divine makes itself felt, not as presence but as pressure. Not as light, but as the impossibility of sight. To call God “One” is already a concession to representation; true divinity lies prior to the numeral, prior to being. It is the zero-point in which all things are latent, and none yet formed. The future world—the *Olam HaBa*—is not elsewhere. It is the return to zero, to \emptyset , to the unspeakable beginning that has no origin and no end.

We began this essay asking whether nothingness could be encoded—whether the void, the \emptyset , could be inscribed in symbolic grammar. We end by recognizing that it cannot. But its outline can be traced. Its pressure can be felt. And its silence, paradoxically, can be heard—not in the speech of meaning, but in the quiet geometry of all things that come into being, only to return.

References

- Adler, Mortimer J. *Aristotle for Everybody*. New York: Touchstone, 1997.
- Aristotle. *The Complete Works of Aristotle: The Revised Oxford Translation*. 2 vols. Edited by Jonathan Barnes. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984.
- Atkins, Peter. *Four Laws That Drive the Universe*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Aquinas, Thomas. *Summa Theologica*. Translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province. Westminster, MD: Christian Classics, 1981.
- Avicenna. *The Metaphysics of the Healing*. Translated by Michael Marmura. Provo, UT: Brigham Young University Press, 2005.
- Beauvoir, Simone de. *The Second Sex*. Translated by Constance Borde and Sheila Malovany-Chevallier. New York: Vintage, 2011.
- Chittick, William C. *The Sufi Path of Knowledge: Ibn al-'Arabi's Metaphysics of Imagination*. Albany: SUNY Press, 1989.
- Clausius, Rudolf. *The Mechanical Theory of Heat*. Translated by T. Archer Hirst. London: Macmillan, 1879.
- Derrida, Jacques. *Of Grammatology*. Translated by Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1976.

⁴⁸ Plotinus, *The Enneads*, trans. Stephen MacKenna (London: Penguin Classics, 1991).

⁴⁹ Pseudo-Dionysius, *The Mystical Theology*, trans. Colm Luibheid (New York: Paulist Press, 1987).

- — —. *Margins of Philosophy*, trans. Alan Bass (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982).
- Democritus. "Fragments." In *The Presocratic Philosophers*, edited by Jonathan Barnes. London: Routledge.
- Fakhry, Majid. *A History of Islamic Philosophy*. 2nd ed. New York: Columbia University Press, 1983.
- Heidegger, Martin. "What is Metaphysics?" In *Pathmarks*, edited by William McNeill. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Hegel, G.W.F. *Science of Logic: Book I – Being*. Translated by George di Giovanni.
- Husserl, Edmund. *Ideas Pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology and to a Phenomenological Philosophy*. Translated by F. Kersten. Dordrecht: Springer, 1982.
- Ibn 'Arabī. *al-Futūḥāt al-Makkiyya*, vol. 1. Edited by Osman Yahia.
- Ibrah, Georges. *The Universal History of Numbers: From Prehistory to the Invention of the Computer*. Translated by David Bellos et al. New York: Wiley, 2000.
- Joseph, George Gheverghese. *The Crest of the Peacock: Non-European Roots of Mathematics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2011.
- Kant, Immanuel. *Critique of Pure Reason*. Translated by Paul Guyer and Allen W. Wood. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- Kierkegaard, Søren. *Fear and Trembling*. Translated by Alastair Hannay. London: Penguin Classics, 2003.
- — —. *The Concept of Anxiety*. Translated by Reidar Thomte. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980.
- Kirk, G.S., J.E. Raven, and M. Schofield. *The Presocratic Philosophers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- Leucippus and Democritus. In *The Presocratic Philosophers*, edited by G.S. Kirk, J.E. Raven, and M. Schofield. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- McKirahan, Richard. *Philosophy Before Socrates: An Introduction with Texts and Commentary*. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing.
- Melissus. "Fragments." In McKirahan, *Philosophy Before Socrates*.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. *Phenomenology of Perception*. Translated by Colin Smith. London: Routledge, 2002.
- Nasr, Seyyed Hossein. *An Introduction to Islamic Cosmological Doctrines*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1993.
- Nishitani, Keiji. *Religion and Nothingness*. Translated by Jan Van Bragt. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1982.
- Owens, Joseph. *The Doctrine of Being in the Aristotelian Metaphysics*. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1978.
- Parmenides. "On Nature." In *The Presocratic Philosophers*, edited by G.S. Kirk, J.E. Raven, and M. Schofield. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
- Peters, Ted. *God – The World's Future: Systematic Theology for a Postmodern Era*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2000.
- Plato. (1997). *Complete Works* (J. M. Cooper & D. S. Hutchinson, Eds.). Hackett Publishing Company.
- Plotinus. *The Enneads*. Translated by Stephen MacKenna. London: Penguin Classics, 1991.
- Pseudo-Dionysius. *The Mystical Theology*. Translated by Colm Luibheid. New York: Paulist Press, 1987.
- Russell, Bertrand. *A History of Western Philosophy*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1945.
- Russell, Bertrand. *The Problems of Philosophy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1912.
- Schrödinger, Erwin. *What is Life?*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1944.
- Spinoza, Benedict de. *The Collected Works of Spinoza*. Vol. 1. Edited and translated by Edwin Curley. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.