

Re: Existence as predicate

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.logic/2004-09/0017.html>

From: Tarald Andresen (tarald.a_at_online.no)

Date: 08/31/04

Date: Tue, 31 Aug 2004 09:17:31 +0200

> > *This is an attempt at refuting Kant's claim that a thing's existence can't be a predicate:*

> >

> > *Since everything is connected ("hangs together") – there are no absolute dividing lines / there is no empty space – everything must have a *common denominator*; this common denominator must be necessary (since everything is necessary / has at least one cause); therefore general existence must have a necessary component/aspect in order to exist (therefore existence is a quality/predicate).*

>

> *Let's see. David Lewis denied that everything is connected, and while his view may be false, I know of no conclusive arguments to that effect. I am not sure what you mean when you say that there is no empty space.*

Nothingness/emptiness cannot exist (an "empty space" has no content – it "consists" of nothingness – thus the concept 'empty space' must also be empty, have no content). Thus there is nothing that can disconnect any matter from other matter, and so everything is connected (to matter).

> *However, even if everything were connected, this would not entail the existence of a common denominator. Even if we assume that things must share something in common to be connected, object 1 might be connected to object 2 by sharing A, and object 2 might be connected to object 3 by sharing B, and objects 1 and 3 might then be connected without sharing anything in common.*

My point is that all these objects share one common trait; they are *matter*! As matter then in principle is a continuous thing (that can't be divided in an absolute sense), all matter must have a common denominator (and not only a nominal one as belonging to the category "matter").

You seem to assume that things which are not

> *necessary must have causes, which seems not to be the case (popular*

sci.logic: Re: Existence as predicate

- > *interpretations of present quantum theory deny this). Finally, even if*
- > *everything that existed needed to have a component in common, that would*
- > *not entail that this common component would be existence.*

Anything that exists belong to the category "existence". And I don't much care about popular interpretations of quantum theory; to say that something can exist without a cause is like saying that things can exist without any material characteristics – i.e. not belong to the physical/spatial world – which is absurd.