

# Nothingness-Definition Antinomy Analysis

Berke Nihat Akay

In order for the operation of association of definitions and information relative to transcendental space to be conducted, first of all we must analyse how human reason is able interpret-objects that can be considered useful for this interpretation- abstractions in relation to nothingness and; how it interprets nothingness itself.

Human reason's construction in metaphysical attempts of thought, for example abstraction X in the mind, unable to be associated with the phenomenal universe's attributes, not in the knowledge sense but can only be thought in metaphysical form situated in accordance to nothingness, in, how, and, why it constructs it the way it does, must be understood. How do we answer to the question: Why is there a necessity forced by the mind to think of the abstraction as, the way it was constructed by the mind, to be thought inside a space? Let us, for the sake of a mind experiment, hypothesize and think of the abstraction to be not contained inside any space; that is, in other words, spatial formations that: Existed, existing, will exist, and have the potential to exist; even in the noumena (provided that it exists there) that does not conform to any known logical and mathematical rules (the assumption made here may actually cause the hypothesis we formed to take on an entirely different form in the former noumena we proposed); that is to say, existing/will exist (even if potentially) completely transcendental; out of all these spatial formations, and, thought as no association can be made in any way to these spatial formations, the abstraction (to understanding of the mind) falls out of everything, that is, inside nothingness.

Now that it is clear that what is to be studied on the basis of this, it is possible to begin to analyze the nature of the relationship and the characteristics it possesses. First of all, one shouldn't get confused here to think that, the mind is allowing the abstraction to migrate from conceptual to actual. The abstraction may be less or more functional in how we construct it in our minds, compared to in the noumena. If here, I am able to make an attempt to define the abstraction, that is because I can design it's existence metaphysically. Also, I can not know whether or not, the abstraction I am dealing with will have to obey to what kind of axiomatic rules in occurrences that are beyond perception, logic, and reason. But, the only thing I am able to reach with reason alone is: I know that they, in there, in that way, do have the potential to exist having those (whatever) properties. Them having a potential does not mean that: They are observed in X but are actually found in Y, once the threshold is passed and potential reached, in X understood in accordance to reason having it's original properties that were originally found in Y. Here the potential carries the meaning of metaphysical possibility, that is, it is not epistemological. Nothingness, in those occurrences; thought inside of the axiomatic infrastructures that limit our reasoning capabilities, if it's perception is guessed to be possible, then, depending whether or not it is possible, the following conclusion can be drawn: Nothingness' itself or in relation to any abstraction, to be imagined, thought, comprehended, and to be understood is impossible; even if, nothingness conceptually is available to reason's interpretation, it is impossible for it to be defined in accordance to it's own nature, because: Nothingness is not some "thing" that can be comprehended by the mind, mind has no way of reaching nothingness in itself.