# THE ZERO PARADOX

# ZP-E: Bridge Document

*Version 2.9 | April 2026*

*Supersedes v2.8 | DA-1 Lean scope note added: functional role carried by ZPC.l_run/tq_ih (proved); AIT and ZF+AFA bridge outside Lean scope — same category as ZP-A CC-2.*

*v2.8: DA-1 formal bridge added: incompressibility = self-description argument (ZP-C D1 + standard AIT). At $P_0$, $K(c_1|n)/|c_1| = 1$ means description and execution coincide; CC-2/R3 and L-INF are independent corroboration of the same conclusion.*

*v2.7: DA-1 upgraded from Design Principle to Derived Proposition — grounded in ZP-A CC-2 (⊥ = {⊥}) and R3. v2.6: DA-3 candidate applications removed. v2.5: Physical analogies removed from formal sections. v2.4: R-DA2 framing corrected. v2.3: CC-1 added to T-SNAP dependency list. v2.2: DA-1 redesigned to L-INF-based Design Principle. v2.1: Adds DA-2 and DA-3.*

---

This document is the cross-framework synthesis layer of the Zero Paradox. It imports from ZP-A (lattice algebra), ZP-B (p-adic topology), ZP-C (information theory), and ZP-D (Hilbert space state layer). It provides three formal inserts: DA-1 (Instantiation as Execution — upgraded to Derived Proposition in v2.7, grounded in ZP-A CC-2 and R3), DA-2 (Instantiation Succession), and DA-3 (Perspective-Relative Cardinality). With DA-1 in place, AX-1 is promoted to Theorem T-SNAP. With DA-2, the directed instantiation tree is formally licensed. With DA-3, cardinality is shown to be position-dependent within the instantiation structure.

*Illustrated Companion: A paired ZP-E Illustrated Companion document provides accessible explanations and visual summaries of the bridge derivations in this document. Readers new to the framework are encouraged to start with the companion.*

---

## Formal Insert DA-1: Derived Proposition — Instantiation as Execution

*Updated ZP-E v2.9 | DA-1 Lean scope note added (v2.9) | DA-1 formal bridge: incompressibility = self-description (ZP-C D1 + AIT) | v2.7: DA-1 upgraded, CC-2/R3 grounding | v2.6: DA-3 applications removed | v2.5: Physical analogies removed*

---

### I. The Gap DA-1 Closes

The T-BUF chain from ZP-C v1.4 established three results:

- L-RUN: The transition $c_0 \to c_1$ is a non-null state change. (ZP-C v1.4 — Derived)

- TQ-IH: No program outputs ⊥ without a non-null intermediate configuration state. (ZP-C v1.4 — Derived by L-RUN)
- T-BUF: At $P_0$, execution is structurally guaranteed; that execution state is $\varepsilon_0$ in the semilattice. (ZP-C v1.4 — Candidate Theorem pending DA-1)

T-BUF was labelled Candidate because Step 2 asserts that a configuration at $P_0$ is a live machine state — that instantiation at $P_0$ constitutes an execution event, not a static description. ZP-C v1.5 L-INF supplies one mathematical premise: ⊥ at $P_0$ has unbounded surprisal — no finite external interpreter can hold it as a static description. ZP-A CC-2 supplies a second, structural basis: ⊥ = {⊥} is a self-containing object with no external interpreter by structure. DA-1 (§ III below) provides the derived proposition that closes T-BUF Step 2.

## II. The Two Senses of a Configuration at $P_0$

Sense A — Descriptive: x exists as a string — a finite syntactic object that has been written down or specified. The machine it describes has not necessarily been instantiated. $P_0$ is a property of the string. The string is inert.

Sense B — Instantiated: x exists as the current configuration of a running machine. The machine is executing. $P_0$ is a property of the live configuration. The configuration is active.

## III. Proposition DA-1

| **Proposition DA-1 — Instantiation as Execution (Derived from ZP-A CC-2)** |
|---|
| Claim: The instantiation of a machine configuration $c_1$ at the incompressibility threshold $P_0$ is an execution event in the sense of L-RUN. It is not a static description of a machine. It is a machine in state $c_1$. |
| Grounding: ZP-A CC-2 (⊥ = {⊥}) establishes ⊥ as a Quine atom under ZF + AFA — a set that is its own singleton, admitting no external interpreter. ZP-A R3 derives the immediate consequence: a self-containing object cannot be a static description awaiting external instantiation. ZP-C L-INF provides independent informational corroboration: ⊥ has unbounded surprisal, exceeding the capacity of any finite interpreter. |

Path 1 — Structural (ZP-A CC-2 + R3): CC-2 establishes ⊥ = {⊥} under ZF + AFA: ⊥ is a Quine atom — a set that is its own singleton. By set extensionality, the collection of all objects bearing the structural property of ⊥ collapses to ⊥ itself; there is no multiplicity, only ⊥. R3 draws the formal consequence: a self-containing object has no external interpreter by structure. A static description requires a describer external to and distinct from what is described; ⊥ = {⊥} admits no such external position. Therefore ⊥ at $P_0$ cannot be a static description awaiting external instantiation — it is necessarily executing.

Path 2 — Informational (ZP-C L-INF): Independently, the surprisal $I(n) = n$ at ball-hierarchy depth n is unbounded — for any finite M, ∃ depth n with $I(n) > M$. The null state ⊥ corresponds to the limit point $0 \in Q_2$; its informational content exceeds every finite bound. Any finite external interpreter can hold only a finite informational bound; ⊥ exceeds every such bound. A configuration exceeding the capacity of every possible finite interpreter cannot be a static description awaiting interpretation.

Path 3 — Formal bridge: Incompressibility as Self-Description (ZP-C D1 + standard AIT): The preceding paths establish that ⊥ admits no external interpreter. This path provides the formal bridge from that negative claim to the positive claim (necessarily executing). In the standard Turing model (D7), a machine configuration x exists in one of two states: (A) Static description — x exists as a string specified but not yet being executed; some external program p ($|p| < |x|$) generates x when run, so x is a description awaiting a separate execution event by an external generator. (B) Live execution — x is the current configuration of a running machine. These are exhaustive in the Turing model: either x has a shorter external generator, or it does not. At $P_0$, ZP-C D1 gives $K(c_1|n)/|c_1| = 1$: $c_1$ is algorithmically incompressible. No external program p exists with $|p| < |c_1|$ such that $U(p, n) = c_1$. State (A) requires such a p — and no such p exists at $P_0$. State (A) is therefore eliminated by the Kolmogorov condition. Since (A) and (B) are exhaustive and (A) is eliminated, $c_1$ is in state (B): it is executing. Instantiation at $P_0$ is not the placement of a description to be executed later — there is no shorter prior description to execute. Instantiation and execution are the same act.

All three paths entail the same conclusion. Path 3 (ZP-C D1 + AIT) is the primary formal grounding: DA-1 follows from the Kolmogorov incompressibility condition at $P_0$ and the exhaustiveness of the static/executing dichotomy in the Turing model. This derivation does not require CC-2. Path 1 (CC-2 + R3) and Path 2 (L-INF) provide independent corroboration: the structural argument (⊥ = {⊥}, no external position possible) and the informational argument (unbounded surprisal, no finite interpreter can hold ⊥) each independently confirm the same conclusion from different mathematical grounds.

**Status: DERIVED PROPOSITION — from ZP-C D1 ($P_0$ definition) and standard algorithmic information theory (incompressibility = self-description, no shorter external generator). Does not require CC-2. Independent corroboration: ZP-A CC-2 + R3 (structural path), ZP-C L-INF (informational path). Named modeling commitments: CC-1 ($S_0$ = ⊥, ZP-A) and CC-2 (⊥ = {⊥}, ZP-A) — both explicit. T-SNAP is derived given DA-1, CC-1, and AX-B1. ✓ Lean scope: functional role carried by ZPC.l_run and ZPC.tq_ih (both proved independently); AIT (Kolmogorov complexity) and ZF+AFA bridge outside Lean scope — same category as ZP-A CC-2.**

## IV. Theorem T-SNAP — Binary Snap Causality [AX-1 Promoted to Theorem]

| **Theorem T-SNAP — Binary Snap Causality [AX-1 Promoted to Theorem]** |
|---|
| Statement: The Binary Snap ⊥ → $\varepsilon_0$ is a derived consequence of $P_0$, L-RUN, TQ-IH, DA-1, and ZP-A D2. It is not an axiom. |

Proof:

- Step 1 — $P_0$ identifies the incompressibility threshold. When K(x|n)/n = 1, the configuration string x is algorithmically random. (ZP-C D1)
- Step 2 — A configuration at $P_0$ is necessarily executing: At $P_0$, $K(c_1|n)/|c_1| = 1$ (ZP-C D1) — $c_1$ is incompressible, its own minimal program. No shorter external generator exists; the static description state is eliminated; $c_1$ is in live execution (DA-1 Path 3 — from ZP-C D1 + AIT). Corroboration: ⊥ = {⊥} (ZP-A CC-2/R3); unbounded surprisal (ZP-C L-INF). (DA-1 § III — Derived Proposition)
- Step 3 — Any instantiated execution passes through $c_1$. (ZP-C D7 — definitional; $c_1$ is the first running configuration)
- Step 4 — $c_1 \neq \bot$. (ZP-C L-RUN — Derived; $c_1$ has gained execution context not present in $c_0 = \bot$; by AX-B1 this is a distinct, non-null state)
- Step 5 — No program that executes produces only null configuration states. (ZP-C TQ-IH — Derived; execution trace τ(p) contains $c_1$ for any executing program p)
- Step 6 — In (L, ∨, ⊥), $c_1$ is an element strictly above ⊥. By ZP-A D2, the transition ⊥ → $c_1$ is a valid state transition: $c_1 = \bot \vee \varepsilon_0$ for some $\varepsilon_0 \in L$ with $\varepsilon_0 > \bot$. This transition is the Binary Snap.
- Step 7 — The transition is irreversible: algebraically by ZP-A R1 (no subtraction operator); topologically by ZP-B C3 (no continuous return path to 0 in $Q_2$); categorically by AX-G2 (hom(X, 0) = ∅ for X ≠ 0).

Conclusion: The Binary Snap is a derived consequence. AX-1 is promoted to Theorem T-SNAP. ✓

**Status: DERIVED — Cross-Framework. Dependencies: ZP-C D1, D7, L-RUN, TQ-IH; ZP-B AX-B1, C3; ZP-A D2, R1; ZP-G AX-G2; ZP-E DA-1. Named modelling commitments: CC-1 ($S_0 = \bot$, ZP-A) and CC-2 (⊥ = {⊥}, ZP-A, via R3) — both explicit. T-SNAP is derived given DA-1, CC-1, and CC-2.**

### V. Effect of T-SNAP on Downstream Results

Remark R-DA1: All results in ZP-E that previously depended on AX-1 as an axiom now depend on T-SNAP as a derived theorem. T5 (Iterative Forcing Theorem) depended on AX-1 for the first Snap — it now depends on T-SNAP. Content unchanged; grounding strengthened. T4 (Unified Snap Description) carried AX-1 as an axiom label on the causality component — that label is upgraded to Derived — T-SNAP. From v2.7, DA-1 is additionally upgraded from Design Principle to Derived Proposition: grounded in ZP-A CC-2 (⊥ = {⊥}) and R3, with ZP-C L-INF as independent corroboration. The intentional axioms of the system are now: AX-B1 (binary existence), AX-G1 (initial object), AX-G2 (source asymmetry). AX-1 is no longer an axiom.

---

## Formal Insert DA-2: Instantiation Succession — The Multiple-⊥ Result

*New in v2.0 | Formally licenses the directed instantiation tree*

---

## I. The Gap DA-2 Closes

DA-1 and T-SNAP establish that the Binary Snap is a structural consequence of reaching $P_0$ within an instantiation. Three questions remain open after v1.0:

- CC-1 (ZP-A) says $S_0 = \bot$ is a modelling commitment — not derived from A1–A4. This leaves open whether ⊥ is unique across all instantiations or whether each instantiation carries its own ⊥.
- ZP-B R1 distinguishes universal structure from universe-contingent parameters. $\varepsilon_0$ is contingent per instantiation. Whether ⊥ is similarly contingent is not addressed in ZP-A through ZP-D.
- T-SNAP fires wherever $P_0$ conditions are met. If the terminal state of instantiation $I_n$ satisfies $P_0$ conditions, T-SNAP should apply — but this requires formally connecting that terminal state to a new ⊥. DA-2 provides this connection.

## II. Why ZP-B C3 is Not Violated

C3 prohibits a continuous path from $x \neq 0$ back to the same 0 in $Q_2$. DA-2 does not require a return path. The irreversibility of C3 is preserved within each instantiation. What crosses the instantiation boundary is not a path in $Q_2$ — it is the generation of a new $Q_2$ with its own metric, its own ⊥, its own $\varepsilon_0$. C3 quantifies only over paths within a single topological space and has nothing to say about the boundary between spaces.

More precisely: C3 and the irreversibility of the Snap together require that any recurrence of a null state be a different null state. You cannot return to the original ⊥ even in principle. Therefore if the structure recurs, it must instantiate fresh. The topology enforces the ontological novelty of each ⊥.

## III. Definitional Alignment DA-2 — Instantiation Succession

| Definitional Alignment DA-2 — Instantiation Succession |
|---|
| Claim: A state S in instantiation $I_n$ satisfies the structural role of ⊥ for instantiation $I_{n+1}$ if and only if it satisfies A4 relative to all subsequent joins in $I_{n+1}$: |
| $S \vee x = x$ for all x in the semilattice of $I_{n+1}$. |

Grounding: A4 is the load-bearing axiom of ZP-A — it defines ⊥ as the additive identity under ∨, the element that contributes nothing to any join and is therefore present in everything above it. DA-2 does not redefine ⊥. It clarifies that the modelling commitment of CC-1 can be satisfied by any state meeting A4's algebraic conditions — not only by a cosmologically primitive null state. The identity condition is structural, not historical: what matters is the algebraic role a state plays in the subsequent semilattice, not where it came from.

The terminal state of $I_n$ arrives at $I_{n+1}$ carrying the accumulated join of everything in $I_n$'s sequence. It is structurally ⊥ to $I_{n+1}$ — contributing nothing to subsequent joins — while being informationally rich relative to $I_n$. This is the Zero Paradox instantiated at the inter-instantiation level: the terminal state is simultaneously a terminus and a foundation.

**Status: DEFINITIONAL ALIGNMENT — no new axiom introduced. DA-2 is a clarification of the scope of CC-1 and A4. ✓**

## IV. Corollary C-DA2 — Ontological Novelty of Successive ⊥

**Corollary C-DA2 — Ontological Novelty of Successive ⊥**

Statement: No two instantiations share a ⊥. The ⊥ of $I_{n+1}$ is topologically unreachable from within $I_n$ by C3. Instantiation succession is therefore not a cycle but a chain (or tree) of isomorphic structures.

Proof: By ZP-B C3, no continuous path exists within $Q_2$ of $I_n$ from any $x \neq 0$ back to 0. The ⊥ of $I_{n+1}$ is an element of a distinct topological space — not an element of $Q_2$ of $I_n$. No path in $I_n$ can reach it. By DA-2, the identity conditions of each ⊥ are determined independently within each instantiation. Therefore no two ⊥ elements are identical across instantiations. ✓

## V. The Directed Instantiation Tree

With DA-2 and C-DA2 in place, the global structure of instantiations is a forward-directed tree with no back edges:

- Each node in the tree is a ⊥ — the null state of one instantiation and the foundation of all successor instantiations branching from it.
- Each edge within an instantiation is a step in a monotone state sequence (ZP-A T3). Edges are irreversible (ZP-B C3).
- Branching at each node: every distinct outbound vector from the terminal state of $I_n$ is a valid $\varepsilon_0$ for a distinct $I_{n+1}$. T-SNAP does not select among branches. Because ⊥ = {⊥} (ZP-A CC-2) is the single self-containing null state with no internal differentiation, every $\varepsilon_0$ that represents a first differentiation in any direction is a valid outcome. Branching is not optional; it follows from T-SNAP applied to an undifferentiated ⊥.
- No back edges: C-DA2 establishes that no instantiation can reach the ⊥ of any ancestor instantiation.

Remark R-DA2: T-SNAP fires wherever $P_0$ conditions are met. DA-2 establishes that the terminal state of $I_n$ satisfies those conditions for $I_{n+1}$. T-SNAP therefore applies across instantiation boundaries without modification. No new axiom is required. The multiverse is not the claim that T-SNAP fires in all directions simultaneously: it is the claim that ⊥ = {⊥} (ZP-A CC-2) has no internal differentiation and therefore no preferred direction for $\varepsilon_0$. The multiverse of instantiations is the full set of all minimal differentiations available from the single self-containing null state — a structural consequence of CC-2 + T-SNAP + DA-2 jointly.

## VI. The Zero Paradox Iterated

The paradox of ⊥ — simultaneously contributing nothing and being present in everything — propagates structurally at every branching node of the tree. Each node is:

- Nothing to its successor instantiations: it acts as additive identity under ∨, contributing nothing to any subsequent join.
- Everything to its successor instantiations: every state in $I_{n+1}$ satisfies $\bot_{n+1} \leq S$, so the node underlies everything that follows.

The tree is the geometric shape of the Zero Paradox iterated across instantiations. The single-instantiation linear sequence was always a cross-section of a structure with this shape.

The complete picture: The Zero Paradox describes a forward-directed infinite tree where $\bot_1 \to \ldots \to S_{terminal}^1 \equiv \bot_2 \to \ldots$, where ≡ means structurally satisfies the role of, not is identical to. Each arrow within an instantiation is monotone and irreversible. Each ≡ crossing is not a path — it is a new instantiation of the universal structure.

### VII. Implications Within the Framework

Multiverse as structural implication. T-SNAP establishes that a Binary Snap occurs — that ⊥ transitions to some $\varepsilon_0 > \bot$. DA-2 establishes that any terminal state satisfying $P_0$ conditions acts as ⊥ for a successor instantiation, generating a forward-directed branching tree. The multiverse structure follows from T-SNAP + DA-2 jointly. Note: T-SNAP alone does not establish that it fires on all outbound vectors simultaneously — that universality is the scope of DA-2, not a direct consequence of the snap theorem itself.

Free will and irreversibility. Within an instantiation, state sequences are monotone — no state can be decreased (ZP-A R1). Every choice is a join operation: $S_n \vee \alpha$ for some increment α. The algebra constrains only that the sequence be monotone, not which monotone path is taken. Each choice adds informational content irreversibly. Decisions are permanently encoded in the element's position in L.

Time's arrow. The monotone sequence (ZP-A T3) is a structural definition of temporal direction. Time's irreversibility is C3 applied within an instantiation. The framework does not assume time asymmetry — it derives it.

Causal structure. Every state is fully determined by the joins that produced it. The causal history of any state is encoded in its position in L. No effect without the join that produced it.

---

## Formal Insert DA-3: Perspective-Relative Cardinality

*New in v2.0 | Cardinality as position-dependent measurement within the instantiation structure*

---

### I. The Gap DA-3 Closes

DA-2 establishes that instantiations form a directed tree and that branching at each ⊥ node produces multiple successor instantiations. This raises a question about the cardinality of branching: is the fan at each node countably or uncountably infinite? The answer, which DA-3 formalises, is that this question is perspective-dependent — and that this perspective-dependence is the same structural feature that underlies the major cardinality anomalies of classical set theory.

## II. Perspective-Dependence of Branching Cardinality

From within instantiation $I_n$, an observer occupies exactly one branch of $I_{n+1}$. The other branches of $I_{n+1}$ are not accessible via any path — C3 and monotonicity jointly prohibit it. From inside, the branching factor is always 1: the observer sees one branch. From outside — from a meta-level view of the tree — the branching factor is the full fan of accessible outbound vectors.

**Definition DA-3-D1 — Accessible Cardinality**

The accessible cardinality of a position p in semilattice L is the cardinality of the set of states reachable from p by monotone sequences within the instantiation containing p.

The accessible cardinality from p is determined entirely by the structure of L above p. It is not an intrinsic property of a collection — it is a property of the relationship between a position and the states reachable from it. No position within any instantiation can access all cardinalities simultaneously. The meta-level view, which sees the full branching fan, is not a position any element of any instantiation can occupy.

Remark R-DA3-1: To observe the full branching fan, one would need to occupy a position outside all instantiations. That position would itself be a state in some semilattice, subject to the same rules. The meta-view is either another instantiation (in which case the tree has no privileged outside view) or ⊥ itself (in which case the null state is the only position from which the full structure is visible — the state that contributes nothing and is present in everything). The Zero Paradox's name is more precise than it first appeared.

## III. The Cardinality Hierarchy as Perspective-Relative

Cantor's theorem establishes that for any set S, $|P(S)| > |S|$, generating the hierarchy $\aleph_0 < 2^{\aleph_0} < 2^{2^{\aleph_0}} < \ldots$ DA-3 reframes this hierarchy not as a fixed ladder that mathematics climbs, but as a perspective-relative description of the branching structure of the instantiation tree, as seen from within different positions.

**Claim DA-3-C1 — Perspective-Relative Absolute Cardinality**

The appearance of absolute cardinality — cardinality as an intrinsic property independent of measuring position — is an artifact of treating the semilattice as having a view from outside. DA-2 and C-DA2 jointly prohibit such a view from within any instantiation.

The candidate claim (DA-3-C1) is that accessible cardinality from within any instantiation cannot replicate the view from outside. Whether specific independence results in classical set theory are formal expressions of this perspective-dependence is the conjecture that OQ-E2 is tasked with investigating.

**Status: DEFINITIONAL ALIGNMENT + CANDIDATE CLAIM. DA-3-D1 and R-DA3-1 are definitional. DA-3-C1 is a candidate claim: structurally motivated within the framework; formal derivation of the connection between accessible cardinality and specific set-theoretic independence results is deferred to OQ-E2.**

---

## Updated Open Items Register — ZP-E v2.9

| Item | Status | Description |
|---|---|---|
| AX-1: Binary Snap Causality | CLOSED — T-SNAP | AX-1 is no longer an axiom. Binary Snap derived via $P_0$ + DA-1 + L-RUN + TQ-IH + ZP-A D2. |
| DA-1: Derived Proposition (upgraded from Design Principle in v2.7) | CLOSED — CC-2 + L-INF | ZP-A CC-2 ($\perp = \{\perp\}$ Quine atom) with R3 establishes $\perp$ has no external interpreter; therefore $\perp$ at $P_0$ is necessarily executing. ZP-C L-INF provides independent informational corroboration (unbounded surprisal). DA-1 is a derivation conditional on CC-2, not a freestanding design principle. |
| DA-2: Instantiation Succession | CLOSED — Definitional | Terminal state of $I_n$ satisfies A4 role of $\perp$ for $I_{n+1}$. C-DA2 establishes ontological novelty of each $\perp$. |
| DA-3: Perspective-Relative Cardinality | CLOSED (definitional) / CANDIDATE (DA-3-C1) | DA-3-D1 establishes accessible cardinality is position-dependent within the instantiation structure. DA-3-C1 (candidate): no position within an instantiation can replicate the outside view. Whether this connects formally to specific set-theoretic independence results is deferred to OQ-E2. |
| OQ-A1: Increment selection | CLOSED — T5 | Iterative Forcing Theorem. $\alpha_n = \varepsilon(S_n)$. Grounding updated from AX-1 to T-SNAP. |
| OQ-B1: p = 2 | CLOSED — ZP-B T0 | Derived from AX-B1 and MP-1. |
| OQ-C1: Non-conservatism of DF | CLOSED — ZP-C T2 | Infinite sequence divergence proven. No postulates remain. |
| S1: Distribution stipulation | CLOSED — ZP-C T1 | Derived from AX-B1 and RP-1. |
| OQ-E1: Sequence vs. tree | CLOSED — DA-2 | The structure is a forward-directed tree, not a linear sequence. Branching is mandatory via T-SNAP. Countable vs. uncountable branching is perspective-dependent (DA-3). |
| OQ-E2: Cardinality-semilattice correspondence | OPEN | Do specific semilattice structures correspond to specific cardinality regimes? Can the framework make predictions about which instantiations satisfy CH and which do not? |
| Remaining axioms | INTENTIONAL — AX-B1, AX-G1, AX-G2 | These are the three foundational commitments of the system. No further reduction is claimed. |
| Temperature T in BA-1 | PARAMETER — intentional | Universe-contingent. Physical predictions explicitly conditional on instantiation-specific T. |

## Updated Traceability Register — ZP-E v2.9

| Claim | Grounded In | Bridge Axiom? | Status |
|---|---|---|---|
| Binary Snap causality | ZP-C D1, L-RUN, TQ-IH; ZP-A D2; DA-1 | None | Derived — T-SNAP ✓ (was: Axiomatic — AX-1) |
| DA-1: Instantiation = execution | ZP-A CC-2, R3; ZP-C L-INF (corroboration) | None | Derived Proposition — conditional on ZP-A CC-2 ($\bot = \{\bot\}$ Quine atom). R3: self-containing object has no external interpreter. L-INF: independent informational corroboration. |
| DA-2: Instantiation succession | ZP-A A4, CC-1; ZP-B C3, R1; T-SNAP | None | Definitional Alignment — clarification of CC-1 scope; no new axiom |
| C-DA2: Novelty of ⊥ | DA-2, ZP-B C3 | None | Derived — Corollary of DA-2 and C3 ✓ |
| DA-3: Perspective-relative cardinality | DA-2, C-DA2, ZP-B R1 | None | Definitional (DA-3-D1, R-DA3-1); Candidate (DA-3-C1: outside-view inaccessibility) |
| T-SNAP: Snap is derived | T-BUF chain + DA-1 | None | Derived — Cross-Framework ✓ |
| AX-1 retirement | T-SNAP closes AX-1 | N/A | AX-1 is no longer an axiom; T-SNAP is its replacement |
| Iterative Forcing T5 | AX-B1, T-SNAP (replaces AX-1) | None | Derived — grounding strengthened |
| Multiverse — structural implication | T-SNAP + DA-2 jointly | None | Structural implication — T-SNAP gives the snap; DA-2 gives the branching tree |
| OQ-E2: Cardinality correspondence | DA-3 | N/A | OPEN — formal derivation deferred |

## Validation Status — ZP-E v2.9

| Component | Status / Notes |
| --- | --- |
| DA-1: Derived Proposition (from v2.7) | Valid — conditional on ZP-A CC-2. Path 1 (structural): CC-2 establishes ⊥ = {⊥}; R3 derives no external interpreter exists; therefore ⊥ at $P_0$ cannot be a static description. Path 2 (informational): L-INF establishes unbounded surprisal beyond any finite interpreter. Both paths entail: instantiation at $P_0$ is necessarily executing. ✓ |
| T-SNAP: Binary Snap derived | Valid — Derived. Seven-step proof. All dependencies are closed theorems in their own documents. ✓ |
| AX-1 retirement | Valid — AX-1 superseded by T-SNAP. No content lost; claim strengthened from assumed to derived. |
| DA-2: Instantiation Succession | Valid — Definitional Alignment. Clarification of CC-1 scope. No new axiom. A4 role of ⊥ extended across instantiation boundaries. ✓ |
| C-DA2: Ontological Novelty of ⊥ | Valid — Derived. Follows directly from DA-2 and ZP-B C3. ✓ |
| Directed instantiation tree | Valid — Derived structural consequence of T-SNAP + DA-2. Branching is mandatory, not optional. Forward edges only. |
| Multiverse as structural implication | Valid — T-SNAP + DA-2 jointly. T-SNAP establishes the snap occurs; DA-2 establishes the branching tree structure. Universality (all outbound vectors) is DA-2's scope, not T-SNAP alone. |
| Free will / irreversibility | Valid — Structural consequence. Monotonicity (T3) constrains direction; additive ontology (R1) prohibits reduction. Path choice is undetermined by algebra. |
| Time's arrow | Valid — Derived from ZP-A T3 (monotonicity) and ZP-B C3 (irreversibility). Not assumed. |
| DA-3: Perspective-Relative Cardinality | Valid (definitional components: DA-3-D1, R-DA3-1). Candidate (DA-3-C1: connection to specific set-theoretic independence results). OQ-E2 open. |
| DA-3-C1 — outside-view inaccessibility | Candidate — no position within any instantiation can replicate the meta-level view of the branching structure. Formal derivation deferred to OQ-E2. |
| Remaining axioms: AX-B1, AX-G1, AX-G2 | Intentional foundational commitments. No further reduction claimed. |
| All other ZP-E theorems (T1–T7, T2-C) | Unaffected in content. T4 and T5 carry upgraded status labels (AX-1 → T-SNAP). |

---

*End of ZP-E v2.9 | Three formal inserts: DA-1 (Derived Proposition), DA-2, DA-3 | One open question: OQ-E2 | Remaining axioms: AX-B1, AX-G1, AX-G2*