

講吳所樣野
狂 恂 堯

目錄

I	冇吳呢句野點話	3
II	乜嘢係理性	7
III	吳 𠵼𠵼𠵼 𠵼𠵼 𠵼 一個	9
Ⅳ	有人話真相係	11
Ⅴ	理性 嘅 邊界	13

| 冇吳呢句野點話

講世間上有冇吳呢個問題，講證明嘅話，我就想問，唔知可唔可以搵到一個係話吳唔存在嘅建設性證明呢吓？咩叫建設性嘅證明呢？姐係個證明，個嘢關，唔用歸謬法嘅，唔係拗到搵乜就話有矛盾所以之前講過嘅拗落嘅全部都站唔住腳，唔係講到大尾篤見到唔對路所以就可以好有信心話開初講嘅假設係流嘅，所以個假設嘅倒返轉先至係堅嘅。咁樣嘅論就係建設性喇。我嘅問題就係，要證明吳唔存在，可唔可以搵到一個建設性嘅嘢關呢？

認真諗下諗下，我都幾肯定應該係做唔到。事關本身個要求好似就有少少矛盾，有少少又要又唔要。點解咁話呢？喺，唔要歸謬呀嘛，咁姐係你想砌野出嚟啦。但事關你點樣砌一個講法去話一樣野唔存在呢？如果你係想你個論係建設性嘅，你就姐係係砌緊啲野出嚟。砌嘅過程就係立論同證明嘅過程佢自己本身。你要砌，你就要講啲舊野係點點點。咁姐係你係瞄住果舊野去出發。你嘅目的就係透過你嘅砌積木式嘅立論去講，喺，因為我地知道呢舊野同呢舊野都存在，所以將佢咁樣咁樣組合埋嘅嘢呢都存在。存在住嘅呢個特質透過你砌嘅呢個行為由一個嘢講保存去到另外一個嘢講。咁試問，你點樣可以去到搵乜係飄到「唔存在」出嚟呢？你由乜乜乜點點點度開始，砌咗呢舊野，跟住又切到呢舊野，跟住呢舊野，一舊一舊存在生半半薈晒喺度，係出唔到舊冇野——唔啱，可能話「唔係野」先至啱——係出唔到出嚟架嘅。你重要唔係要證明有啲咩「冇野」或者「唔係野」——如果呢幾舊野多到台ㄣ嘅話——我地要證明嘅係一舊叫吳嘅嘢唔存在。講到尾，要試問嘅就係諸君我等何以茲巨能之物理建諸立之乎？

咁姐係話，如果你唔要係講到淆底先至話冇吳嘅話，你有冇辦法直接講得出點解吳唔存在呢？

歸謬法，其實運作上係同構乎一方俾人質問，畀人 誑，卒之畀人 誑行嘢講講唔同喇，要淆底，推翻晒之前講嘅嘢。反問呢個手段，「乜可以咩」，本質上就係要搭嘅個話唔可以。話唔可以就係承認淆底嘅嘅一刻，就係歸謬嘅一刻，就係子之矛攻子之盾 生 一 聲嘅嘅一刹那。撞板，就係我地有得唔淆底嘅嘅一刻。淆底，就係我地打倒晒之前最開初嘅句嘢講，並且要樹立個句嘢講調返轉嘅命令。

歸謬法性嘅證明呢，係本質上同建設性嘅證明有唔同㗎所以。依度順帶一提，廣東話嘅日常市井立論習慣，係好撚多歸謬法性嘅嘢講同手段。而既然歸謬本身因為係淆底，就必然要個歸謬嘅一方吞左啖氣佢去歸謬，個行為係有認低威嘅成份嘅。要認低威，就要放低 孖咁，咁普通人就自然 藍色創作放。個々都 藍色々 藍色々，咪容易鬧到面紅耳赤火遮眼，跟住你又唔服我我又唔服你囉，李 鬧人嘅時文就會開始忍唔住挈李靚哩飛晒出嚟，最後未都係講唔到個真相係乜，不歡而散。所以呢，講廣東話嘅人，好似零舍臭脾氣就係有部份係係依度㗎。

言歸正傳，講咗咁耐拗轉晒條腰都係講到碌晒脷，斷唔會要話吳唔存在係可以用一個建設性嘅證明可以做得得到。敢亦姐係話呢，斷任何一個話乜乜乜係唔可能嘅嘢講，要講得通嘅話，就一定要係裝埋牆，裝版，畀矛盾叫我地掉頭走，我地先至可以講得通話乜乜乜係有可能。

但只不過呢，我地要記住，我地之所以可以撞到版撞到牆，係因為個迷宮有捧牆嘅度。個迷宮係點，係取決於個迷宮嘅設計。個迷宮個李兮之所以係咁嘅樣而唔係另外一個樣，係因為我地揀咗呢個迷宮嚟行。

個比喻可能扯得太遠，要講得具體返啲。我地之所以會撞板，遇到矛盾，係因為我地用嘅「公理」，姐係 兮兮琴，係注定硬會導致我地行到呢個位就會遇到個矛盾——因為我地開初嘅個個想證明嘅個嘅嘢講嘅調返轉，係同乍公理係一定唔啱牙，水溝油，有矛盾。而呢啲嘅公理，係我地服嘅開波嘢講，我地服嘅底層嘢講——姐係我地講到底我地 𦵏' 我 𦵏 嘅嘢，我地當係係真，唔使問嘅嘢。我地當係堅係真，係因為我地信呢啲嘢講。我地服呢野嘢講。因為我地覺得佢哋係所謂嘅不言自明，自證然者，唔使問亞季之事物。

唔使問姐，係唔係姐係唔問得呢？實問得㗎，但係會好難搞咁解。但係我地即管試吓啦吓。我地點解信呢所謂嘅公理呢吓？其實你可以唔信唔

賺唔服 咁。咁你唔信唔 賺唔服，我咪試吓講啲理由過你，講下啲蠶到你直覺嘅嘢講囉。喺，咁你聽完，你可能覺得，啊，到聽落講得通啊，信 賺服喇，咁咪收工囉。但係如果你照舊唔信唔 賺唔服嘅，咁我咪再試吓講多啲蠶得到你直覺嘅嘢囉。咁來來回回拉拉鋸鋸，你其實都係可以唔信唔 賺唔服架嘅——你唔係痴線或者癡柴，你係的確可以真誠真心信唔到，賺唔落，心唔服。唔過骨，係因為過唔到你骨。過唔到你骨，係因為你唔肯比佢過骨。你唔 賺唔過骨，係因為你畀唔落。就好似一個要違反天地良心，仍然覺得有合理懷疑嘅陪審員，你唔肯唔 賺。姐係，你揀咗啲嘢。你做咗選擇。

咁亦姐係意味住話，信 賺服一條所謂嘅公理，其實只不過係揀咗條公理嚟信 賺服咁解。

而你信 賺服得一條嘢嚟升佢上神台，就姐係你揀咗佢嚟信 賺服。

正如先頭所講，你信 賺服埋晒做公理嘅嘢，決定住你去信 賺服埋晒啲其他嘅嘢，或者你斷估話埋晒嘅其他嘢講，會唔會同你信 賺服嘅公理矛盾撞板，攞到你拗到某個為嘅時候就要消底反口。

話一樣嘢係唔可能，淨係可以靠歸謬法先至講得通。以之因為歸謬法本質上係建基於你信服一啲特定嘅公理。你要首先認咗啲啲公理，先至可以揸住啲公理當牌揸正牌咁講話：「根據我信 賺服嘅呢啲公理，乜乜乜係一定唔通、一定唔成立、一定唔可能。」

咁即係話，其實係有可能，你信 賺一啲嘢做公理嘅嘢講，佢哋所可以孳乳到出嚟嘅矛盾，同另外一乍等住比你信 賺服做公理嘅嘢講，所可以孳乳到出嚟嘅矛盾，可能會係唔一樣。你信呢個就可能一定會係呢到撞板，但係信嗰個就可能你個矛盾從來到唔會出現，行到去嗰樹就已經消散左，等住你係一條康莊大道，比你一炮過講到尾。信呢個就會有呢個矛盾唔會有嗰個矛盾。同時間，你要有呢個呢個矛盾你就可能要信呢一組組嘅公理組合。咁，你要有啲咩矛盾，要透過歸謬法嚟講得到話乜乜乜係有可能嘅話，你就要執藥咁執執執呢個嗰個公理出嚟。

咁再檻多一步，一 爰 咁 公理同一 爰 咁 矛盾係有互對嘅關係 廝 住，或者係所謂「雙射」嘅關係。一 爰 咁 公理，係一對一對住一 爰 咁 矛盾。要乜嘅公理，就有乜嘢嘅矛盾。公理定矛盾，矛盾定公理。要乜嘢矛盾，就有乜嘢公理。乜乜乜公理係若且僅若啲乜乜乜矛盾。再講得中啲，就係公

理就係矛盾。堅野同流野係互定其定義嘅。

講返吳唔存在冇得唔用矛盾嚟諗。既然係有乜公理先至有乜某盾，咁姐係話你講到話吳唔存在，係你啲公理所導致搞成嘅。咁有冇可能有其他嘅公理之下，就會唔可以搵到過矛盾出嚟話吳唔存在呢？有！梗係有啦。你將「吳存在」信 賺服做公理咪得囉！

II 乜嘢係理性

乜嘢係理性 㗎？理性 𠵿𠵿𠵿 係由頭落到手指尾啄啄一個來佬貨。講廣東話嘅人係可以話自古以來都有理性嘅。廣東話裏面可以用嚟討論理性嘅資源共㗎撐根本就淨係得雞碎咁多；要搵啲講理性係啲乜東東嘅文啊書啊根本就係苛求太監論床事。

乜嘢係理性？𠵿𠵿 𠵿 野係理性嘅呢？𠵿𠵿 𠵿 野係有理性，係可以有理性嘅呢？有理性嘅嘢嘅共同特質就係 𠵿 理性性（𠵿 理性性）。噏下噏下到 𠵿𠵿 泰西鬼佬講嘅 𠵿𠵿𠵿𠵿𠵿，用「理性」呢個和制漢詞根本必唔到啲唔有用或者得意嘅理解出嚟，因為個詞根本就冇詞根源流嘅，亦有典籍同同義詞網去輔助同詮釋 𠵿𠵿𠵿 個意思同用法係乜係點，根本講完等於冇講。

如果要真係可以好好地咁捕捉到 𠵿𠵿𠵿𠵿𠵿 係啲乜嘢，我地就應該好好地用廣東話嘅時文同詞彙粒子照住個 𠵿𠵿𠵿𠵿𠵿 嘅譜嚟砌返出嚟——他器自造。

咁我地就可以有一個比較咁上下且 𠵿𠵿𠵿 嘅講法喇。

咁鬼佬講嘅理性，係乜嗟？𠵿𠵿𠵿𠵿𠵿 𠵿𠵿𠵿𠵿𠵿 軀使 𠵿 特質。𠵿𠵿 𠵿𠵿𠵿𠵿𠵿 𠵿𠵿𠵿𠵿𠵿 軀使 𠵿 特質 𠵿𠵿 野。

理性 ~ 𠵿𠵿𠵿𠵿𠵿 ~ 𠵿𠵿𠵿𠵿𠵿 軀使 𠵿 特質 𠵿𠵿 野

「軀使」太過白言文，用自己話講就可以話「啲」，所以呢，𠵿𠵿𠵿𠵿𠵿 𠵿𠵿𠵿𠵿𠵿 啲 𠵿 特質 𠵿𠵿 野。

理性 ~ 𠵿𠵿𠵿𠵿𠵿 ~ 𠵿𠵿𠵿𠵿𠵿 啲 𠵿 特質 𠵿𠵿 野

通常去到呢度就大家都會好滿意㗎啦，可以收手放工飲啖茶。之不過

呢，我地可以問一問，辭齡 啲你，你做得一個人，你就就咁畀佢啲㗎啦？你有 諗㗎？辭齡 話乜就係乜嘅喇咩？咁樣同聽話有乜嘢分別？辭齡 話乜，我地自己心目中可以有分寸㗎？可以駁嘴㗎？可以話我俾唔俾佢過骨㗎係咪㗎？

如果呢個諗法係對理性呢個概念嘅可講得通嘅分析嘅話，咁我地就可以話，歪兮旡旡季 止以 有料判斷應唔應制畀理過骨嘅特質。

理性 ~ 歪兮旡旡季 ~ 皆辭齡兮 啲 乜 特質 𠵼 矣 野

~ 制 皆辭齡兮 啲 乜 特質 𠵼 矣 野

~ 制 皆辭齡兮 過骨啲 乜 特質 𠵼 矣 野

~ 有料判斷應 𠵼 應制 皆辭齡兮 過骨啲 乜 特質 𠵼 矣 野

畀理所啲嘅特質

制畀理所啲嘅特質

畀理所引導嘅特質

畀理過骨嘅特質

制唔制畀理過骨嘅特質

應唔應制畀理過骨嘅特質

判斷應唔應制畀理過骨嘅特質

有料判斷應唔應制畀理過骨嘅特質

III 吳止𠵿𠵿𠵿 𠵿𠵿 𠵿 一個

吳止𠵿𠵿𠵿 𠵿𠵿 𠵿 一個。道都係止𠵿𠵿𠵿 𠵿𠵿 𠵿 一個。吳同道本質上係分唔開嘅，因為佢哋只不過係同一舊野嘅唔同嘅名——或者至少我地應該咁樣信住先啦。唔 𠵿𠵿 可以擇日再拗過。噏，但係依度都係咁意𠵿𠵿𠵿𠵿𠵿 你 𠵿，等 𠵿 𠵿 好 𠵿 𠵿 𠵿。𠵿，話吳道為一，你詐型嘅一定就會話，吳係有人性嘅，佢係有個性，有判斷力，有意識，有自由意志，有玄 𠵿𠵿。至於道呢家野呢，道係有人性嘅，佢係有喜怒哀樂有欲求嘅。道只不過係規矩，係規律。道係嘅道係被遵守或者被其統治之嘅嘢。道佢規管住野，但係佢並唔統治任何野，因為道係有意志，有意識，佢有野諗亦諗唔到野嘅。道係有咩想要唔想要，佢淨係會講乜嘢係得乜嘢係唔得。我話吳道為一，你鬧我嘅度溝埋一齊搞緊賴尿牛丸，未嘗有道理。我要嘅度應你嘅話，我會話，最高最 𠵿𠵿 𠵿 道，係要有 𠵿 吳 𠵿 有 𠵿 特質，尤其係自由意志，先至理順到道呢個概念嘅本質。調返轉頭，唔使問亞季，吳本身就係規矩，係規律。道所做嘅嘢，吳都做緊。

回歸正傳，試問點解咁話呢吓？點解話吳止𠵿𠵿𠵿 𠵿𠵿 𠵿 一個呢吓？因為吳同道係同一樣野，而道只可以有一個。如果有兩個嘅話，我地會好快發現其實講唔通。

噏，就當有兩個吳。有兩個有個性，有自由意志嘅吳類個體係樹喇。既然係樹 𠵿，𠵿 試問佢哋兩個點樣互動呢？噏，如果佢哋兩個互動到埋一齊嘅，咁就一定係有啲規矩束住佢哋互動嘅模式同有啲咩做得一啲咩唔做得。咁嘅話，個規管住佢地之間嘅互動，就可以話係道嘅一部份。呢個規管住佢哋互動嘅道一定係係樹，事關如果呢舊嘢係唔存在嘅話，咁就意味住嗰兩個吳類個體嘅意志根本唔受外在嘅所影響或者束住，咁姐係其實對於對方嚟講根本就唔存在。

你可能會話，佢哋兩個唔影響對方咁又點掂？兩舊野可以係處於一個冇得互動嘅狀態隔，唔 奇咗 佢哋兩個根本就唔存在㗎。但之不過係咪呢？如果兩舊野係有可能互相影響到，冇得互相 冇規矩 對方，咁我地憑咩講話佢哋兩舊野存在呢？

但只不過咁，我地回歸我地講緊嘅嘢——我就當緊有兩個吳。呢兩舊野，係我地嘅腦袋我地嘅心眼度 齊吳畀，躉咗喺度。佢哋兩個可能有直接嘅互動，但我地嘅心眼就睇緊佢哋，我地甚至可以係我地嘅心眼度使佢哋啱嚟啱去，甚至撞埋一齊。佢哋點樣互動，我地呢個第三方嘅係睇緊。咁姐係話，佢哋兩個嘅互動係影響緊我地呢個第三方。如果係咁嘅話，咁佢地同我地嘅互動一定係一定嘅規律主宰住，一定係有啲嘢可以發生，同埋一定係有某種意義上嘅因果。咁姐係話，有某種意義上嘅理，有溝，有道，係樹，統一咁主宰個兩個嘅吳。咁姐係話，嗰兩個嘅吳，其實係畀一個比佢哋更加大，更加架勢嘅個體所支配緊。咁姐係話，嗰兩個嘅所謂吳，今本就唔係終極嘅吳，而主宰住佢哋嘅嗰舊更加雄偉嘅道，先至終極嘅吳。

× 有人話真相係

有人話真相係就係點樣樣嘅嘢。有人話真相係同你信開個套講得埋一齊嘅嘢。有人話真相係實際上行得通、有用嘅嘢。有人話真相係齊方便噏嘢嘅嘢，冇乜特別意思。有人話真相係大家坐埋枱傾吓傾吓，噏吓噏吓、唔經唔覺約定俗成搵出嚟嘅嘢。有人話真相係個句講出嚟同現實啱牙相符嘅嘢。有人話真相係根本就係多餘嘅嘢諗，斷宜一句嘢講係堅嘅根本就冇添加到任何新嘅資訊。有人話真相係用靠得住嘅方法呖出到出嚟嘅嘢。有人話真相係有好多個好多種嘅，同埋係按情況而變嘅，係唔同嘅領域度會唔同。有人話真相係無論你信唔信，都照樣存在嘅嘢。

有人話野靚嘅呢個特質係有和諧、有比例、睇落舒服嘅嘢所呈現嘅一畀野。有人話野靚嘅呢個特質係會令人動人心弦撩起人心嘅嘢所呈現嘅一畀野。有人話野靚嘅呢個特質係會令人睇、聽、感受到之後覺得好享受嘅經驗所呈現嘅一畀野。有人話野靚嘅呢個特質係賞心悅目，畀人五官享樂嘅嘢所呈現嘅特質，而且係一樣主觀受授予嘅一畀野。

有人話野靚嘅呢個特質係靚嘢本身就有嘅一畀味道，見到就會覺得正，唔關你點諗事。

有人話野靚嘅呢個特質係係有形式同有本本嘅嘢所呈現嘅一畀野。

有人話野靚嘅呢個特質係睇文化習俗同場合話事，邊度流行咩就咩靚嘅一畀野。

有人話個好字係可以將歎嘅感覺撐到最大同將痛苦削到最少嘅嘢。有人話個好字係同預義氣鏟同埋普世規矩啱牙對齊嘅嘢。有人話個好字係推動埋晒啲人類豐盛同高尚情操嘅嘢。

有人話個好字係人定嘅同風俗噏出嚟嘅。

有人話個好字係一個有神性嘅有人格體話係好所以就係好嘅嘢。

有人話個好字係 𨮒 乎人類天性、自然，同理性器官嘅嘢。有人話個好字係好玩好歎嘅嘢。有人話個好字係被認同係可以益到社會嘅嘢。

有人話個好字係證明到可以改善到同解決到社會問題嘅嘢。

有人話個好字係培育到人同人之間嘅掙扎同推進到對他人嘅關懷嘅嘢。

有人話個好字係問心就知係乜嘅嘢。

有人話乜嘢係 𨮒 就係可以令最多人開心同減少最多人痛苦嘅嘢。

有人話乜嘢係 𨮒 就係符合道德責任同道德命令嘅嘢。有人話乜嘢係 𨮒 就係培育埋晒德性同埋推動埋晒人類幸福同盛放嘅嘢。

有人話乜嘢係 𨮒 就係大家認同係會益到社會及其成員嘅嘢。

有人話乜嘢係 𨮒 就係被神命令同埋符合神嘅意志嘅嘢。有人話乜嘢係 𨮒 就係睇後果同攷點樣所決定嘅嘢。有人話乜嘢係 𨮒 就係尊重同維護個人權利同自由嘅嘢。

8 理性嘅邊界

乜野係理性嘅？理性嘅咁係由頭落到手指尾啄啄一個來佬貨。講廣東話嘅人係可以話自古以來都有理性嘅。廣東話裏面可以用嚟討論理性嘅資源共啲撐根本就淨係得雞碎咁多；要搵啲講理性係啲乜東東嘅文啊書啊根本就係苛求太監論床事。

泰西鬼佬講嘅理性，用我地廣東話要搵返個咁上下嘅講法呢，可能就係「諗通講通嘢嘅」

There is a boundary to rationality. What lies beyond there? it is wittgenstein's whatever one cannot speak of one must remain silent. It is Jonah and the whale. It is 塞翁失馬塞翁得馬. it is isaiah chapter 55 verse 8 - my ways are not your ways. It is reflexivity. It is karma. It is serendipity. It is revelation. It is the integral factor rule. A computational competent man would compute his rational conclusions without fault. A wise man would know where his rationality ends and let God work his powers.

理性有個界限。界限之外係乜嘢呢？就係維根斯坦講嗰句——「凡係講唔到嘅，就要保持沉默。」就係約拿條鯨魚肚入面。就係「塞翁失馬，焉知非福」。就係《以賽亞書》第五十五章第八節：「我嘅道路唔係你嘅道路。」就係反身性。就係因果報應。就係機緣巧合。就係啟示。就係積分因子法則。一個計算能力完全正確嘅人，可以有錯咁算到佢嘅理性結論。但一個智慧嘅人，會知道自己嘅理性去到邊度就完，然後交界上帝去發揮祂嘅力量。

There is a sense, that Christianity, is fundamentally inconsistent. It is praxalogically inconsistent. It says one thing but does

another - or rather - it says one thing but requires something else for it to survive and prosper. It is the same thing why "I vow to thee my country" can be argued to be fundamentally a war-mongering, fascist, and therefore ultimately unchristian song. If Christ asks you to turn the other cheek when your crimea is taken, and your twin towers obliterated, and your country raped, then to vow to thee my country all earthly things above is unchristian - you ask for God to be on your right hand to make wealth and his wisdom and love on your left to forge the weapons so you may slaughter his children...yet Christianity like all other faiths - including science - which is a faith if you're honest and you dive deep enough - cannot prosper if its prophets are artful in speech but ultimately unarmed... Christianity needs armed prophets but it also demands its soldiers be unarmed - it is blatantly inconsistent.

Who is good enough to enter heaven? The theologically orthodox answer is no one. Everyone is a sinner. And no one is able to make up for their sins. No one is morally perfect for heaven. Entry to heaven is only by God's grace.

This seems to me to be saying that ultimate moral goodness is not the result of some supreme moral algorithm. It is ultimately determined by god - an intelligence beyond algorithmic compatibility.

This outrageous theory by Julian Jaynes that I have first heard from a friend in New York earlier this year has inspired me an equally outrageous thought in me. Jaynes argue from the Illiad that before 1200 bce humans did not conceive of "the inner voice" as an inner voice of one's self, but as a voice from god or from the gods. The breakdown of that conception which gave way to the recognition or identification of the inner voice marks the a milestone in the evolution of consciousness.

One thing that has befuddled me is Christianity's emphasis on love. It has always seemed so bizarre to me that Christianity should

place such emphasis on love as the most sublime form of human emotion - in the sense that the position appears so very sounding loud the obvious. OBVIOUSLY love is the most profound and sublime affection humans are capable of duh. (係愛啊哈利) well, perhaps the reason why Christianity made such a big deal out of it is because humans WERENT capable of love. (Perhaps the psalms would disagree) Love appears to be apparently and obviously the most sublime and divine emotion there is only because Christianity has triumphed. Indeed, on an arguably ignorant perspective, can we say for sure the Romans knew love, with all their political marriages, warmaking, boy-fucking, and divorcing? Did the Greeks know love? Did the ancient Persians? The Egyptians? Did the ancient Chinese really express “love” in 青青子衿悠悠我心縱我不往子寧不嗣音? Is 所謂伊人在水一方 really an innocent expression of playful flirtiness across a stream, or is it a grotesque and lustful display of “no means yes” ?

“If and only if” propositions are engines of truth. They beget a paradigm of truth in themselves. They assert a web of logically and metaphysically connected assertions. If “existence must have meaning” implies and is implied by “god exists” then in the chain of proofs that establishes the implication and the contrainplication we will have established an associated chains of truths as well. They live or die with the conclusion.

If existence has meaning is what we take to be truth on faith, in the same way we take the law of non contradiction, we may say that the

If we seek morality only because we are driven by a deep drive to continue existing, because we want to realise that meaning, we will ask where does that meaning come from, and god would be a reasonable answer.

The theist answer to the Question of Existence, Morality, basi-

cally the question of what is the true the good the right beautiful,
must not only assert god to be an answer, it must assert to be the
only answer

