

講吳所樣野  
狂 恂 堯

# 目錄

I	冇吳呢句野點話 . . . . .	3
II	理性嘅邊界 . . . . .	6

## 一 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攞到「唔存在」出嚟呢？你由乜乜點點點度開始，砌咗呢舊野，跟住又切到呢舊嘢，跟住呢舊野，一舊一舊存在生半半曬晒嘅度，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」——如果呢幾舊野多到咁嘅話——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嗰一刻，就係歸謬嘅一刻，就係子之矛攻子之盾 生 一 聲嘅嗰一刹那。撞板，就係我地冇得唔淆底嘅嗰一刻。淆底，就係我地打倒晒之前最開初嗰句嘢講，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，就必然要嗰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 龜 龜咗。個乜都 龜 龜，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，最後未都係講唔到個真理出嚟。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㗎，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<sup>design</sup>到版撞<sup>design</sup>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<sup>design</sup>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 冥 冥，係注定硬會導致我地行到呢個位就會遇到個矛盾——因為我地開初嘅嗰個想證明嘅嗰個嘢講嘅調返轉，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 豈 我 奔 嘅嘢，我地當係堅係真，唔使問嘅嘢。我地當係堅係真，係因為我地信呢啲嘢講。我地服呢嘢嘢講。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，我咪試吓講嘅理由過你，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——你唔係痴線或者癡柒，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 賺畀佢過骨，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淆底反口。

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，但係信啲個就可能你個矛盾從來到唔會出現，行到去啲樹就已經消散左，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啲個矛盾。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啲個公理出嚟。

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。

## 11 理性嘅邊界

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？就係維根斯坦講個句——「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：「我嘅道路唔係你哋嘅道路。」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, basically 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