

Is there really any good reason not to say that, although x is not *an* authority, but rather a *source* of authority, x nonetheless *has* authority?

May we not say, for example, that, although God is not *an* authority, but rather the implicit, primal, ontic *source* of authority, God nonetheless *has* authority, indeed, has the *supreme* authority that only the implicit, primal, ontic source of authority could conceivably have?

Or, again, even if we deny that experience and reason are *an* authority, because they are rather the implicit, primal noetic *source* of authority, may we not still affirm that experience and reason *have* authority, in fact, have the *supreme* authority that could belong only to the implicit, primal noetic source of authority?

September 2000