



Philosophical Plays

ISSN 1654-6296 (print) · ISSN 1654-6318 (online)

IN THIS ISSUE:

Philosophical Play: Wendy's Risky Role-Play and the Gory Plot of the Okefenokee

Man-Monster, BO C. KLINTBERG

1–238

SCENE I. Too Late for a Lady of the Law	1
SCENE II. Boy Lies with Girl	10
SCENE III. Backstage Drama	19
SCENE IV. A Really Relaxing Rendezvous	55
SCENE V. Baldy's Barbie-Babes	64
SCENE VI. The Owen Problem	84
SCENE VII. Just Follow the Money	94
SCENE VIII. Katherine Has a Heart	107
SCENE IX. Elephant Friends Forever	132
SCENE X. Incommensurability	145
SCENE XI. The Fat Rat	156
SCENE XII. Localization or Globalization?	171
SCENE XIII. Wendy's Risky Role-Play	193
SCENE XIV. A Moribund Mortality Proof	204
SCENE XV. The Okefenokee Man-Monster	215
SCENE XVI. Some Conclusive Costume Talk	230



Philosophical Plays

ISSN 1654-6296 (print) · ISSN 1654-6318 (online)

IN THIS ISSUE:

Philosophical Play: Wendy's Risky Role-Play and the Gory Plot of the Okefenokee

Man-Monster, BO C. KLINTBERG

I–238

SCENE I. Too Late for a Lady of the Law	<i>I</i>
SCENE II. Boy Lies with Girl	<i>10</i>
SCENE III. Backstage Drama	<i>19</i>
SCENE IV. A Really Relaxing Rendezvous	<i>55</i>
SCENE V. Baldy's Barbie-Babes	<i>64</i>
SCENE VI. The Owen Problem	<i>84</i>
SCENE VII. Just Follow the Money	<i>94</i>
SCENE VIII. Katherine Has a Heart	<i>107</i>
SCENE IX. Elephant Friends Forever	<i>132</i>
SCENE X. Incommensurability	<i>145</i>
SCENE XI. The Fat Rat	<i>156</i>
SCENE XII. Localization or Globalization?	<i>171</i>
SCENE XIII. Wendy's Risky Role-Play	<i>193</i>
SCENE XIV. A Moribund Mortality Proof	<i>204</i>
SCENE XV. The Okefenokee Man-Monster	<i>215</i>
SCENE XVI. Some Conclusive Costume Talk	<i>230</i>

PUBLISHED BY:
Bo C. Klintberg

FOUNDER, AUTHOR, EDITOR:
Bo C. Klintberg

ART DIRECTION & TYPOGRAPHY:
Bo C. Klintberg

ONLINE EDITION (OPEN ARCHIVE):
<http://www.philosophicalplays.com>
ISSN: 1654-6318

PRINT EDITION (FREE PDFs):
<http://www.philosophicalplays.com>
ISSN: 1654-6296

COPYRIGHT:

All published material in *Philosophical Plays*, both in the print edition and in the online edition, is Copyright © 2012 by Bo C. Klintberg. All rights reserved.

No part of these publications may be reproduced, or republished, or stored in a retrieval system, without prior permission in writing from the author.

PERMISSIONS:

For inquiries about permission to reproduce, or to republish, or to store in a retrieval system, the material appearing in either the print edition or the online edition of *Philosophical Plays*, kindly write the author at the e-mail address provided below.

CORRESPONDENCE:
[philosophicalplays.editor
\[at\] gmail \[dot\] com](mailto:philosophicalplays.editor@gmail.com)

Wendy's Risky Role-Play and the Gory Plot of the Okefenokee Man-Monster

BO C. KLINTBERG

CHARACTERS:

Christianus, *a satisfactionist*

Katherine, *a lawyer*

Wendy, *a waitress*

Baldy, *a player*

Selma, *an old lady*

Thelma, *another old lady*

*The scene throughout is at
a coffee shop in London; it's 10:15,
Friday, March 23, 2007.*

SCENE I.

Too Late for a Lady of the Law

- 1 KATHERINE: Hey Chris . . . you're *late!*
- 2 CHRISTIANUS: Well, what did you *expect?* This
is not The *Early* Victorian, is it?
- 3 KATHERINE: No. But . . .

- 4 CHRISTIANUS: I know, I know. I *am* sorry, Katherine. I didn't *plan* coming late. But some last-minute matters came up.
- 5 KATHERINE: Nothing serious, I hope?
- 6 CHRISTIANUS: Well, national food policy issues are *always* serious. But *personal* ones are even *more* so. So here I am!
- 7 KATHERINE: *That's* the spirit! I am *really* glad you could make it!
- 8 CHRISTIANUS: Likewise. So what do you think about this place?
- 9 KATHERINE: It looks *great!*
- 10 CHRISTIANUS: Yes, and they have some *a-m-a-z-i-n-g* coffee!

1:1, you're late: This meeting was scheduled for 10 a.m. See Christianus and Katherine's discussion at XVI:24–37 in *KQQ* (Klintberg 2008a, pp. 97–98).

BO C. KLINTBERG (2008a), *Katherine's Questionable Quest for Love and Happiness in Philosophical Plays*, vol. 1, no. 1.

1:6, national food policy issues: This comment may have been related in some way to the proposed change in screenplay writing and production standards suggested by the Republican FCC commissioner Deborah Tate, who, according to Brooks Boliek, 'wants celery and carrots to get equal TV time with doughnuts and candy bars' (Boliek 2007). Tate said that, '[t]he story line should include healthful messages and activities' (Boliek 2007).

It is also interesting to note that although the article apparently was written by Brooks Boliek at 1 p.m. EST on 22 March 2007, it was not released (at least not with the same title) until 7:58 p.m. EST on 22 March 2007, after which it *again* was released at 2:54 a.m. EST on 23 March 2007, presumably with minor corrections. It may also be relevant to note that their UK archive [<http://uk.reuters.com>] has a similar article, dated 22 March 2007, 5:00 GMT, but only released *once*. Therefore, if this *is* the food policy issue that Christianus is referring to, there were many opportunities for him to see this information, just on Reuters.

BROOKS BOLIEK (2007), 'FCC Member wants more fruits, vegetables on TV'. Reuters, Friday, 23 March 2007,

- 11 KATHERINE: So I've heard. The only problem
is that it's *crowded!*
- 12 CHRISTIANUS: Hmmm, yes. But let's go in an-
yway. You can't see everything from the
street.
- 13 KATHERINE: Sure, sometimes one has to inves-
tigate things from some other location or
perspective to get the whole story. Or at
least *more* of the story.
- 14 CHRISTIANUS: Thy words are wise, my dear
Lady of the Law!
- 15 KATHERINE: No wiser than those that *thou*
speak'st, my dear Sage of Satisfaction!
- 16 CHRISTIANUS: Ha ha! You're funny!

2:54 a.m. EDT. Online article retrieved from the Reuters website [http://www.reuters.com] on Tuesday, 3 April 2012.

1:6, food policy . . . always serious: If Christianus's serious food policy issue was connected to the ideas presented in Boliek's article (Boliek 2007; ref. *supra*, note 'food policy' at 1:6), Christianus might have responded to FCC's representative something like this, having Table 37 ('Modifications of public policies that would promote better food choices and more active lifestyles') in mind (Nestle 2002, p. 367): 'If childhood obesity, or *any* obesity, really *is* the issue, why propose *equal* TV time? Why not just *prohibit* the exposure of all unhealthy foods and practices on air, or at least decrease their time on air *radically*? And

why not implement *the rest* of Marion Nestle's *Food Politics* recommendations as well, while you're at it?'

MARION NESTLE (2002), *Food Politics: How the Food Industry Influences Nutrition and Health*. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press.

1:15, *thou*: The pronoun 'thou', derived from Old English (for OE pronoun paradigms, see Lockwood 1975, p. 184), is a word that might be understood as 'you'. It has been used in Early Modern and Elizabethan English, and also in 'most of the modern dialects of England' (Wright and Wright 1973, pp. 159–160), although (most of) its later use probably should be understood as being 'archaic' and therefore mainly 'poetic' or 'literary'. However, it is not immediately clear how

- 17 KATHERINE: You too.
- 18 CHRISTIANUS: Shall we?
- 19 KATHERINE: Sure. I am *freezing!*
- 20 CHRISTIANUS: After *you*, mademoiselle!
- 21 KATHERINE: Thanks, but why don't *you* go
first, since you know the place?
- 22 CHRISTIANUS: OK. Just be careful with the
door here. It's *really* heavy.
- 23 KATHERINE: Uff! Uh! You're right. And *squeaky!*
- 24 CHRISTIANUS: Indeed.
- 25 KATHERINE: But still *charming!*
- 26 CHRISTIANUS: Well . . .

and when one might use it, since the word 'you' *also* might be used, but not always interchangeably. In fact, it is that (potentially) *non*-interchangeable aspect of these words that playwrights such as Shakespeare sometimes use to display, in a more explicit way, the shifting roles and relations that the characters are going through. Thus, Foakes is right to point out that speakers sometimes (e.g. in *King Lear*) *do* signal changes in their relationships when they suddenly start using 'thou' instead of 'you', or vice versa (Foakes 1997, pp. 7–8).

However, Foakes's simple categorization of the word 'you' as 'the common, more neutral form' (Foakes 1997, p. 7) might be troublesome: for what does 'common' and 'neutral' *mean*? If, for example, we would take 'neutral' to mean 'less emotional' or 'unemotional' or 'emotionally disengaged', we would

still not be able to explain cases such as the example in Abbott's *Shakespearian Grammar* where one seemingly *should* use 'you' even in a *more* passionate (i.e., *less* 'neutral') utterance: 'When the appellative "sir" is used, even in anger, *thou* generally gives place to *you*' (Abbott 1883, p. 155).

Therefore, it may be better (at least in the beginning stages) to simply avoid Foakes's attempt to offer a simple categorization and instead go directly to Barber (1993, pp. 186–187) or Wright and Wright (1973, pp. 159–160) for a better, but still not entirely unproblematic, introduction. The serious student can then continue to Abbott's more detailed account and its many examples (Abbott 1883), after which he also may consider using the concise 'thou' entry in Onions as a convenient 'Abbott reminder' (Onions 1966, p. 255).

- 27 KATHERINE: *Aaah!*
- 28 CHRISTIANUS: What?
- 29 KATHERINE: It's *warm* in here!
- 30 CHRISTIANUS: It sure is. With so many people,
how could it *not* be?
- 31 KATHERINE: Right. But I'm not complaining.
I *like* it hot.
- 32 CHRISTIANUS: Me too.
- 33 KATHERINE: And I absolutely *adore* that classi-
cal music!
- 34 CHRISTIANUS: Yes, it's quite popular.
- 35 KATHERINE: What is it?

Consulting these resources, it might then not be unreasonable to take Katherine's usage of 'thou', in *this* particular context, *not* as a gesture of any 'good-humoured superiority' towards a servant, but simply as an 'affection' towards a friend (Abbott 1883, pp. 153–154; cf. Onions 1966, p. 225). But if *that* is the case, why does she — *and* Christianus — switch back to 'you' soon after? Is there no more *affection* on the table? Or are the times a-changing?

E. A. ABBOTT (1883), *A Shakespearian Grammar: An Attempt to Illustrate Some of the Differences Between Elizabethan and Modern English*. New edition. London: Macmillan.

CHARLES BARBER (1993), *The English Language: A Historical Introduction*. Cambridge Approaches to Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

R. A. FOAKES (1997), 'Introduction'

in William Shakespeare, *King Lear*. High Holborn: Arden Shakespeare, pp. 1–151.

W. B. LOCKWOOD (1975), *Languages of the British Isles Past and Present*. London: André Deutsch.

C. T. ONIONS (1966), *A Shakespeare Glossary*. Second edition, revised. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press.

JOSEPH WRIGHT AND ELIZABETH MARY WRIGHT (1973), *An Elementary Middle English Grammar*. Second edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

1:34, it's quite popular: Christianus here seems to be talking about the *current* state of affairs in this particular coffee shop, in terms of what customers generally are saying about the music when they visit. But serious historians should, of course, be very careful *not* to conclude from this statement that clas-

- 36 CHRISTIANUS: I am not sure. I wasn't part of
the music committee. But it's *definitely*
something late nineteenth-centuryish.
- 37 KATHERINE: How do you know *that*, if you
don't know what it *is*?
- 38 CHRISTIANUS: It just follows naturally.
- 39 KATHERINE: From what?
- 40 CHRISTIANUS: From the premises.

sical music was *very* popular in Christianus's time; for in the beginning of the twenty-first century, only a relatively small percentage of the population actively listened to classical music.

Also, one should probably *not* understand Christianus's statement as having anything to do with the preferences of the general population in (late) *Victorian* times. Although classical music certainly was promoted in different forms by associations such as the Philharmonic Society in London (see *infra*, note 'late Victorian classical music at 1:42) and by the (in 1883) newly inaugurated Royal College of Music (with its 50 students, selected from 1,588 local candidates, studying pianoforte, singing, violin, composition, violoncello, organ, clarinet, flute, and harp; see *Musical Times* 1883), classical music was probably not the most popular type of music for the middle class.

The *exact* 'composition' of what the middle class liked may remain unknown, but there are still a few points one could make. In terms of commercial interest and 'popular culture', the (London) music hall and its nightly entertainment, including its 'song, dance, comic rou-

tine, acrobats, and animal acts' (Faulk 2004, p. 1) must be mentioned. Other popular music events were Gilbert and Sullivan's playful operas at the Savoy, which, according to Wood, 'will always be associated with the late Victorian age' (Wood 1982, p. 285) and, according to George Rowell, their popularity so lasting that 'for modern audiences Savoy Opera and the Victorian theatre have largely become synonymous' (Rowell 1978, p. 95). But we shall not forget that also many late Victorian musical adventures simply were had at home, around the piano (Harwood 2009, p. 22), or in other small groups of people coming together in various locations, such as in those 'singing classes' and 'temperance bands' that Dave Russell mentions (Russell 1987, p. 18).

BARRY J. FAULK (2004), *Music Hall and Modernity: The Late-Victorian Discovery of Popular Culture*. Athens, OH: Ohio University Press.

JEREMY HARWOOD (2009), *Looking Back at Britain: Holidays and Hard Times – 1870s*. London: Reader's Digest.

MUSICAL TIMES (1883), 'The Inauguration of the Royal College of Music (1 June 1883)'. Reprinted (partly, with

- 41 KATHERINE: *What* premises?
- 42 CHRISTIANUS: Well, if you know that they must *not* play anything but late Victorian classical music, then what else could it *be*?
- 43 KATHERINE: Hmm. No exceptions?
- 44 CHRISTIANUS: Well, when the place is *closed*, the staff can play whatever they want,

omissions) in J. M. Golby, ed., *Culture and Society in Britain 1850–1890: A Source Book of Contemporary Writings*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 228–231.

GEORGE ROWELL (1978), *The Victorian Theatre 1792–1914*. Second edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

DAVE RUSSELL (1987), *Popular Music in England, 1840–1914: A Social History*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

ANTHONY WOOD (1982), *Nineteenth Century Britain: 1815–1914*. Harlow: Longman.

1:42, late Victorian classical music:

What is the significance of the phrase ‘late Victorian’, in connexion with the term ‘classical music’ and the role it plays at the coffee house? One way to interpret this expression might be to propose that the kind of classical music that was played there was the one that was *composed* sometime during that era. In this case, one could then include works such as, for example, César Franck’s Symphony in D minor (1888), Tchaikovsky’s Fifth Symphony (1888), and Arnold Schoenberg’s *Verklärte Nacht* (1899), as mentioned in Grout and Palisca (1988, p. 666).

Another way to interpret this expres-

sion might be to suggest that the kind of classical music that was played there was the one that was *performed* in the late Victorian era, whether it was *composed* in that era or not. One could then list, for example, the works performed by the Philharmonic Society at its First Concert (of the season) at St. James’s Hall on Thursday, 23 March 1876, as reported by the *Illustrated London News* (1876a, p. 310), including Mendelssohn’s overture ‘The Isles of Fingal’, Weber’s overture ‘Euryanthe’, Schumann’s symphony in C, and Beethoven’s pianoforte concerto in G. However, the full programme that Thursday evening, as Foster has recorded it (Foster 1912, p. 354), also included works by Mozart, Stradella, Chopin, Hiller, Taubert, and Brahms.

MYLES BIRKET FOSTER (1912), *The History of the Philharmonic Society of London: 1813–1912; A Record of a Hundred Years’ Work in the Cause of Music*. London: John Lane.

DONALD JAY GROUT AND CLAUDE V. PALISCA (1988), *A History of Western Music*. Fourth edition. New York and London: W. W. Norton & Company.

ILLUSTRATED LONDON NEWS (1876a), Saturday, 25 March 1876, vol. 68, no. 1913.

if they just keep the volume down. But when it's *open*, it *has* to be Victorian. *Late* Victorian.

45 KATHERINE: I see.

46 CHRISTIANUS: But now, ta-ta-ta-taaa-ta-ta-
taaaaaa!

47 KATHERINE: What?

48 CHRISTIANUS: I have a surprise for you!

49 KATHERINE: You *do*?

50 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. We just have to cross the
room.

51 KATHERINE: How *can* we? It's so crowded!

52 CHRISTIANUS: Yes, I know. Which is why I'll
ask Baldy and his basketball buddies to
move their butts.

53 KATHERINE: OK. Just be polite.

54 CHRISTIANUS: Sir?

55 BALDY: Yes?

56 CHRISTIANUS: Can you and your friends ex-
cuse us?

57 BALDY: Uh . . . ?

58 CHRISTIANUS: We just want to take a look at
the wall over there, behind you. But nei-
ther of us is seven feet tall. So maybe we
could trade places?

59 BALDY: Oh, I see! Sure, no problem! We can

hang out at the statue instead.

60 CHRISTIANUS: *Great!* Thanks, mate!

61 KATHERINE: Thanks!

62 BALDY: My pleasure.

63 CHRISTIANUS: Was I polite enough?

64 KATHERINE: Yes. *Very* nice!

65 CHRISTIANUS: Good. So here it is!

SCENE II.

Boy Lies with Girl

- 1 KATHERINE: *A mural?*
- 2 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. It's apparently one of those
Victorian *fresco* projects.
- 3 KATHERINE: *Fantastic!*
- 4 CHRISTIANUS: But not very off-the-wall.
- 5 KATHERINE: It obviously wasn't *meant* to be.
- 6 CHRISTIANUS: That's the problem.
- 7 KATHERINE: Problem? There's no *problem*. It's
beautiful! What an artist! Just look at all
that *marble!*

11:2, Victorian fresco projects: Christianus may, for example, think of some 'representative' Victorian art projects that involved murals. One such ambitious project involved the planned production of many murals in London's Westminster Palace, 'intended to give an impetus to a revival of the art of historical painting in general, and of fresco painting in particular' (Kurzer 2006, p. 139). However, according to Ormond, the only frescoes produced having 'any real expressive power' — although their lustre faded rather quickly (cf. Kurzer 2006, p. 146), perhaps due to the 'mania' of trying to produce historically 'authentic portraits' (Strong 2004, pp. 91–93; cf. Vaughan 1983, p. 756) — were the panoramic military-history murals

The Meeting of Wellington and Blücher at Waterloo and *The Death of Nelson* in the Royal Gallery, completed by Daniel Maclise, R.A. (1806–1870) in 1863 and 1865 (Kurzer 2006, p. 147), or, alternatively, sometime during the last twelve years of his life (Ormond 1968, pp. 691–692).

Another ambitious art project was the group of twelve wall paintings (eight of which are true frescoes, the others oil on canvas) in Alfred Waterhouse's Great Hall of Manchester Town Hall, finished in 1893 by Ford Madox Brown (1821–1893) — in Farr's estimation, 'the most ambitious civic commission of its kind in the nineteenth century' (Farr 1978, p. 328).

DENNIS FARR (1978), *The Oxford Histo-*

- 8 CHRISTIANUS: I'm looking.
- 9 KATHERINE: It's very Italian, wouldn't you say?
- 10 CHRISTIANUS: Or Roman.
- 11 KATHERINE: Right. And so *horizontal!*
- 12 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. Horizontal *is* the word.
- 13 KATHERINE: And *romantic!*
- 14 CHRISTIANUS: Boy lies with girl?
- 15 KATHERINE: Absolutely!
- 16 CHRISTIANUS: But do we have to conclude
that there is *romance* at work here? Is *that*
what you are pleading, Miss Lawyer?
- 17 KATHERINE: You mean there *isn't*?
- 18 CHRISTIANUS: What if *he* is gay? Or *she* is les-

ry of English Art, vol. XI: *English Art 1870–1949*. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press.

FREDERICK KURZER (2006), 'Herbert Church FRS and the Palace of Westminster Frescoes' in *Notes and Records of the Royal Society of London*, vol. 60, no. 2, pp. 139–159.

RICHARD ORMOND (1968), 'Daniel Maclise' in *The Burlington Magazine*, vol. 110, no. 789 [Special Issue Commemorating the Bicentenary of the Royal Academy (1768–1968)], pp. 684–693.

ROY STRONG (2004), *Painting the Past: The Victorian Painter and British History*. London: Pimlico.

WILLIAM VAUGHAN (1983), 'Romanticism' in Lawrence Gowing, ed., *A History of Art*. London: Macmillan, pp. 745–768.

11:6, That's the problem: The idea here might be that there is something unsatisfactory about art that is *not*, to *some* extent at least, off-the-wall. Maybe Christianus wants to say that art that is created to be 'historically accurate' does not guarantee that it is *really* satisfying — and perhaps especially so if also the *motif* is too ordinary, or otherwise 'too easily digested' by the audience.

11:12, Horizontal is the word: It is easy to imagine that the mural's width would be greater than its height and therefore would be horizontal in a gross physical sense. But this comment by Christianus seems to suggest that there are certain *pictorial elements* of that mural that contribute to its 'horizontality'.

bian?

19 KATHERINE: Well, I'm not . . .

20 CHRISTIANUS: Or what if she doesn't *like* men
with moustaches? Or with teal-coloured
scarves wrapped around their heads?

21 KATHERINE: But . . .

22 CHRISTIANUS: Or what if it's just the prelude

11:20, men with moustaches: Why has this artist chosen to equip the depicted male with a moustache? One answer, of course, could be that the artist himself just *liked it* that way, regardless of what any future audience might think.

Another answer could be that moustaches were quite popular in late *Victorian* times, and that the artist therefore consciously used that type of facial barbering to make his paintings more palatable for his potential customers. For if the frequency with which moustache-equipped men are found in the illustrations in the *Illustrated London News* from 1842 and onwards are indicative of the contemporary taste of the general population, we might take note of Dwight E. Robinson's research (Robinson 1976, Fig. 1, p. 1135). His study shows that moustaches were rather steadily increasing in popularity from 1842 (3% of all depicted men had moustaches) until about 1917 (60%), after which the trend went the other way, ending in 1972 (6%). Noteworthy is also that sideburns (*without* moustaches) had been on the decline since 1842 (40%), and was down to nil at the time of the peak of moustaches in 1917.

For more on moustaches, see, for

example, SCENE V ('The Mustachio Man') in *KQQ* (Klintberg 2008a, pp. 27–32; ref. *supra*, note 'you're late' at 1:1).

DWIGHT E. ROBINSON (1976), 'Fashions in Shaving and Trimming of the Beard: The Men of the *Illustrated London News*, 1842–1972' in *American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 81, no. 5, pp. 1133–1141.

11:20, teal-coloured scarves: The idea of 'teal-coloured scarves' may lead one in the direction of Lawrence Alma-Tadema (1836–1912), who seemingly was fond of men with various pieces of cloth wrapped around their heads, as seen in, for example, *The Triumph of Titus* (see Ash 1989, frontispiece; Barrow 2001, p. 118) and *Anthony and Cleopatra* (see Academy Editions 1977, Plate 27).

Considering also Katherine's and Christianus's comments about the marble, the horizontality, the Italian-Roman milieu, and the potential romance at work, a fair guess would be that the mural is a reproduction of the scene in Alma-Tadema's 1876 work *Pleading* (see Barrow 2001, p. 86; Standing 1905, plate facing p. 120; Kern 1996, p. 9). However, there *are* similarities between *Pleading* and his 1877 work *A Question* (see Academy Editions 1977, Plate 21) as

to a one-night, or perhaps in this case, a one-*midday*, stand?

23 KATHERINE: All right, all right. You made your point. But I still think the style is very *classy*.

24 CHRISTIANUS: Or at least *classical*. And clean.

25 KATHERINE: And very nice!

both Pieri and Barrow notes (Pieri 2005, pp. 69–70; Barrow 2001, p. 85), as well as between *Pleading* and his 1883 work *Xanthe and Phaon* (see Barrow 2001, p. 87) as Barrow notes (Barrow 2001, p. 85); but neither *A Question* nor *Xanthe and Phaon* features any teal-coloured scarf. And even though there also are similarities between *Pleading* and Alma-Tadema's 1877 work *Flora: Spring in the Gardens of Villa Borghese* (see Ash 1989, Plate 7) as Ash notes (Ash 1989, p. facing Plate 7), the teal-coloured piece of cloth depicted in *Flora* is not wrapped around the head of a *man*.

Finally, one may here also add that if the mural *does* depict the *Pleading* scene, Katherine's idea about it would be closer to the 'proposal composition' idea that Kern presents (Kern 1996, pp. 7–9) than to any of the considerably less romantic alternatives that Christianus seemingly has in mind.

RUSSELLASH (1989), *Sir Lawrence Alma-Tadema*. New York: Harry N. Abrams.

ACADEMY EDITIONS (1977), *Alma-Tadema*. London: Academy Editions.

R. J. BARROW (2001), *Lawrence Alma-Tadema*. London: Phaidon.

STEPHEN KERN (1996), *Eyes of Love: The Gaze in English and French Paintings*

and *Novels 1840–1900*. London: Reaktion Books.

GIULIANA PIERI (2005), *The Influence of Pre-Raphaelitism on Fin de siècle Italy*. MHRA Texts and Dissertations, vol. 65. London: Maney Publishing for the Modern Humanities Research Association.

PERCY CROSS STANDING (1905), *Sir Lawrence Alma-Tadema, O.M., R.A.* London: Cassell and Company.

11:24, classical . . . clean: Christianus seems to say that the scene of the mural, in some sense, is 'classical' and 'clinically clean', and, perhaps also, that it is that 'cleanness' or 'classicalness' (or both) that makes it *not* (very) classy from a satisfactionist's point of view — a stance that may coincide somewhat with Peter Fuller's, who notes Alma-Tadema's 'necrophiliac obsession with archaeological accuracy and marble surfaces' (Fuller 1989, p. 179) and also quotes a correspondent in the *Art Journal* who not only thinks that Ruskin's evaluation of Alma-Tadema's works as vacuous is correct, but also goes on to explain that their vacuity are 'due to their complete denial of spirituality' (Fuller 1989, p. 180). On such a reading, Christianus might not be very shocked to learn that Alma-Tadema's

- 26 CHRISTIANUS: If you don't *think* too much
about it.
- 27 KATHERINE: Hmmm. So who made it?
- 28 CHRISTIANUS: Owen did.
- 29 KATHERINE: Owen?
- 30 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. He's the boss here.
- 31 KATHERINE: Is he also a professional artist?
- 32 CHRISTIANUS: No.
- 33 KATHERINE: An *amateur* artist, then?
- 34 CHRISTIANUS: Not even that.
- 35 KATHERINE: I don't get it.
- 36 CHRISTIANUS: It's simple. He *has* no artistic
sense or sensibility. At all.
- 37 KATHERINE: But didn't you just say that he
made the mural?
- 38 CHRISTIANUS: I did. But it's a long story.
- 39 KATHERINE: I have lots of time.

house in St. John's Wood 'seemed like a realisation of one of his own paintings' (Denvir 1986, p. 8) with all the Roman paraphernalia imaginable, including so highly polished marble floors 'that visitors were provided with slippers to avoid accidents' (Denvir 1986, p. 9).

BERNARD DENVIR (1986), *The Late Victorians: Art, Design and Society, 1852–1910*. London and New York: Longman.

PETER FULLER (1989), 'Fine Arts' in Boris Ford, ed., *The Cambridge Cultural History of Britain*, vol. 7: *Victorian Brit-*

ain. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, pp. 162–207.

11:26, *think too much*: Alma-Tadema once laid forth some of his thoughts on art: 'Art must be beautiful because Art must elevate, not teach; when Art teaches, in the common sense of the word, it becomes accessory to some other object' (Zimmern 1886, p. 28) — a stance that seems intimately linked with his statements that '[w]e are no longer . . . the people of the religion of death' and

- 40 CHRISTIANUS: Sure. But do you also have the
 stamina to *stand up* while I'm narrating
 the whole thing?
- 41 KATHERINE: Probably not.
- 42 CHRISTIANUS: So let's find ourselves a table
first.
- 43 KATHERINE: If we *can*. It's *so* crowded.
- 44 CHRISTIANUS: It really *is*. In fact, I have never
 seen *anything* like it! Normally, at this
 time of day, there is always at least *one*
 free table in this room.
- 45 KATHERINE: Maybe it's some public holiday
 or something?
- 46 CHRISTIANUS: Not that *I* am aware of.
- 47 KATHERINE: But are you aware of *all* of
 them?
- 48 CHRISTIANUS: Maybe not. After all, it's Friday.
- 49 KATHERINE: I'm sorry?

'[w]e now look out for cheerful things' (Zimmern 1886, p. 28). His overall idea seems to be that the audience should not *think* so much (especially not about *death*), but simply enjoy the artwork, since that process (alone?) 'ennobles the mind' (Zimmern 1886, p. 28). Christianus's comment may here signal that he is aware of Alma-Tadema's philosophy of art, but dismisses it, wholly or partly.

HELEN ZIMMERN (1886), *L. Alma Tadema: His Life and Work in The Life and Work of Sir Frederick Leighton, Bart.*,

Sir John E. Millais, Bart., L. Alma Tadema. London: Art Journal Office.

11:29, Owen? It seems clear from the ongoing discussion that Katherine has not seen this motif before, neither in its original form nor in the form of a reproduction, with or without being legally licensed by Alma-Tadema (Verhoogt 2007, p. 443). So why is she hesitant here? Is it simply because she has never heard of Owen before? Or is it because she doesn't believe that he, or perhaps anyone with

- 50 CHRISTIANUS: You should have been at my little brown-bag meeting yesterday. *Then* you would have understood it.
- 51 KATHERINE: But you said, very explicitly, that you *didn't* want to see me yesterday.
- 52 CHRISTIANUS: *Did I?*
- 53 KATHERINE: Yes.
- 54 CHRISTIANUS: Hmm.
- 55 KATHERINE: So what *would* I have understood, if I *had* been there?
- 56 CHRISTIANUS: That Friday is the day of Venus, according to the classical tradition.
- 57 KATHERINE: How is *that* relevant?
- 58 CHRISTIANUS: Well, it's just that my *omniscience* usually works quite poorly on venerean days, especially *before* breakfast. So it *could be* some sort of holiday today, even though I am not immediately aware of it.
- 59 KATHERINE: But?

such a name, (originally) made, or even *could* have made, that mural?

ROBERT VERHOOGT (2007), *Art in Reproduction: Nineteenth-Century Prints after Lawrence Alma-Tadema, Jozef Israëls and Ary Scheffer*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

11:51, *didn't want to see me:* Two days earlier Christianus told Katherine that he could not see her on Thursday, for

he had already scheduled a meeting with Tim, a physics professor. And Katherine seems to remember that discussion well. See xvi:24–27 in *KQQ* (Klintberg 2008a, p. 97; ref. *supra*, note 'you're late' at 1:1).

11:56, Friday . . . Venus: For more information on the connexion between the word 'Friday' and the word 'Venus', see note 'Venus-day' at 111:61 in *TSG*

- 60 CHRISTIANUS: But even if it *were* some unfamiliar *holiday*, it still wouldn't explain all those unfamiliar *faces*. I go here all the time, and I usually recognize *most* of the people hanging out here.
- 61 KATHERINE: But maybe it has to do with that special offer they advertised outside?
- 62 CHRISTIANUS: *What* special offer?
- 63 KATHERINE: The offer which I had lots of time to read, since you were so late.
- 64 CHRISTIANUS: Which was?
- 65 KATHERINE: The poster said, 'Friday ONLY!' And then, below that . . .
- 66 CHRISTIANUS: Yes?
- 67 KATHERINE: . . . 'The return of the popular *Cookie Monster Treat*. Four home-made cookies and unlimited coffee refills for only £6.'
- 68 CHRISTIANUS: Ah! It's one of those 'Monster'

(Klintberg 2008b, pp. 27–30).

BO C. KLINTBERG (2008b), *Tim's Sexy Girl-Goddess and the Tale of the British Raisin* in *Philosophical Plays*, vol. 1, no. 2.

11:58, *venerean*: Though the word 'venerean' might be understood in a purely sexual way, one may doubt that Christianus is here using it in that fashion. Perhaps it rather should be understood in a more general sense, as 'relating or

pertaining to Venus or her service' (Little 1980, p. 2460).

WILLIAM LITTLE, H. W. FOWLER, AND JESSIE COULSON (1980), *The Shorter Oxford English Dictionary on Historical Principles*, vol. 11 (Marl–Z and Addenda). Revised and edited by C. T. Onions. Third edition completely reset with etymologies revised by G. W. S. Friedrichsen and with revised addenda. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

days! *That* explains it! Or at least *some* of it.

69 KATHERINE: Really?

70 CHRISTIANUS: Yes, last time they had it they
got so many new customers that they al-
most doubled their sales.

71 KATHERINE: Wow.

72 CHRISTIANUS: So it's a smart thing to do, busi-
ness-wise. Once and a while.

73 KATHERINE: But it's a little inconvenient for
us.

74 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. A little.

75 KATHERINE: So what do we do now?

SCENE III.

Backstage Drama

1 CHRISTIANUS: Let's have a look at *the other*
rooms.

2 KATHERINE: They have *other* rooms?

3 CHRISTIANUS: Yes.

4 KATHERINE: How many?

5 CHRISTIANUS: Three. If you count the re-
stroom.

6 KATHERINE: They only have *one* restroom?

7 CHRISTIANUS: Isn't one enough? Do you need
two? Or three?

8 KATHERINE: Not as long as *one* is working and
no-one else is in it.

9 CHRISTIANUS: Right. So if you ever need it, it's
this *Notting Hill*-blue door here. Even if
you're *not* Anna Scott.

10 KATHERINE: No, I'm definitely *not* a Scot. But
I *am* American.

11 CHRISTIANUS: But not a damsel in any *orange-*
juice distress, I take it?

12 KATHERINE: Actually I am.

13 CHRISTIANUS: You *are*? But your sweater looks
clean.

- 14 KATHERINE: Well, it's an *internal* kind of distress.
- 15 CHRISTIANUS: Internal?
- 16 KATHERINE: Yes. I drank at least half a gallon of orange juice just before I came here.
- 17 CHRISTIANUS: Holy Krishna! I hope it wasn't *commercially* produced, at least? With all that mold and stuff?
- 18 KATHERINE: No, no. I made a special order. They even had *organic* Florida oranges. Just like *home!* So I couldn't stop myself.
- 19 CHRISTIANUS: Well, then, I guess, you really *are* in some sort of juice jeopardy, after all.
- 20 KATHERINE: Yes.
- 21 CHRISTIANUS: So what are you waiting for? Why don't you go in?
- 22 KATHERINE: It's *occupied!*
- 23 CHRISTIANUS: Oh dear!

111:9, Notting Hill-blue door: This is presumably a reference to the motion picture *Notting Hill* (1999), and to the colour of that blue front door, behind which one (still) may find William Thacker's — and Spike's, of course — somewhat messy apartment. The door pops up several times in the movie, both as an entry point leading Anna Scott (Julia Roberts) into William's (Hugh Grant) more private life, as well as an exit point leading her out of it. On both of these occasions, it is Anna's distressful

condition that triggers her move through that blueish, wooden Stargate.

NOTTING HILL (1999), starring Hugh Grant, Julia Roberts, Rhys Ifans, Emma Chambers, Tim McInnerny, Gina McKee, and Hugh Bonneville. Roger Mitchell (director), Richard Curtis (screenplay), and Duncan Kenworthy (producer). A production by Polygram Filmed Entertainment, Working Title Films, Bookshop Productions, and Notting Hill Pictures. Released on DVD in 1999 (in Europe) by Universal Pictures UK.

- 24 KATHERINE: Well, at least I know where it is
now.
- 25 CHRISTIANUS: It's not *that* urgent, I hope? Can
you manage?
- 26 KATHERINE: I'll try.
- 27 CHRISTIANUS: Good. So let's continue with
our little inventory.
- 28 KATHERINE: All right.
- 29 CHRISTIANUS: So here's the smallest room.
- 30 KATHERINE: It's cosy. But all tables are taken.
- 31 CHRISTIANUS: Unfortunately, yes. But look
around! What do you see?
- 32 KATHERINE: Ah! Nice wallpaper!
- 33 CHRISTIANUS: Well, maybe on *this* wall.
- 34 KATHERINE: French design?
- 35 CHRISTIANUS: British, I think. But not from
this era, obviously. And?

III:13, your sweater looks clean: In *Notting Hill* (1999; ref. *supra*, note 'Notting Hill-blue door' at III:9), it is the orange juice that William spills over Anna Scott that becomes the 'entry ticket' to William's world behind the blue door.

III:27, inventory: As we shall see, it is not without reason that Christianus is using the word 'inventory' here. He might have used the word 'sightseeing' (or 'safari') instead, but that might not have been as fitting as 'inventory', if the

aim was to 'count' and 'evaluate' not only the available chairs and tables, but also the artworks.

III:32, wallpaper: One may note that the word 'wallpaper' is not entirely insignificant in the history of impressionism. Shapiro mentions that, both when it comes to pictures and wallpaper, the ground coat is called 'impression' (Shapiro 1997, p. 21). Also worth mentioning because of its potential relevance is that Leroy the critic once used the word

- 36 KATHERINE: And . . . a *Renoir!*?
- 37 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. The impressionist.
- 38 KATHERINE: *Just* my style!
- 39 CHRISTIANUS: I thought so.
- 40 KATHERINE: Is it the original?
- 41 CHRISTIANUS: Does it *look* like the original?

'wallpaper' when criticising one of Monet's works (Shapiro 1997, p. 21).

MEYER SCHAPIRO (1997), *Impressionism: Reflections and Perceptions*. New York: George Braziller.

III:35, *this era*: Even assuming that the word 'era' is to be understood *not* as '[t]he initial point assumed in a system of chronology' (Simpson and Weiner 1989a, p. 362) or as '[a] date, or an event, which forms the commencement of a new period' (Simpson and Weiner 1989a, p. 362), but more along the lines of '[a] historical period; a portion of historical time marked by the continuance throughout it of particular influences, social conditions, etc.' (Simpson and Weiner 1989a, p. 362), one would still need to determine the type and extent of that historical period: whether it might coincide with, for example, a certain century, decennium, or other time period used by ordinary people; whether it might coincide with an 'academic' period that, for instance, scholars of general history, political history, economic history, or art history may have defined or documented in their publications; or, alternatively, whether the word 'era' *only* may be decisively deciphered by an in-

timiate knowledge of Christianus's own proprietary system of historical analysis.

Turning now to the word 'this', we may also ask the following question: What work does the word '*this*' do in the phrase '*this era*', and what can we conclude from it? Here are two scenarios. One scenario is that the phrase '*this era*' might be meant to refer to the era of the year in which Christianus utters that phrase; and since the scene is set in 2007, '*this era*' would point to 'the era of 2007'. If we now take 'era' to mean 'millennium', 'century', or even 'decennium', then Christianus would, in effect, just be saying that the wallpaper is *not* from the twenty-first century; but if we take 'era' to mean, for example, 'the post-9/11 era', the wallpaper might very well be from 2001. However, in both of these cases, the word 'obviously' may signal the idea that the wallpaper really *is* from the Victorian or near-Victorian era, or at least, not from the twenty-first century.

Another scenario is that — since Christianus is at The Late Victorian at the time of this speech — the phrase '*this era*' might be meant to refer to the era of the year, or period, that the interior design of The Late Victorian is trying to reproduce, replicate, or emulate.

- 42 KATHERINE: No.
- 43 CHRISTIANUS: There you go.
- 44 KATHERINE: But it's still very, very nice.
- 45 CHRISTIANUS: It's not *that* bad.
- 46 KATHERINE: Well, *I* just *love* it! Even though
it's very famous.
- 47 CHRISTIANUS: You don't find it *cheesy*? I mean,

If we now take 'era' to mean 'century' or 'decennium', then Christianus would, in effect, be saying either that the wallpaper is *not* from the nineteenth century, or *not* from one of the (late) decades of the nineteenth century; but if we take 'era' to mean, for example, one of the 'academic' periods of the late Victorian era (cf., for example, Harrison 1990, who puts it between 1875 and 1901), Christianus might be saying that the wallpaper either was made in 1874 or earlier, or in 1902 or later. Thus it seems fair to say that the word 'obviously' here plays a different role than in the first scenario: for in the second scenario it seems to indicate that there is some aspect of the wallpaper design that is *not* in 'stylistic harmony' with all the other style-creating environmental elements of the café.

J. F. C. HARRISON (1990), *Late Victorian Britain, 1875–1901*. Oxford: Fontana Press.

J. A. SIMPSON AND E. S. C. WEINER, EDS. (1989a), *The Oxford English Dictionary*, vol. v (Dvandra–Follis). Second edition. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

III:37, The impressionist: Christianus's statement can be understood in a vari-

ety of ways. Since Katherine is interested in art history, that comment does not seem to serve as an 'educational' comment, at least not in regard to information pertaining to Pierre-Auguste Renoir himself. But this phrase might serve to distinguish Pierre-Auguste Renoir (1841–1919) from his son, since Jean Renoir (1894–1979) was not a famous impressionist painter, but, among other things, an 'author and producer of plays and films' (Renoir 1962, p. 171). Alternatively, this phrase may serve the purpose of presenting a general stylistic term ('impressionist'), not with the aim of clarifying *which* Renoir it is, but with the aim of making Katherine reveal whether or not she is into *all* impressionist painters, or just some small subset.

JEAN RENOIR (1962), *Renoir, My Father*. Translated by Randolph and Dorothy Weaver. London: Collins.

III:38, Just my style! This statement of Katherine's seems to be in harmony with her taste for at least one other impressionist artist, as noted at 1:42–48 in *KQQ* (Klintberg 2008a, pp. 6–7; ref. *supra*, note 'you're late' at 1:1). It is unclear, however, what attracts her the most — is

Au Moulin de la Galette?

48 KATHERINE: *Cheesy?* The original? Or the reproduction?

49 CHRISTIANUS: Are they any different?

50 KATHERINE: I thought you were a *philosopher?*

it the colours, the style, or the motif? Or is it some combination of them?

111:47, *Au Moulin de la Galette*: This painting (oil on canvas, 131 x 175 cm; reproduced in colour in Broude 1990, p. 11; Courthion 1989, pp. 112–113; Schapiro 1997, p. 76; ref. *supra*, note ‘wallpaper’ at 111:32) goes under several names: *Le bal au moulin de la Galette*, *Le bal de Moulin de la Galette*, or simply *Moulin de la Galette*. It was one of the ‘two major works’ painted in 1876 by Pierre-Auguste Renoir (1841–1919), the other being *Anna* (Elgar 1966, col. 163). It was allegedly intended as ‘a historical painting’ (Musée d’Orsay 2002, p. 6), showing (some version of) a busy, contemporary open-air dance scene in the artist’s own (working-class) neighbourhood of Montmartre, seemingly without any cats (cf. Rubin 2003, pp. 111–125), but at least with many other animated beings, many of which include the artist’s own friends and models: Estelle, Lamy, Norbert Goeneutte, and Georges Rivière are found in the foreground; Gervex, Cordey, Lestringuez, Lhote, Solares y Cardenas, and Margot are on the dance floor (Courthion 1989, p. 112) — is, according to Distel, ‘without doubt the most perfect example of Renoir’s Impressionism’ (Distel 1996, p. 208).

But it was a relatively rough road to recognition for Renoir. Only after a

series of ‘cheap’ sales in the first half of the 1870s, both at the public auctions at the Hôtel Drouot (cf. Bodelsen 1968) and at the first two ‘independent’ (Rubin 2005, p. 1109) Impressionist Exhibitions, did Renoir eventually decide to participate with this painting in the Third Impressionist Exhibition in 1877 — at a time when (at least some of) the participating painters now had accepted the label ‘impressionist’, and also were actively promoting it (Broude 1990, p. 12). This was in face of the silence after his submission of seven canvases (*Dancer*, *The Opera Box* or *The Theatre Box*, *Parisian Woman*, and others; Distel 1996, p. 207; Elgar 1966, col. 163) to the First Impressionist Exhibition in 1874 at the old studio of Félix Nadar (Gaspard-Félix Tournachon), ‘the greatest portrait photographer of the nineteenth century’ (McPherson 2001, p. 7); and, most importantly, after a major setback in conjunction with his submission of fifteen works to the Second Impressionist Exhibition in 1876 at the Durand-Ruel Gallery when Albert Wolff of *Le Figaro* criticized his *Study (Nude in the Sunlight)* as simply being a ‘heap of decomposing flesh’ (Distel 1996, p. 208).

Nowadays, however, Renoir’s paintings are extremely well regarded, and are sold at top prices at quality auction houses. One example of this is the *Au Moulin de la Galette*, which in 1990

- 51 CHRISTIANUS: What do you mean? Shouldn't
philosophers ask *questions*?
- 52 KATHERINE: It's not *that*.
- 53 CHRISTIANUS: What is it, then?
- 54 KATHERINE: Well, you seem to say that the

was sold for a respectable \$72,000,000 at an auction at Sotheby's in New York (Wood 1997, p. 216), after their auction catalogue initially had estimated it at '\$40,000,000–50,000,000' (Sotheby's 1990). And that was only the *smaller* version of this painting (78 x 114 cm; nicely reproduced in Sotheby's 1990) — the *full-scale* version is still (in 2012), since 1986, hanging at the Musée d'Orsay in Paris (Musée d'Orsay 2012).

MERETE BODELSEN (1968), 'Early Impressionist Sales 1874–94 in the Light of Some Unpublished "Procès-Verbaux"' in *The Burlington Magazine*, vol. 111, no. 783, pp. 330–349.

NORMA BROUDE (1990), 'A World in Light: France and the International Impressionist Movement, 1860–1920' in Norma Broude, ed., *World Impressionism: The International Movement, 1860–1920*. New York: Harry N. Abrams, pp. 8–35.

PIERRE COURTHION (1989), *Impressionism*. Translated from the French by John Shepley. New York: Galahad Books.

ANNE DISTEL (1996), 'Renoir, (Pierre-) Auguste' in Jane Turner, ed., *The Dictionary of Art*, vol. 26 (Raphon–Rome, ancient, §II: Architecture). New York: Grove, pp. 207–210.

FRANK ELGAR (1966), 'Renoir, Pierre Auguste' in Massimo Pallottino, ed., *Encyclopedia of World Art*, vol. 12 (Renaissance–Shahn). New York, Toronto,

and London: McGraw-Hill and Venezia e Roma: Istituto per la Collaborazione Culturale, cols. 162–167.

HEATHER MCPHERSON (2001), *The Modern Portrait in Nineteenth-Century France*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

MUSÉE D'ORSAY (2002), *In the Times of the Impressionist Exhibitions (1874–1886)*. Paris: Musée d'Orsay. Visitor's Sheet in PDF format retrieved from the Musée d'Orsay website [<http://www.musee-orsay.fr>] on Tuesday, 16 November 2010.

MUSÉE D'ORSAY (2012), *Auguste Renoir: Bal du moulin de la Galette (Notice de l'oeuvre)*. Paris: Musée d'Orsay. Online article retrieved from the Musée d'Orsay website [<http://www.musee-orsay.fr>] on Tuesday, 3 April 2012.

JAMES H. RUBIN (2003), *Impressionist Cats and Dogs: Pets in the Painting of Modern Life*. New Haven, CT and London: Yale University Press.

JAMES H. RUBIN (2005), 'Impressionism' in Maryanne Cline Horowitz, ed., *New Dictionary of the History of Ideas*, vol. 3 (Game Theory–Lysenkoism). New York: Thomson Gale, pp. 1109–1111.

SOTHEBY'S (1990), *Pierre-Auguste Renoir: Au Moulin de la Galette*. From the Collection of Mr. and Mrs. John Hay Whitney. Auction: Thursday, May 17, 1990 at approximately 8:00 pm. Production coordinator: Nina Marin

original and the reproduction are non-different.

55 CHRISTIANUS: Aren't philosophers allowed to say that?

56 KATHERINE: Of course they are. But aren't you a friend of Plato's?

57 CHRISTIANUS: Sure. In an Aristotelian sort of way.

58 KATHERINE: And didn't Plato say something about originals and reproductions in art?

59 CHRISTIANUS: He certainly did.

60 KATHERINE: And *that* is not interesting to you?

61 CHRISTIANUS: *Of course* it is. But what *I* can recall, he didn't mention anything about *cheesiness*.

62 KATHERINE: But *you* don't seem to be very in-

Moore; photographer: Louis Romano; cover design: Barbara Olejniczak; consultant art director: Alan Hartwell; color separations: Toppan Printing. New York: Sotheby's.

CHRISTOPHER WOOD (1997), *The Great Art Boom 1970–1997*. Edited by Duncan Hislop and Sharron Clarke. Surrey: Art Sales Index.

III:57, Aristotelian . . . way: Although Christianus very well may be acquainted with Aristotle's ideas of friendship, it is unlikely that Katherine would have any deeper insight into such matters. In any case, a passage in Aristotle's *Nicomachean*

Ethics says: 'Still perhaps it would appear desirable, and indeed it would seem to be obligatory, especially for a philosopher, to sacrifice even one's closest personal ties in defence of the truth' [Gr. doxeie d' an isòs beltion einai, kai dein epi sôtèriai ge tês alêtheias kai ta oikeia anairein, allòs te kai philosophous ontas] (1096a14–16; Aristotle 1982, pp. 16–17). But also cf. a passage in Plato's *Republic*: 'Yet all the same we must not honour a man above truth' [Gr. all' ou gar pro ge tês alêtheias timêteos anêr] (595c2–3; Plato 1946, pp. 420–421) — a passage that both Camerarius and Cousin think is the origin of the famous

terested in talking about any cheesiness, either.

63 CHRISTIANUS: It's just that it reminds me of food. And I am *hungry!* And I *desperately* need some coffee.

64 KATHERINE: Me too. But I just want to know this. Are you saying that it's just as cheesy to own the original painting as it is to own this reproduction? Or *any* reproduction?

65 CHRISTIANUS: It's much worse than that.

66 KATHERINE: Much *worse?*

67 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. But that is a *long* story, just like the one about Owen. So before we get into *that*, let's check the next room *first*.

68 KATHERINE: OK.

Aristotelian passage above (Cazac 1889, p. 11).

For a nice overview of Aristotle's ideas on friendship, see Guthrie (1981, pp. 384–390); and for more general introductions on the topic of friendship, including also what other philosophers in the history of philosophy have thought about it, see, for example, Badhwar (1998) and Sherman (2005).

ARISTOTLE (1982), *The Nicomachean Ethics*. With an English Translation by H. Rackham. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press and London: William Heinemann.

NEERA K. BADHWAR (1998), 'Friend-

ship' in Edward Craig, ed., *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 794–797.

HENRY-PIERRE CAZAC (1889), *Polémique d'Aristote contre la théorie platonicienne des idées*. Tarbes: Émile Croharé.

W. K. C. GUTHRIE (1981), *A History of Greek Philosophy*, vol. VI: *Aristotle: An Encounter*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

PLATO (1946), *The Republic*, vol. II (Books VI–X). With an English Translation by Paul Shorey. London: William Heinemann and Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

NANCY SHERMAN (2005), 'Friend-

- 69 CHRISTIANUS: *This* way.
- 70 KATHERINE: I'm right behind.
- 71 CHRISTIANUS: So what do you think?
- 72 KATHERINE: Oh, a *yellow* room! And all these
photographs! And things! How *charming!*
- 73 CHRISTIANUS: I guess . . .

ship' in Donald M. Borchert, ed., *Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, vol. 3 (Determinables—Fuzzy logic). Second edition. Farmington Hills, MI: Thomson Gale, pp. 748–751.

111:72, all these photographs: Though the distance between the poor and the rich continued to grow in the late Victorian era (Harwood 2009, p. 20; ref. *supra*, note 'it's quite popular' at 1:34) — as we perhaps can symbolize by the increasing concern for that 'large element of slum dwellers who lived in a state of near-starvation' (Wood 1982, p. 284; ref. *supra*, note 'it's quite popular' at 1:34) — there was a relatively prosperous middle class on the rise. And that middle class seems to have been very fond of the idea of a 'Home Sweet Home' (Harwood 2009, pp. 22–23).

This interest for the home as a meeting place and 'life-world' sometimes manifested itself in the form of heavily ornamented rooms and spaces, not only packed with photographs but also with other things. According to Roger Hart, some distinguishing features of such Victorian living rooms were: '[t]he curtains and wallpaper would be heavily patterned; gilt and silver framed watercolours, cameos, and later in the century, photographs would be hung on the

walls, and placed on flat surfaces such as tables, dressers and pianos (which were themselves covered in lace cloths)' (Hart 1971, p. 88).

So if The Late Victorian coffee house is designed to emulate some such popular Victorian style, it could very well be that Katherine and Christianus here are experiencing (some aspects of) an interior milieu like the one in, for example, the 1895 photograph of a late Victorian sitting room (Hart 1971, p. 88); or, perhaps, something like the one seen in the photographs by Frank Connor of the sitting room scene in David Lynch's film *The Elephant Man* (1980), in which John Merrick is having tea with Dr. Frederick Treves and his wife Anne (Kuhn and Connor 1980, pp. 58–60) — a scene that may have been inspired by the 'real' John Merrick's (1860–1890) visit to Treves's 'small house' in Wimpole Street (Treves 1980, p. 23; Howell and Ford 1992, p. 114).

ROGER HART (1971), *English Life in the Nineteenth Century*. Hove: Wayland.

MICHAEL HOWELL AND PETER FORD (1992), *The True History of the Elephant Man*. New [third] edition, Extensively Revised with Much Fresh Information. London: Penguin Books.

JOY KUHN AND FRANK CONNOR (1980), *The Elephant Man: The Book of the Film*.

- 74 KATHERINE: But no tables.
- 75 CHRISTIANUS: No. But at least there's a *decent* piece of art. Over *there!*
- 76 KATHERINE: *Aaah! Wonderful!*
- 77 CHRISTIANUS: Yes, it's quite good.
- 78 KATHERINE: Watercolour?

With a section on Mel Brooks by Maxim Jakubowski. Book designer: Martyn Atkins; co-ordinator: David Martin. London: Virgin Books.

THE ELEPHANT MAN (1980), starring Anthony Hopkins, John Hurt, John Gielgud, Freddie Jones, Wendy Hiller, Anne Bancroft, and Hannah Gordon. David Lynch (director, screenplay), Christopher De Vore (screenplay), Eric Bergren (screenplay), Frederick Treves (book: Treves 1980), Ashley Montagu (book: *The Elephant Man: A Study in Human Dignity*), Stuart Cornfeld (executive producer), and Jonathan Sanger (producer). A Brookfilms production. Released on DVD in 2001 (in Europe) by Momentum Pictures.

FREDERICK TREVES (1980), *The Elephant Man and other Reminiscences*. London: A Star Book published by the Paperback Division of W. H. Allen & Co.

III:75, *decent* . . . art: There is a possibility that a vegetarian or pacifist-inclined art critic might object here and say that there is nothing 'decent' about that painting, since it seems to depict a hunting party looking for animals to kill. One (quick) way to respond would be to suggest that Christianus might not here be referring so much to the *contents* of the painting as he is to the *manner* in

which it has been painted. But even if that is Christianus's 'stance', it is not entirely unlikely that there is more to the story. So another way to respond would be to say that Christianus indeed *is* referring to the *story* in that painting, and comparing it to the *story* in the Renoir; and in doing so, he is finding the French one *less* decent.

However, Christianus's *own* preference for a vegetarian lifestyle certainly complicates the issue: for how can he find *this* scene more decent than the French one, where there is (seemingly) no killing going on, or planned? One possibility is that it is the *portrayed* 'seriousness' and the 'sobriety' of the hunting scene that makes it more 'decent', even though the scene also contains some characters that Christianus himself would not mingle with. Maybe Christianus finds the French scene 'too gay' in the sense that it is *too much* focused on immediate bodily enjoyment and gaiety and *too little* on spiritual things and (perhaps) on the idea of 'duty'. If that reading of Christianus's comment has some merit, it is probably a good idea *not* to understand it as an expression of some simple Victorian propriety, even though Christianus very well may agree that, for example, the open-air consumption of alcohol, or at

- 79 CHRISTIANUS: Definitely. And pencil.
- 80 KATHERINE: I just *love* the elephants! Are they
Indian?
- 81 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. Or from Nepaul. Like the
turban-equipped *mahouts*.
- 82 KATHERINE: *Mahouts?*
- 83 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. They steer the elephants.
- 84 KATHERINE: Oh, I see. Drivers.
- 85 CHRISTIANUS: Yes.
- 86 KATHERINE: And the men in those white-grey-
ish casks?

least of *hard* liquor, would be a bad idea for anyone seriously committed to a satisfactionist way of life.

III:81, Nepaul: Many Asian geographical names from the time of the nineteenth century, mentioned in publications such as the *ILN*, are hard to find on modern maps. Even so, it is not an impossible task for a modern person to deduce — even without any historical maps at hand — that the word ‘Nepal’ might be a possible stand-in for ‘Nepaul’. And it is this ‘deductive ease’ by which one might move from ‘Nepaul’ to ‘Nepal’ that Christianus here presumably is counting on. So even if Katherine *doesn't* know, for instance, that Nepal, unlike India, was *not* ruled by the British at the time of the ‘elephant painting’, Christianus still probably thinks that Katherine, in all likelihood, *will* be able to morph that old proper name into its modern variant.

III:81, mahouts: According to Simpson and Weiner, the word ‘mahout’ — also spelled ‘mahote’, ‘mahoot’, ‘mahaut’, ‘mahouhut’, and ‘mohout’ — is derived from the Hindi word *mahaaut*, *mahaawat* (*mahâvat*), and means ‘An elephant-driver’ (Simpson and Weiner 1989b, p. 206). Chaturvedi and Tiwari, for example, define *mahâvat* as ‘a mahaut, elephant-driver’, and lists it as ‘nm’ (Chaturvedi and Tiwari 1981, p. 586), indicating that it — unless it is one of the ‘large number of words’ which are victims of some ‘incredible’ gender ‘anarchy’, in which case its listing is that of the usage ‘in the western Hindi region’ (Chaturvedi and Tiwari 1981, p. xiv) — is used as a masculine noun. McGregor also lists *mahâvat* as a masculine noun meaning ‘a mahout, elephant-driver’, but also traces it back to ‘mahâmâtra-’, allegedly an OIA (Old Indo-Aryan) source word/construct (McGregor 1993, p. 800).

87 CHRISTIANUS: They are the European visitors.

88 KATHERINE: No women?

89 CHRISTIANUS: Apparently not. Unless they are unusually flat-chested and wear bogus beards or mock moustaches.

90 KATHERINE: Hmmm. And what's that *black* thing there, in front of all the elephants? A dog, or something?

91 CHRISTIANUS: Yes.

92 KATHERINE: European too?

93 CHRISTIANUS: No no. It's a *wild* one.

MAHENDRA CHATURVEDI AND B. N. TIWARI, EDs. (1981), *A Practical Hindi-English Dictionary*. Second edition. New Delhi: National Publishing House.

R. S. MCGREGOR, ED. (1993), *The Oxford Hindi-English Dictionary*. Oxford and Delhi: Oxford University Press.

J. A. SIMPSON AND E. S. C. WEINER, EDs. (1989b), *The Oxford English Dictionary*, vol. 1x (Look–Mouke). Second Edition. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

III:88, No women? Although no women are portrayed in that scene, some women in India, at least *nowadays*, are very much into elephants: Mark Shand has, for example, produced an interesting travel documentary about Parbati Barua, the 'Queen of the Elephants' (Shand 1995). As for women in India in the *late Victorian era*, one may note the 1876 article called 'The Women of India' published in the *Illustrated London News*, which covered some of the

daily routines of Indian women, including their dealings with animals such as cows and buffaloes (*ILN* 1876a, p. 302; ref. *supra*, note 'late Victorian classical music' at 1:42); and on the immediately preceding pages, in a set of pictures labelled 'Costumes of Western India', a handful of portraits depict how some of the Indian women were dressed at that time (*ILN* 1876a, pp. 300–301).

MARK SHAND (1995), *Queen of the Elephants*. London: BCA, by arrangement with Jonathan Cape.

III:93, a wild one: From this statement we can be reasonably sure that the painting in question has some kind of connexion with the 'two-pager' scene published in the special attachment to the *ILN* named 'Extra Supplement to the Illustrated London News, March 25, 1876' (*ILN* 1876a; ref. *supra*, note 'late Victorian classical music' at 1:42). There is no other illustration in the *ILN* during

- 94 KATHERINE: Wild?
- 95 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. All *black* dogs in Nepal are
wild. Didn't you *knooooouuw*?
- 96 KATHERINE: *Noooouuu*, I didn't. So, who made
it?

the first half of 1876 where we can find white-casked men and *mabhouts* on their elephants, with a black dog running in front, whether wild or not. The reason why 'the first half of 1876' is significant will be seen in a later footnote.

III:95, *knooooouuw*: Although it is very common that speakers emphasize certain words in different ways, a philologically inclined person — especially one interested in 'practical' epistemology and the idea of distinguishing, for example, 'truth' from 'falsity', or a 'joke' from a 'serious statement' — might find it interesting to note that Christianus here *modulates* the very word that represents the idea of 'knowing'.

III:97, God . . . makes dogs: Cf. a passage in Plato's *Republic*, where, in a discussion about a 'natural' couch (as opposed to a couch made by a painter or a cabinet-maker), Plato writes that one would seem to think that it is one which 'God produces, or who else?' [Gr. *theon ergasasthai. ê tin' allon;*] (597b5–6; Plato 1946, pp. 426–427; ref. *supra*, note 'Aristotelian . . . way' at III:57).

III:99, anonymous artist: As can be seen in those (two dozen or so) issues published in the first half of 1876, the editor(s) of the *Illustrated London News* had different ways to cope with cap-

tions. Some illustrations had a caption that only described the scene, without mentioning any artist, such as 'A Hindoo Mendicant Pilgrim' (*ILN* 1876d, p. 156) and 'The Queen Opening Parliament: Procession in the Peers' Corridor' (*ILN* 1876d, p. 161). Other illustrations had a caption that both described the scene *and* mentioned the name of the original artist: 'The Railway Accident at Abbots Ripton, Near Huntingdon: Working Parties Removing the Injured; From a Sketch by Mr. Gompertz, a Passenger' (*ILN* 1876c, p. 97) and 'Life on the Crozet Islands; From Sketches Supplied by Mr. Spencer Josten' (*ILN* 1876f, p. 389). Many other illustrations, however, were accompanied by a caption that did not mention the artist by name, but still acknowledged him indirectly: 'Inundations at Rome: The Ghetto Submerged; From a Sketch by Our Special Artist' (*ILN* 1876b, p. 8) and 'Tame Elephants Hunting a Wild Elephant; From a Sketch by One of Our Special Artists in India' (*ILN* 1876e, p. 329).

ILLUSTRATED LONDON NEWS (1876b), Saturday, 1 January 1876, vol. 68, no. 1901.

ILLUSTRATED LONDON NEWS (1876c), Saturday, 29 January 1876, vol. 68, no. 1905.

ILLUSTRATED LONDON NEWS (1876d), Saturday, 12 February 1876, vol. 68, no. 1907.

ILLUSTRATED LONDON NEWS (1876e), Saturday, 1 April 1876, vol. 68, no. 1914.

- 97 CHRISTIANUS: God, I guess. *Who else* makes dogs?
- 98 KATHERINE: No, the *paaainting*, stupid!
- 99 CHRISTIANUS: Aaaaahh! The *paaainting*! Some anonymous artist, hired by the *Illustrated*

ILLUSTRATED LONDON NEWS (1876f), Saturday, 22 April 1876, vol. 68, no. 1917.

III:99, *Illustrated London News*: Described by some as ‘that bland old grey thing’ (Waller 2006, p. 144) and by others as ‘the world’s most venerable pictorial news magazine’ (Robinson 1976, p. 1134; ref. *supra*, note ‘moustaches’ at 11:20) and ‘probably the most important single pictorial source for the social history of any age or country’ (Bryant 1995), the *Illustrated London News* started its road to fame and glory already on Whit Saturday, 14 May 1842. Herbert Ingram and Nathaniel Cooke ran the operation from their office in Crane Court, close to 10 Fleet Street, where Palmer and Clayton had their ‘steamy’ printing machine (Smith 1995, p. 9). Its first sixteen-page issue was filled not only with thirty engravings (depicting Queen Victoria’s Magnificent Fancy Dress Ball at Buckingham Palace, the Conflagration of the City of Hamburg, etc.) as their widely distributed *ILN* prospectus already had advertised would be their weekly minimum quota, but also covered other interesting news: a Parliamentary Report, the Royal Academy Exhibition, Paris Fashions, etc. (Smith 1995, p. 9). While the sale of the first issue of the *Illustrated London News* ‘only’ amounted to 26,000 copies, the demand seems to have been greater; and already

by the end of December that year, after almost having doubled the number of engravings, the sales reached 66,000 (Smith 1995, p. 10). By 1863 at least 300,000 copies were sold each week — an amazing number, considering that the *Times* (in 1861) sold no more than 70,000 (Hibbert 1977, p. 14) or ‘60,000 or more daily through the sixties and into the early seventies’ (Best 1979, p. 248), the *Daily News* just 6,000, and the *Morning Post* a bleak 4,500 (Hibbert 1977, p. 14).

GEOFFREY BEST (1979), *Mid-Victorian Britain 1851–75*. London: Fontana.

ARTHUR BRYANT (1995), ‘Foreword’ in Leonard de Vries and Ursula Robertshaw, eds., *History as Hot News 1842–1865: The World of the Early Victorians As Seen Through the Eyes of The Illustrated London News*. London: John Murray, p. 5.

CHRISTOPHER HIBBERT (1977), *The Illustrated London News: Social History of Victorian Britain*. London: Angus & Robertson.

W. H. SMITH (1995), ‘The Early Days of “The Illustrated London News”’ in Leonard de Vries and Ursula Robertshaw, eds., *History as Hot News 1842–1865: The World of the Early Victorians As Seen Through the Eyes of The Illustrated London News*. London: John Murray, pp. 9–12.

PHILIP WALLER (2006), *Writers, Read-*

London News.

100 KATHERINE: Anonymous?

101 CHRISTIANUS: Well, at least to many of the
casual readers of the *ILN*. But not to

ers, and Reputations: Literary Life in Britain 1870–1918. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

III:101, *casual* readers . . . *ILN*: The idea here seems to be that this artist might remain anonymous to *casual* readers of the *Illustrated London News*, since such readers may simply look at the illustrations and perhaps quickly read the short captions (where this particular artist's name would *not* be mentioned; but cf. *supra*, note 'anonymous artist' at III:99), but *not* attentively read (all of, much of, or any of) the considerably longer body copy (where the artist's name *sometimes* were to be found). In the case of the particular illustration under scrutiny (see *supra*, note 'a wild one' at III:93), the original artist's name *was* mentioned in the body copy (*ILN* 1876a, pp. 305–306; ref. *supra*, note 'late Victorian classical music' at I:42), and also accompanied by his own description of this scene (*ILN* 1876a, p. 306) and other events (*ILN* 1876a, p. 307). Therefore, he would *not* have been anonymous to a *non-casual* reader.

III:101, *ILN* . . . editors: Who among the contemporary *ILN* editors would have been able to identify the artist who provided the original artwork to that previously mentioned 'two-pager' illustration in the *Illustrated London News* (cf. *supra*, note 'a wild one' at III:93)? This is not an easy question. But per-

haps we can say this. If we may think of George C. Leighton as the 'general' editor, in virtue of his role as a 'Printer and Publisher' after Herbert Ingram passed away in 1860 (Smith 1995, p. 12; ref. *supra*, note '*Illustrated London News*' at III:99) and onwards, then it seems fairly certain that he would have been able to say who this artist was, if not for any other reason than that this artist's name appeared in the body copy of that issue, together with a story (which one might presume that Leighton would have read and understood) describing the scene of his original sketch.

A similar, perhaps even stronger, argument could be made in regard to John Lash Latey, the (copy) Editor who took over after the previous editors F. W. N. Bayley (until 1846), John Timbs (until 1852), and Charles Mackay (until 1859) had left the scene (Smith 1995, p. 10). John Lash Latey (1808–1891), one of 'several editors who never became well known' (Maidment 2009, p. 303) — and not to be confused with his son John Latey (1842–1902), editor of the *Penny Illustrated Paper* (Plarr 1899, p. 623) — would continue editing the *ILN* after Ingram's death until 1890 (Lee 1912, p. 412), and presumably was somewhat more actively involved in the integration of this artist's texts (mostly describing the scenes of his own artwork) into the body copy, blending them with other snippets of text.

As for the Art Editor, Mason Jack-

some of its *editors*, of course.

102 KATHERINE: Do *you* know who he was, or is?

103 CHRISTIANUS: Certainly. A freemason.

104 KATHERINE: A *freemason*?

son, we can be almost cent per cent sure that he knew who the original artist of this illustration was; for the artist himself mentions 'Mr. Jackson' several times in his *Autobiography* in situations where his *ILN* assignments were discussed, and where Jackson seems to have been one of his main contacts, if not *the* main one.

BRIAN MAIDMENT (2009), 'Illustrated London News (1842–1989)' in Laurel Brake and Marysa Demoor, eds., *Dictionary of Nineteenth-Century Journalism*. Gent: Academia Press, pp. 301–303.

VICTOR G. PLARR (1899), *Men and Women of the Time*. Fifteenth edition, revised and brought down to the present time. London: George Routledge and Sons.

SIDNEY LEE (1912), *Dictionary of National Biography*. Second supplement, vol. 2 (Faed–Mybridge). London: Smith, Elder & Co.

III:103, freemason: Based on the preliminary information hitherto presented by Christianus, one might here deduce — after some historical research — that the freemason in question is William Simpson, an 'almost entirely self-taught' artist 'with an appetite for work' (Theroux 1987, p. 2). That he was an 'ardent member' of a freemason lodge is mentioned by George Eyre-Todd, the editor of Simpson's *Autobiography*, in the preface to that book (Simpson 1903, p. x). It is also practically demonstrated by Simpson's own publishing efforts for the

Quatuor Coronati Lodge, no. 2076, in London (Simpson 1890). And if Eyre-Todd's account and Simpson's own publishing example would not constitute enough evidence, then one might simply go to the beginning of that very same *AQC* issue and inspect the record from their (then) last meeting. It will then be obvious that Simpson was *not* just some sort of 'passive outsider' that submitted freemason-friendly articles to that journal, but, on the contrary, was present, in an active role, at their meetings, as, for instance, on Friday, 20 December 1889, at 6 p.m., when he joined Pratt, Lewis, and some other committee members for a meeting at 12, Kensington Gardens Square, W., and where it also was announced that 'the Lodge' had accepted five new 'brethren' during 'Bro. Simpson's year of office' (*AQC*, vol. 3, part 1, p. 3).

However, we do not know for certain whether or not Christianus himself had access to all of the above sources. But being a serious student of people, and perhaps also having read the research done by Stephen Knight (1985; 'impressively researched', *The Observer*) and Martin Short (1990; 'it is doubtful if a more conclusive book could have been written', *Times Literary Supplement*), Christianus might rather easily have applied a principle such as 'the rather typical freemason search for societal honour, prestige and power' to identify freemason-sounding passages in Simpson's

105 CHRISTIANUS: Sure. Who else would get a
Monday opportunity like that? Hanging
out with *royalty*?

106 KATHERINE: Royalty?

Autobiography, without ever having read Eyre-Todd's preface or the *AQC*. Christianus may therefore have found such freemason tendencies in the passage where Simpson says to Haghe — in an attempt to try to make *their* 'new' society [Institute of Painters in Water-Colours] more honourable than the 'old' society [Royal Society of Painters in Water-Colours] — that the Crown Princess of Germany was 'a possible empress in the future, and if we could secure her as an honorary member, we should be a long way ahead of the old Society' (Simpson 1903, p. 289). Alternatively, Christianus could have identified some similar tendencies in the passage where Simpson laments over a work on India which the financially troubled Day & Son could not publish, whereupon Simpson says, in no uncertain terms, 'I lost the honour and reputation which would have been due to me if such a work had been properly produced and published' (Simpson 1903, p. 78).

Still another possibility would be that Christianus deduced that freemason character from Simpson's 1896 work by observing its overall design and focus on religious symbolism, in combination with some well-chosen passages such as 'The Masonic craftsman may here be asked to recall the ritual of installing the new W.M.' (Simpson 1896, p. 204) as well as 'The Dervishes are said to have initiatory rites, secret words and signs like the Freemasons. If this is so, the

matter deserves more careful investigation than it has yet received' (Simpson 1896, pp. 136–137).

STEPHEN KNIGHT (1985), *The Brotherhood: The Secret World of the Freemasons*. London: Grafton.

MARTIN SHORT (1990), *Inside the Brotherhood: Further Secrets of the Freemasons*. London: Grafton.

WILLIAM SIMPSON (1890), 'The Mummies, or Guisers' in *Ars Quatuor Coronatorum, Being the Transactions of the Lodge Quatuor Coronati, no. 2076, London, vol. 3, part 1, pp. 81–82*.

WILLIAM SIMPSON (1896), *The Buddhist Praying-Wheel: A Collection of Material Bearing Upon the Symbolism of the Wheel and Circular Movements in Custom and Religious Ritual*. London and New York: Macmillan.

WILLIAM SIMPSON (1903), *The Autobiography of William Simpson, R.I. (Crimean Simpson)*. Edited by George Eyre-Todd. Illustrated with Many Reproductions of Simpson's Pictures from the Collections of His Majesty the King, the Duke of Newcastle, the Marquis of Bute, the Earl of Rosebery, the Earl of Northbrook, the British Museum, South Kensington Museum, The Palestine Exploration Fund, etc. London: T. Fisher Unwin.

PAUL THEROUX (1987), *Mr. William Simpson of The Illustrated London News: Pioneer War Artist 1823–1899*. Includes an essay by Simon Peers. London: The Fine Art Society.

107 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. He's with the Prince of
Wales and his imperialist hunting party.

108 KATHERINE: Well, just for the record: I am no
great fan of either royalty or freemasonry.

III:105, Monday: Another indication that the previously mentioned illustration seems to depict the very same scene that Christianus has been talking about, is that he here says it took place on a Monday. This fits well with the description in the text that accompanied the *ILN* illustration, provided by the 'anonymous' artist himself, William Simpson, wherein he says it happened '[o]n [a] Monday' (*ILN* 1876a, p. 306; ref. *supra*, note 'late Victorian classical music' at 1:42).

The problem, however, is that Simpson does *not* mention any specific date; and his *ILN* text is also not dated as a whole. So *which* Monday was it? Well, we know that his text was published in the *ILN* on Saturday, 25 March 1876. And we also know that his sketches could not be transmitted via any telegraph lines, neither via any land lines, nor via the (then) rather recently completed India ocean telegraph (Parkinson 1870). Furthermore, the transit times from England to India at that time, at least for the transportation of *people* (and possibly also for some packages containing sketches and manuscripts), were around a month or, perhaps, at best, three weeks ('I left London . . . on September 28, 1875, and arrived in Bombay on October 30th'; Simpson 1903, p. 270; ref. *supra*, note 'freemason' at III:103). Therefore, it seems problematic to suggest that the event should have happened *later* than, say, the first

week of March — and this is even *without* taking into account the time needed to produce the *ILN* articles, and especially the illustrations; for even as late as in the 1870s it still 'took at least another week for drawings of a scene to be transferred into an engraving' (Lake 1984, p. 153), once the sketches finally *did* arrive in London.

Another important piece of information is that the depicted scene seemingly took place on Nepalese territory, as mentioned by Simpson (*ILN* 1876a, p. 306). And we also know that the time spent in that territory was limited: the Prince of Wales crossed the Sarda river into Nepal in time for dinner on Sunday, 20 February 1876, after first having waited to break up from his temporary camp at 'Bunbussa' (cf. modern 'Banbasa' in India's Uttarakhand) until 3 p.m. (Russell 1878, p. 428; also cf. Simpson's account in *ILN* 1876a, p. 307); and after having spent a few weeks there, laying down all those Terai tigers, he 'crossed back again . . . into British territory' (Wheeler 1876, p. 331) on Sunday, 5 March 1876, via the Sarda, which was as 'bright, clear, and blue as the Rhone at Geneva, but twice as broad' (Russell 1878, p. 451).

Therefore, we have only two Mondays left to choose from: 21 February and 28 February. But the reports of the 28th seem to fit badly with a number of points that Simpson mentions, and in particular with the 'partitioning' of

They just don't *interest* me.

109 CHRISTIANUS: Right. But I think it's the wrong approach.

the day into two 'heats', with one tiger killed by the Prince in the first session, and six others by himself and others in the second. For I have found no reports in the non-Simpsonian accounts of any 'heats' on that day, at least not of the *hunting* variety. This might have something to do with that they, that day, also moved their camp to a new location at Mooza Panee (Russell 1878, p. 447) — a location that seemingly was 'further on into Nepaul, a distance of three miles' (Wheeler 1876, p. 330) — and therefore may have had little time for anything other than a single run. And even if they *had* two hunting 'heats' that day (i.e., without reporting it), the total number of tigers still doesn't add up. For Simpson mentions explicitly that, on the day of the *painting*, they shot 'seven in that one day' (*ILN* 1876a, p. 306). But on the 28 February they only 'shot four tigers' (Wheeler 1876, pp. 330–331), and only one of them on the account of the Prince of Wales (Russell 1878, p. 447). Also, that frightening and 'hard-to-forget-to-mention' event on the 28th, when a tiger jumped up on the Prince's elephant (Russell 1878, pp. 447–448), had not yet been explicitly reported in *ILN* issue no. 1913; it was only a week later, in issue no. 1914, that this event would be thoroughly covered in the *ILN*, both in the form of a story told by 'one of the gentlemen of his [the Prince's] party' (*ILN* 1876e, p. 330; ref. *supra*, note 'anonymous artist' at 111:99), as well as in the form of that

impressive 'two-pager' illustration in the extra supplement at the end (*ILN* 1876e, after p. 336), which was based on Simpson's original sketch (Simpson 1903, facing p. 271).

The Monday event that Christianus is mentioning seems therefore to have occurred on 21 February 1876. For all sources confirm that a total of seven tigers were killed that day (Russell 1878, p. 431; Wheeler 1876, p. 322); and they confirm that this was accomplished in two 'heats' — the first one starting '[a] little after eight' (Wheeler 1876, p. 321) and finishing 'just' before 12:30 (Russell 1878, p. 430), with the Prince killing one tiger, first firing 'both barrels' and wounding him, and then 'two more shots' to finish him off (Wheeler 1876, 322); the second one starting '[a]fter luncheon' (Wheeler 1876, p. 322). Furthermore, all writers, including Simpson (*ILN* 1876a, p. 306), *especially* mention that event which 'men see but once in a lifetime' (Wheeler 1876, p. 322) and which the 'afternoon's sport was inaugurated by' (Russell 1878, p. 431), namely that very impressive procession of at least 700 elephants (with '600 elephants belonging to Nepaul'; *ILN* 1876e, p. 330) forming a single line (Wheeler 1876, p. 321) in an apparent move to hinder any local tigers escaping — a move that seems to fit well with the information that Sir Jung Bahadur and his servants had worked diligently, for weeks, trying to entrap as many tigers as possible into a very small area, using 'large fires'

110 KATHERINE: *What* is?

111 CHRISTIANUS: To say that it doesn't *interest* you.

112 KATHERINE: *Why*?

(Wheeler 1876, p. 321), presumably in an attempt to provide the best possible Nepalese hunting experience for his British guests.

BRIAN LAKE (1984), *British Newspapers: A History and Guide for Collectors*. Introduction by John Frost. London: Sheppard Press.

J. C. PARKINSON (1870), *The Ocean Telegraph to India: A Narrative and a Diary*. Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood and Sons.

WILLIAM HOWARD RUSSELL (1878), *The Prince of Wales' Tour: A Diary in India. With Some Account of the Visits of His Royal Highness to the Courts of Greece, Egypt, Spain, and Portugal. With Illustrations by Sydney P. Hall*. New York: R. Worthington; and London: Rivers & Co.

GEORGE WHEELER (1876), *India in 1875–76: The Visit of the Prince Of Wales. A Chronicle of His Royal Highness's Journeys in India, Ceylon, Spain, and Portugal. With Map and Diaries*. London: Chapman and Hall.

III:105, opportunity: Although the scene occurred on a Monday, and thus may be thought of as a 'Monday opportunity', Christianus must have been aware that this was not just a quick, one-day opportunity, but only a small sample of the many days that Simpson accompanied the Prince of Wales on his India tour — an experience that Simpson himself describes as 'four months of Lord Mayor's Show' (Simpson 1903, p. 270; ref. *supra*, note 'freemason' at

III:103). But Simpson's memory of the Terai tiger-hunting experience was different — equipped with a private tent and his own elephant, it was 'the only pleasant time I had during the four months' (Simpson 1903, p. 270).

III:107, He's with the Prince: As can be seen both in the *ILN* illustration named 'The Prince of Wales Tiger-Shooting with Sir Jung Bahadoor' (*ILN* 1876a, 'Extra Supplement' attached after p. 312; ref. *supra*, note 'late Victorian classical music' at 1:42) and in Simpson's beautiful watercolour, signed 'H.R.H. The Prince of Wales in the Terai with Sir Jung Bahadoor, in Feb. 1876' (Christie's 1996, p. 52), there were seven elephants in the foreground and many others in the background on that Monday; and those in the background were, according to Simpson himself, only 'a portion of the long line of elephants coming up in close line behind' (*ILN* 1876a, p. 306). The Prince of Wales is seen in the foreground, seated on the second elephant from the right, wearing a light brown coat and a white-greyish cask. In the back seat is, almost certainly, Mr. Peter Robertson, since W. H. Russell assures us that 'the Prince always takes Mr. Robertson behind him in the howdah' (*ILN* 1876a, p. 306). This fits well also with the 'tiger attack' scene a week later, on Monday, 28 March 1876, when the Prince's elephant was attacked by a tiger, and 'tore the cloth on which the howdah rested, coming very close to

- 113 CHRISTIANUS: It's like saying, 'I am not *interested* in the plague'.
- 114 KATHERINE: What does *that* have to do with royals? Or freemasons?

Peter Robertson' (Russell 1878, p. 448; ref. *supra*, note 'Monday' at 111:105), as seen both in the *ILN* illustration of that event (*ILN* 1876e, 'Extra Supplement' attached after p. 336) and in Simpson's own sketch (Simpson 1903, facing p. 271; ref. *supra*, note 'freemason' at 111:103). This confirms that Mr. Robertson's (usual) position (still) was that of sitting behind the Prince.

CHRISTIE'S (1996), *Visions of India, Including the Paul F. Walter Collection of Indian Photographs*. London: Christie, Manson & Woods.

111:107, Prince of Wales: In the late Victorian era, Albert Edward was the Prince of Wales. He was born on 9 November 1841, was made Prince on 8 December 1841, and was baptized on 25 January 1842 (Hopkins 1910, pp. 31–32). After Victoria's death on 22 January 1901 (Strachey 1931, p. 268), he was made king, and ruled England during the Edwardian era until 6 May 1910 (see frontispiece in Hopkins 1910).

But it is also important to know, especially if one wants to understand Christianus's comments in regard to freemasons and royalty, that Prince Albert Edward was Freemasonry's 'main man' in England, in virtue of having been initiated as its Grand Master on 28 April 1875 at the Royal Albert Hall, where 'more than ten thousand members of the craft' were present (Hopkins 1910, p. 181; cf. Beresiner 2002,

p. 6; Wheeler 1876, p. 376; ref. *supra*, note 'Monday' at 111:105). The idea that members of the royal family were freemasons was, at the time, nothing new: 'between 1737 and 1907, sixteen princes of the blood were freemasons, and four of them became kings' (Roberts 2008, p. 44); and between 1782 and 1843 the English Grand Master-ship 'was held continuously by three members of the Royal family' (Roberts 2008, p. 41): 1782–1790 by the Duke of Cumberland, 1790–1813 by the Prince of Wales [later George IV], and 1813–1843 by the Duke of Sussex (Roberts 2008, p. 381; cf. Banvard 1875, p. 206).

JOHN BANVARD (1875), *The Private Life of a King. Embodying the Suppressed Memoirs of the Prince of Wales, Afterwards George IV, of England*. With Corroborative Authorities, Drawn from the Secret Archives of the Chartists, and Authentic Documents in the British Museum. New York: The Literary and Art Publishing Company.

YASHA BERESINER (2002), 'Brother Winston' in *Masonic Quarterly Magazine*, no. 3 (October), pp. 6–10.

J. CASTELL HOPKINS (1910), *The Life of King Edward VII, with a Sketch of the Career of George, Prince of Wales and a History of the Royal Tour of the Empire in 1901*. Toronto: W. E. Scull.

J. M. ROBERTS (2008), *The Mythology of the Secret Societies*. London: Watkins Publishing.

- 115 CHRISTIANUS: *That's* the question.
- 116 KATHERINE: How do you mean?
- 117 CHRISTIANUS: Only when you have *researched*
those topics *extensively* can you determine

LYTTON STRACHEY (1931), *Queen Victoria*. London: Chatto and Windus.

III:107, hunting party: Though many Europeans were part of Prince of Wales's hunting party in the Nepalese Terai, the most important member of that hunting team was Sir Jung Bahadur Rana (1816–1877), the 'virtual ruler' of Nepal (Wheeler 1876, p. 318; ref. *supra*, note 'Monday' at III:105) — an iron-fist ruler whose time was 'preceded by a period of disgusting court intrigue and rank betrayals perpetrated by power-maniac nobles backed by foreign interest' and who not only 'shot dead his own maternal uncle, Premier Mathbar Singh Thapa' and plotted 'a massacre of almost all the defenceless nobles at a place in Kathmandu called "Kot"', but also 'relegated the king to the background and established a family rule' (Upadhyay 1971, p. 10). It was therefore not very surprising that it was Sir Jung Bahadur — rather than the more or less powerless Surendra Bikram Shah, King of Nepal — who 'ran the show' on the Nepalese side of the *Sarda*, making sure that the Prince and his associates had an excellent hunting experience.

In the 'Monday' scene — as seen either in the *ILN* 'two-pager' (*ILN* 1876a, 'Extra Supplement' attached after p. 312; ref. *supra*, note 'late Victorian classical music' at 1:42) or in Simpson's own watercolour (Christie's 1996, p. 52; ref. *supra*, note 'He's with the Prince' at

III:107) — Sir Jung Bahadur is in the foreground, on the third elephant from the right, in white. Jung Bahadur (or Jang Bahadur) is also depicted in several other places. One portrait displays his facial features well (*ILN* 1876a, p. 305), including his beard, whose hairs, Simpson tells us, 'are so wide apart that the outlines of the cheeks and chin can be seen distinctly through it' (*ILN* 1876a, p. 307). Another illustration depicts him — apparently a mile or so from Bunbussa (or Banbasa) at around 1 p.m. on Saturday, 19 February 1876 (*ILN* 1876a, p. 306) — greeting the horse-mounted Prince of Wales (*ILN* 1876a, p. 305). Other illustrations depict him standing in his howdah, as for example in 'The Critical Moment' (*ILN* 1876a, p. 308; reproduced [poorly] in Verney 1979, pp. 156–157) and in 'The Prince of Wales's Elephant Charged by a Tiger' (*ILN* 1876e, 'Extra Supplement' attached after p. 336; ref. *supra*, note 'anonymous artist' at III:99). For a (seemingly rather late, possibly contemporary) photograph of Sir Jung Bahadur, seated, in full attire, see picture 338 in Christie's 1996 (p. 210).

DEVENDRA RAJ UPADHYAY (1971), *Nepal: An Interesting Account to Foreigners*. Kathmandu: Department of Information, Ministry of Communication, HMG/Nepal.

PETER VERNEY (1979), *Animals in Peril*. London: Mills & Boon and Provo, UT: Brigham Young University Press.

whether or not they in any way resemble
the plague.

118 KATHERINE: Why the *plague*?

119 CHRISTIANUS: Because it's *deadly*.

120 KATHERINE: So?

121 CHRISTIANUS: So even if you are not overly *in-*
terested in the plague as a scholarly sub-

111:113, the plague: It seems relatively clear here that Christianus's objective is not to bring the discussion in such a direction as to talk about any *specific* plague, neither in a typological sense (e.g., bubonic plague, pneumonic plague, etc.) nor in a historical one (e.g., the Great Plague in London in 1665, the Ural plague in late Victorian times, etc.), but simply to use it as an *example* of a threat with potentially very severe consequences, not just for people in general but for Katherine in particular.

However, even if this evaluation of Christianus's usage of the phrase 'the plague' is correct, it does not, of course, lead us to conclude that he is not *capable* of bringing up some interesting points about various aspects of plagues. One might very well imagine that he, in another place and time, might have put forward thrilling theories, facts and figures related to, for example, the 'protractedness' of the decline of the English population in the two centuries following the 1348–1349 Black Death (cf. Hatcher 1982, pp. 55–62); or might have chosen to talk about the potential dangers of antibiotics and pesticides and the prospect of emerging superbugs

and superplagues (cf. Rewald 1998); or perhaps might have entered into a more literary-focused discussion on Albert Camus and Daniel Defoe and their pseudo-historical writings on plagues (Camus 1947; Defoe 1990).

ALBERT CAMUS (1947), *The Plague*. Translated from the French by Stuart Gilbert. New York: The Modern Library.

DANIEL DEFOE (1990), *A Journal of the Plague Year; being Observations or Memorials of the most Remarkable Occurrences, as well Publick as Private, which happened in London during the last Great Visitation in 1665. Written by a Citizen who continued all the while in London*. Edited by Louis Landa. With a new Introduction by David Roberts. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

JOHN HATCHER (1982), *Plague, Population and the English Economy 1348–1530*. Studies in Economic and Social History. Edited for the Economic History Society by T. C. Smout. London and Basingstoke: The Macmillan Press.

ENRIQUE REWALD (1998), *Immune Crossover: The Two Faces of Immunity. An Approach to the Dangers of the Plague*. New York and London: The Parthenon Publishing Group.

ject, it is still prudent, from a personal health perspective, to carefully observe exactly *who has it*. Then you may avoid that disease simply by *not* associating with them.

122 KATHERINE: So you are *judging* people? Is *that* what your crazy *satisfactionism* is all about?

III:117, resemble the plague: Although Christianus's point about research seems reasonable, it does not seem to be confined only to, as in *this* case, freemasons or royalty; it *also* seems necessary to engage in a thorough analysis of the plague, from different historical, sociological, epidemiological, and philosophical perspectives. So even though some of Christianus's previous speeches perhaps may have led Katherine to believe that she *wouldn't* have to engage in any plagueish scholarly studies, it is hard to see how she could avoid it, if she wasn't already fully conversant with it. For only then — after having discovered the 'standard' plague stories and their rats, fleas, and blood (cf. Cartwright 1977, p. 61; Winslow 1980, pp. 357–359), as well as some of their competing theories (cf. Lindemann 1999, pp. 42–48) — may she, perhaps, be in a better position to appreciate Christianus's comparative mood.

FREDERICK F. CARTWRIGHT (1977), *A Social History of Medicine*. Themes in British Social History. Edited by J. Stevenson. London: Longman.

MARY LINDEMANN (1999), *Medicine and Society in Early Modern Europe*. New Approaches to European History.

Series editors: William Beik and T. C. W. Blanning. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

CHARLES-EDWARD AMORY WINSLOW (1980), *The Conquest of Epidemic Disease: A Chapter in the History of Ideas*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.

III:121, avoid that disease: One should probably assume here that, whether or not he accepts such a theory himself, Christianus's explanation rests on some version of a 'germ theory of disease' — 'one germ, one disease' (Playfair 2007, p. 34) — since this is the dogma taught in the modern schools, and the dogma that Katherine most likely would subscribe to. For an overview of the development of different germ theories, see, for example, Gale (1970), Porter (1996, pp. 184–185) and Dwork (1981); and for an interesting observation on Kircher's alleged role in that development, see Winslow (1980, pp. 146–151; ref. *supra*, note 'resemble the plague' at III:117).

DEBORAH DWORK (1981), 'contagion' in W. F. Bynum, E. J. Browne, and Roy Porter, eds., *Dictionary of the History of Science*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, pp. 75–77.

123 CHRISTIANUS: No. But you have to *understand*
— a satisfactionist is generally also some-
what of a *chartist*.

124 KATHERINE: But weren't the Chartists rather

E. F. GALE (1970), 'The Development of Microbiology' in Joseph Needham, ed., *The Chemistry of Life: Eight Lectures on the History of Biochemistry*. With an Introduction by Joseph Needham. Cambridge: At the University Press, pp. 38–59.

JOHN PLAYFAIR (2007), *Living with Germs In Health and Disease*. New York: Oxford University Press.

ROY PORTER (1996), 'Medical Science' in Roy Porter, ed., *The Cambridge Illustrated History of Medicine*. Project editor: Sarah Bunney; picture research: Sara Waterson; layout: Andrew Shoolbred; indexer: Barbara Hird; cartography: European Map Graphics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 154–201.

III:124, weren't the Chartists: Is it realistic that Katherine, an *American* lawyer, so immediately can answer Christianus in this way? Maybe we should think of this passage simply as an example of 'non-illusory' theatre, a (rather counter-intuitive) term connected with 'implausibility' and 'infinite flexibility', where, for instance, one might 'leap from this earth to the clouds' (Styan 1975, p. 181)? Or is it, nevertheless, still possible that this *is* some sort of 'realistic', 'plausible', and 'illusory' theatre that we are dealing with here (Styan 1975, p. 180; cf. Boulton 1971, p. 162; Bowman and Ball 1961, p. 179)? Maybe Katherine *did* study nineteenth-century British (social, political, or legal) history in school?

MARJORIE BOULTON (1971), *The Anatomy of Drama*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

WALTER PARKER BOWMAN AND ROBERT HAMILTON BALL (1961), *Theatre Language: A Dictionary of Terms in English of the Drama and Stage from Medieval to Modern Times*. New York: Theatre Arts Books.

J. L. STYAN (1975), *Drama, Stage and Audience*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

III:125, Victorian Chartists: The (early) Victorian Chartists have been portrayed in many ways. Some scholars have seen them as (very) violent: 'in many places Chartism took on the menacing aspect of a terrorist organisation' (Ward 1973, p. 120). But even though Royle also notes some violence, for instance at Norwich in 1841 (Royle 1981, p. 82), he still thinks that 'Chartism was . . . born out of the tradition of articulate, politically conscious artisan radicalism in London, with the encouragement of radicals among the higher classes. Though conscious of class, it was not a document conceived in hatred and conflict' (Royle 1981, p. 19). And Mather seemingly accepts that there *was* a class-struggle aspect to the Chartists, but still thinks that 'the first [aspect, the self-reliance of working men] was more pervasive' (Mather 1982, p. 35). And even if 'daily meetings and riots' in London had occurred (Brown and Daniels 1984, p. 125), how

judgmental? And violent? Like a plague?

125 CHRISTIANUS: *Some of the Victorian Chartists* may have been. But they don't *look* very violent on this old daguerreotype over

relevant and representative were these in regard to the picture that Katherine and Christianus are looking at? Or, put in another way: 'What evidence is there that O'Connor and the Chartists on that day in April had any intention of causing a revolution?' (Browne 1999, p. 97). Thus, there seems to be *some* scope for Christianus's 'not-so-very-violent-looking' comment.

RICHARD BROWN AND CHRISTOPHER DANIELS (1984), *The Chartists*. Documents and Debates. General editor: John Wroughton. London and Basingstoke: Macmillan.

HARRY BROWNE (1999), *Chartism*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

E. C. MATHER (1982), *Chartism*. General series no. 61. London: Historical Association.

EDWARD ROYLE (1981), *Chartism*. Seminar Studies in History. Editor: Patrick Richardson. Harlow: Longman.

J. T. WARD (1973), *Chartism*. London: B. T. Batsford.

III:125, old daguerreotype: A person well-read in the history of photography might here object and say that the usage of the modifier 'old' in front of the noun 'daguerreotype' does not *do* very much, since the overwhelming number of extant daguerreotypes *are* old; so why *add* a superfluous 'old'?

One response to such an objection could be that Christianus here wants to be *kind* to Katherine. By adding the

adjective 'old' Christianus also adds an 'excuse' for the otherwise so modern-minded Katherine *not* to be intimidated or ashamed *if* she doesn't know that the old word 'daguerreotype' either might refer to the daguerreotype *camera* that Louis-Jacques-Mandé Daguerre (1787–1851) introduced in 1839, or to that metal-plate *portrait* that it produced (Harrison 1887, pp. 21–27; Tissandier 1877, pp. 53–63). Thus, it may be seen as a potential invitation to a discussion on early photography, where Christianus then, for example, might have presented *his* take on the quality of that very early picture that Daguerre's business partner Joseph Nicéphore Niepce (1765–1833) had produced with his heliography process already in 1822 or 1826 (Ohlman 1990, pp. 731–733); or raised some points in regard to that 'negatives-producing' paper-and-silver-nitrate-and-salt method that the classical-language-and-mathematics-trained William Henry Fox Talbot (1800–1877) had developed in 1835 together with his assistant Nicholas Henneman (Jenkins 1976).

Another way to respond to that objection could be to say that Christianus here not only might have wanted to indicate that this daguerreotype would be considered 'old' as seen from a *modern* perspective, but also as seen from the perspective of a person living in the era that The Late Victorian coffee house represents. So for a *late* Victorian, that daguerreotype would already

here, do they? Or plagueish?

126 KATHERINE: No. They look rather peaceful.

127 CHRISTIANUS: And organized.

128 KATHERINE: Yes. But maybe it isn't *them*?
What does the caption say? I don't have
my reading glasses.

be 30–50 years old, since it was taken in the *early* Victorian age (cf. speech at 111:29). But it was also old in *another* sense. Because of the gradual disappearance of daguerreotypes in general — after the introduction of the collodion wet-plates in the 1850s, the dry-plates in the 1870s, and, not the least, Kodak's handheld camera in the late 1880s (Chapman 1988; Shranz 1993, p. 72) — daguerreotype *technology* was, by then, *old* technology.

THELMA CHAPMAN (1988), 'The Victorian Camera: Development and Technique' in *Victorian Life in Photographs*. Introduction by William Sansom. Photographic research: Harold Chapman; research consultant: John Hillelson; picture selection and layout: Ian Mackenzie-Kerr. London: Thames and Hudson, pp. 27–30.

W. JEROME HARRISON (1887), *A History of Photography: (Written As) A Practical Guide and an Introduction to Its Latest Developments*. With a bibliographical sketch of the author, and an appendix by Dr. Maddox on the discovery of the gelatino-bromide process. New York: Scovill Manufacturing Company.

REESE V. JENKINS (1976), 'Talbot, William Henry Fox' in Charles Coulston Gillispie, ed., *Dictionary of Scientific Biography*, vol. XIII (Hermann Staudinger–Giuseppe Veronese). New York:

Scribner's Sons, pp. 237–239.

HERBERT OHLMAN (1990), 'Information: Timekeeping, Computing, Telecommunications and Audiovisual Technologies' in Ian McNeil, ed. *An Encyclopedia of the History of Technology*. London and New York: Routledge, pp. 686–758.

P. SCHRANZ (1993), 'camera' in Leslie Stroebel and Richard D. Zakia, eds., *The Focal Encyclopedia of Photography*. Boston: Focal Press, pp. 70–73.

GASTON TISSANDIER (1877), *A History and Handbook of Photography*. Translated from the French. Edited by J. Thomson. With upwards of seventy illustrations. London: Sampson, Low, Marston, Low, & Searle and New York: Scovill Manufacturing Company.

111:128, caption: Though the word 'caption' many times may be used in the sense of 'text passages that accompany photographs and illustrations', it may also carry various *legal* meanings, such as, for example, 'a part of a legal instrument, such as an indictment, showing where, when, and by what authority it was executed' (Guralnik 1978, p. 211; cf. Morris 1973, p. 201; Marckwardt 1966, p. 199) or 'a heading showing the names of the parties, court, and docket number in a pleading or deposition' (Guralnik 1978, p. 211; cf. Marckwardt

- 129 CHRISTIANUS: It says, 'The Last Great Chartist Rally, Kennington Common, 10 April 1848.'
- 130 KATHERINE: 1848? But that's not *late* Victorian!
- 131 CHRISTIANUS: *Of course* it isn't. And the horses

1966, p. 199). So the idea might be that Katherine here not only is looking for an 'informative' text, but one which might serve as *evidence* in a more formal sense.

DAVID B. GURALNIK, ED. (1978), *Webster's New World Dictionary of the American Language*. Second college edition. Cleveland, OH: William Collins and World Publishing Co.

ALBERT H. MARCKWARDT, ED. (1966), *Funk & Wagnalls Standard Dictionary of the English Language*, vol. 1. International edition. New York: Funk & Wagnalls Company.

WILLIAM MORRIS, ED. (1973), *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language*. New York: American Heritage Publishing and Houghton Mifflin Company.

III:129, Kennington Common: This is the place in London where the great Chartist meeting took place in 1848. After much work by Mr. Oliver Davis and others (Montgomery 1889, pp. 47–48), the Common was 'converted into a Park by the Kennington Common Inclosure Act of 1852' (Sheppard 1956, p. 31). The Common Land was located to the south-east of what is today's Kennington Park Road, in areas 11 and 12 of Fig. 3 in Sheppard (1956, p. 18).

H. H. MONTGOMERY (1889), *The His-*

tory of Kennington and Its Neighbourhood, with Chapters on Cricket Past and Present. London: H. Stacey Gold, and Hamilton Adams & Co.

F. H. W. SHEPPARD (1956), *Survey of London*, vol. 26: *The Parish of St. Mary Lambeth*. Part Two: Southern Area. London: The Athlone Press, for the London Country Council.

III:130, not *late* Victorian: If we understand the term 'Victorian' as denoting that time in history when Queen Victoria was in reign, then one might, with J. F. C. Harrison and others, position the *late* Victorian times between 1875 and 1901 (Harrison 1990; ref. *supra*, note 'this era' at III:35). And even if one were to accept, for instance, Rowell's idea of a Victorian period from 1792 to 1914 (Rowell 1978, pp. vii–viii, 6; ref. *supra*, note 'it's quite popular' at I:34), it still would be difficult to claim that the Kennington Common meeting on 10 April 1848 would be a *late* Victorian event. Therefore, Katherine seemingly has a valid point.

J. F. C. HARRISON (1990), *Late Victorian Britain 1875–1901*. London: Fontana Press.

III:131, horses . . . facing left: We know that William Edward Kilburn

weren't *actually* facing left, either. But as an 'atmosphere builder', I think this reproduction works. It sets the stage for *later* Victorian developments.

took at least two daguerreotypes of that Chartist meeting at Kennington Common on 10 April 1848, since Prince Albert acquired them and they ended up in the Royal Collection: D1 with *one* flag in the mid-foreground (Kilburn 1848a), and D2 with *two* (or three) flags (Kilburn 1848b). The trouble is just that those two daguerreotypes — just like the one Christianus and Katherine are looking at — are reproduced the wrong way, with the horses facing left instead of right.

Though it may be tempting, without researching the matter more thoroughly, to quickly conclude that the big (dark) numbers on the bright-coloured flags must be directly readable (i.e., *not* be reversed, or horizontally flipped), there are *other*, less prominent, texts to be found in these pictures that *also* must *not* be reversed, including a text that covers one side of the big car. And since a person present at Kennington Common would *not* have been able to go *behind* the car to read any of its text (since the text is *on* the *non*-transparent side of the car itself), it is more likely that *that* text should *not* be seen reversed on the daguerreotype than the numbers on the flags (which very well *could* have been readable from the opposite side).

Therefore it seems necessary to follow (some aspects of) Goodway, who has claimed (though perhaps a little too optimistically) that the (whole) text 'LABOUR THE SOURCE OF ALL WEALTH' can

be seen on the car (Goodway 1982, p. 141). However, a closer inspection of D1, using maximum magnification, only reveals the word 'SOURCE' in the middle and a final 'H' in the rightmost word; the other words are not *clearly* visible, partly because of a handful of gentlemen with high hats who are standing close to the car, blocking the view, and partly because of the too low resolution (but maybe Goodway was able to inspect the *original* daguerreotype, and thus could see more detail?). In any case, once we have identified the word 'SOURCE', regardless of what *other* words may be surrounding it, we can be pretty sure that this is the right orientation, and that, therefore, the numbers on the flags should be reversed, and that the horses should be facing right, on both daguerreotypes. This may be even further corroborated by considering also other factors, such as, for example, the approximate time of the picture, the shadows generated by the sun, and the location of the industrial buildings in the background.

And there is also *additional* pictorial evidence, apart from these two daguerreotypes, that *further* corroborates these observations. For on Saturday, 15 April 1848, the *Illustrated London News* published a picture of that same event called 'The Meeting on Kennington-Common.—From a Daguerreotype' (*ILN* 1848, p. 242), where the number '3' on the light-coloured flag in the mid-

132 KATHERINE: OK. But what does all of this
have to do with *you*?

133 CHRISTIANUS: Well, I *made* it.

134 KATHERINE: You *made* it?

foreground is reversed, and where one horse is facing right, and where Kennington Common and the buildings in the background are all oriented in the same way as they are on the two corrected, horizontally *flipped* daguerreotypes (D1*f* and D2*f*).

Although the 'orientation issue' of the two daguerreotypes now might be considered resolved, there is seemingly yet *another* issue, pertaining not only to the *ILN* illustration and a possible *third* daguerreotype, but also to D1*f*. For Goodway claims that the *ILN* illustration was 'derived mainly from the first daguerreotype (Figure 10) [D1*f*], but presumably a third, destroyed photograph provided the detail for its left-hand portion' (Goodway 1982, p. 141).

But Goodway's statement is problematic. For the right-hand portion of D1*f* simply doesn't *look like* the right-hand portion of the *ILN* illustration: in D1*f* there is no man stepping down from (or up on) a horse; there is no flag with the number '3' (reversed, or otherwise); and the crowds are not in the same place or arranged in the same way. Consequently, it seems far-fetched to propose that the artist should have used D1*f* in this way. And although the idea of a D3 is sound, why propose that D3 did *not* cover the whole scene of the *ILN* illustration? Would it not be more natural to simply suggest that D3 covered the very same scene as that of the *ILN* illustration, especially since the *ILN* caption

did *not* say 'From *two* daguerreotypes'? But perhaps Goodway thought that D3, for some reason, could not, by itself, have covered a greater area than any of the two other daguerreotypes? But what if the D3 photographer *wasn't* Kilburn? Or, even if he was, what if he used a different camera? Or what if the photographer simply located himself at a slightly greater distance, and thus were able to cover a slightly greater area? The tentative conclusion must therefore be that if D3 existed, it covered the same area as the *ILN* illustration; and if Goodway does not have any factual evidence that D3 is 'destroyed', then it may very well still exist somewhere.

DAVID GOODWAY (1982), *London Chartistism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

ILLUSTRATED LONDON NEWS (1848), Saturday, 15 April 1848, vol. 12, no. 547.

WILLIAM EDWARD KILBURN (1848a), *View of the Great Chartist Meeting on Kennington Common*. RCIN 2932484 [Daguerreotype D1: *one* flag in the mid-foreground with a '2' *not* reversed]. Scanned daguerreotype retrieved from The Royal Collection website [<http://www.royalcollection.org.uk>] on Thursday, 8 March 2012.

WILLIAM EDWARD KILBURN (1848b), *View of the Great Chartist Meeting on Kennington Common*. RCIN 2932482 [Daguerreotype D2: *two* (or *three*) flags in the mid-foreground: one with a '3' *not* reversed, and one (or two) with some other

- 135 CHRISTIANUS: Sure. I made a copy from my old
Morgan history book. Owen neither had
the time nor the book, so he asked *me*.
- 136 KATHERINE: Oh, I see. But I was more inter-
ested in hearing about your *chartist* ac-
tivities.
- 137 CHRISTIANUS: You just did. Isn't *photocopying*
good enough for you?
- 138 KATHERINE: Sure it is. But I mean, other than
that? Are you part of a *political* move-
ment? With a list of *demands*?
- 139 CHRISTIANUS: There are always *demands*, in
every sphere of activity. Whether you are
a chartist or not.

number(s)]. Scanned daguerreotype re-
trieved from The Royal Collection web-
site [<http://www.royalcollection.org.uk>]
on Thursday, 8 March 2012.

III:131, It sets the stage: It is interest-
ing to note that Christianus *keeps* the
discussion in the temporal realm, *con-*
tinuing talking about historical devel-
opments in the Victorian era, instead
of taking it in a more philosophical
direction. It appears that he here oth-
erwise had an excellent opportunity to
lay the groundwork for his (allegedly)
discoverist-laden satisfactionism, and
therefore *could* have said, for instance:
'It sets the stage for a discussion on *dis-*
crepancies, which we can find in every
nook we look', after which he — *not*
always being a very 'tough-minded'
philosopher (Hanson 1958, p. 58)

— might have continued talking about
things such as 'anomalies' (Kuhn 1996,
pp. 52–65) and 'saving the phenomena'
(Popper 1968, pp. 82, 246–247). So
why *didn't* he?

NORWOOD RUSSELL HANSON (1958),
Patterns of Discovery: An Inquiry into the
Conceptual Foundations of Science. Cam-
bridge: At the University Press.

THOMAS S. KUHN (1996), *The Structure*
of Scientific Revolutions. Third edition.
Chicago and London: The University of
Chicago Press.

KARL R. POPPER (1968), *Conjectures*
and Refutations: The Growth of Scientific
Knowledge. New York: Harper & Row.

III:135, old Morgan history book:
Since 'old' is not very precise, and 'Mor-
gan' not an altogether rare name, and
'history' also not a very rare (part of a)

- 140 KATHERINE: Well, that may . . .
- 141 CHRISTIANUS: But a modern chartist, especially of the *satisfactionist* variety, does not think that *his own* demands are for everyone. So he doesn't have a political agenda like the *Victorian* Chartists did.
- 142 KATHERINE: But what *does* a modern chartist do, then?
- 143 CHRISTIANUS: He demands.
- 144 KATHERINE: What?
- 145 CHRISTIANUS: *A map.*
- 146 KATHERINE: How do you mean?
- 147 CHRISTIANUS: He *maps* people.

title, many books may fit Christianus's description. Nevertheless, I think it would be difficult to find many such books that *also* had a daguerreotype of the Chartist gathering at Kennington Common on 10 April 1848 *and* where the horses (and all other objects) were reproduced the wrong way, facing left instead of right. Therefore, I would suggest, it is highly probable that the book in question is Kenneth O. Morgan's *The Oxford Illustrated History of Britain*, in which such a 'wrong-headed' daguerreotype can be found (Morgan 1989, p. 443). One may also note that the daguerreotype in Morgan's book is accompanied by the exact same *caption* that Christianus reads to Katherine. Note, however, that Morgan's caption does not *end* after that sentence; there are two more sentences to go. But perhaps

Christianus consciously chose *not* to reproduce those last two sentences when he photocopied it, to make '*his*' caption extra short and sweet?

KENNETH O. MORGAN, ED. (1989), *The Illustrated History of Britain*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

III:138, list of demands: As Katherine seems aware of, the Victorian Chartists had a list of demands. Those demands, the famous 'Six Points' of the People's Charter, were — as paraphrased from a handbill published in 1838 (reproduced in Finn 1992, p. 14; Rees 1995, p. 8) — the following: (1) Every sound-minded man twenty-one years of age (who also was not presently undergoing punishment for crime) should be able to vote. (2) Voting should be done with the help of a ballot system, to secure the anonym-

- 148 KATHERINE: Maps?
- 149 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. Draws. Charts. Arrows.
Colours. Et cetera.
- 150 KATHERINE: What is he drawing? Or charting?
- 151 CHRISTIANUS: I just told you. Arrows. Colours. Don't you *listen*?
- 152 KATHERINE: But what are the arrows and colours *for*? What does the chart, or map, *show*?
- 153 CHRISTIANUS: People's propensities.
- 154 KATHERINE: Propensities?
- 155 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. Including their propositional and emotional position, speed, and direction.
- 156 KATHERINE: You mean what people *think*?
And *feel*?
- 157 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. And *do*. And what they *did* think, and feel, and do. And what they most likely *will* think, and feel, and do. And so on.

ity of the elector. (3) Members of Parliament should not have to own property, so that also poor people would be able to get elected. (4) Members of Parliament should receive a salary, so that also poor people could *stay* in that new position, once elected. (5) There should be equal voting areas, so that all voters would get the same fair share of the representation.

(6) There should be annual Parliaments, to make it much more costly to bribe the voters than if they were to vote only once in seven years.

JOE FINN (1992), *Chartists and Chartism*. History at Source. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

BOB REES (1995), *Chartism*. Oxford: Heinemann.

158 KATHERINE: So he's some kind of social science statistics stud?

159 CHRISTIANUS: I would say more *student* than *stud*. Or, if you like, less *studdish* than *studious*.

160 KATHERINE: But *social science* is right? And *statistics*?

161 CHRISTIANUS: To an extent. But he's more *personally* pragmatic than most social anthropologists are.

162 KATHERINE: How so?

163 CHRISTIANUS: He normally doesn't waste his time writing long, tedious papers for publication in sterile, peer-reviewed publications.

164 KATHERINE: Why not?

165 CHRISTIANUS: Because then he wouldn't have time to actually *use* the information that he has compiled.

166 KATHERINE: So he is not only a *hunter-gatherer*, but also a consumer, one could say?

III:149, Draws. Charts. Arrows. The general idea behind these staccato utterances seems clear enough. But one may wonder about what *type* of words these are. One possibility is that Christianus intended them all to be verbs, perhaps because he wanted to stress the idea that there is a lot of *action* involved, as opposed to some endless amount of passive

armchair philosophizing or telly-watching. Another possibility is that this is yet another occasion where Christianus's word-play tendencies are surfacing, and perhaps are intended to demonstrate how a 'true' language-wizard can softly and seemingly seamlessly go from a verb to a noun via a verb-noun — and still make (some) sense.

Of information?

167 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. And of *people*.

168 KATHERINE: But only *certain* people, right?

169 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. A very select group.

170 KATHERINE: So we're *full circle*.

171 CHRISTIANUS: How do you mean?

172 KATHERINE: You're *judging* people!

173 CHRISTIANUS: No. I am *researching* them. So that I can determine with whom I want, and do *not* want, to associate. *That's* the issue. I am not *judging* them, or *cursing* them, to go to hell, or even to a cell. *That* would be a *tremendous* waste of time and energy.

174 KATHERINE: *Damn!*

175 CHRISTIANUS: What did I . . . ?

176 KATHERINE: No, no, it's not *you* . . . Oh, my goodness! U-u-u-u-h-h-h!

177 CHRISTIANUS: *Katherine!* What's the *matter?*

178 KATHERINE: I just *h-a-v-e* to go to the restroom. *Now!*

179 CHRISTIANUS: Go, girl! *Go!* It's right here!

180 KATHERINE: But keep your eyes open — u-u-u-h-h-h — for a *table!*

181 CHRISTIANUS: OK, OK, I will. Just *go!*

SCENE IV.

A Really Relaxing Rendezvous

- 1 CHRISTIANUS: Everything OK, juice girl?
- 2 KATHERINE: Yes, yes. *Finally!*
- 3 CHRISTIANUS: Good.
- 4 KATHERINE: Any free tables yet?
- 5 CHRISTIANUS: Nope.
- 6 KATHERINE: Any waitresses?
- 7 CHRISTIANUS: Nope.
- 8 KATHERINE: But *look!* Baldy just *scored!*
- 9 CHRISTIANUS: *Rats! A slam-dunk!* Just when I
didn't *look!* I can't *believe* it!
- 10 KATHERINE: *We needed* that table! *Irritating!*
- 11 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. Do I hear a *lawsuit* coming
up?
- 12 KATHERINE: Ha ha! No, not today.
- 13 CHRISTIANUS: Tomorrow?
- 14 KATHERINE: No.
- 15 CHRISTIANUS: Why not?
- 16 KATHERINE: He actually *helped* us, earlier. Re-
member?
- 17 CHRISTIANUS: Sure. But that wouldn't stop a
lawyer, would it?

- 18 KATHERINE: *Of course* not. But I'm not in the mood. And I really *do* think it was fair play.
- 19 CHRISTIANUS: You *do*?
- 20 KATHERINE: Yes, he was *first*.
- 21 CHRISTIANUS: First?
- 22 KATHERINE: Yes. He apparently *saw* the table *first*, and then he also swiftly took action before *anyone else* did.
- 23 CHRISTIANUS: Like a *weasel*!
- 24 KATHERINE: Well, *quickly*, anyhow.
- 25 CHRISTIANUS: But weasels . . .
- 26 KATHERINE: And, if *that's* not enough, there is also *another* thing.
- 27 CHRISTIANUS: What?
- 28 KATHERINE: He also was first *inside*.
- 29 CHRISTIANUS: Are you *sure*?
- 30 KATHERINE: *Positive*. I saw him go in, just before *you* arrived. *Late*, I may add!
- 31 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. Sorry.

iv:35, *iffs*: Although Christianus here *could* have said just 'ifs', it seems more likely that he instead would be a little *extra* clever and say 'iffs'. The vibratory difference would be minimal, and it is therefore quite unlikely that Katherine would pick up on it and thereby 'ruin' the flow of the dialogue by inquiring about it, particularly since Christianus

also adds the well-known word 'plaintiff' right after — a word that Katherine must know so well that it may act like a magnet on her (mind), and thus 'attenuate' the importance of the preceding word 'iffs'. And since it seems possible to understand (*one* dimension of) Christianus's rhyming ideas just by using *one* of the two words, the pragmatic-mind-

- 32 KATHERINE: So I actually think *he* is less to
blame than *you*.
- 33 CHRISTIANUS: So it's *fiffs*?
- 34 KATHERINE: *Fiffs*?
- 35 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. Rhymes with *iffs* and *plain-*
tiffs: F-I-F-S. FIFS.
- 36 KATHERINE: What's *that*?
- 37 CHRISTIANUS: First In, First Seated.
- 38 KATHERINE: Ah! Yes. But there's also *another*
rule.
- 39 CHRISTIANUS: Oh?
- 40 KATHERINE: M-L-M-H-R-M.
- 41 CHRISTIANUS: *M-L-M-H-R-M?* Hmmm.
Many Lawyers' Metabolisms Happily
Recycle Muffins?
- 42 KATHERINE: Ha ha. No. Mural Ladies Must
Have Real Men.
- 43 CHRISTIANUS: *Real Men?* You mean *Baldy*?
- 44 KATHERINE: Yes. The Mural Lady now has a
Real Man under her, in the right posi-

ed Katherine may very well (quickly) decide to decipher the sentence simply using the word 'plaintiffs', without worrying about any 'iffs' or 'ifs'.

iv:37, First In, First Seated: The expression 'First In, First Seated' seems to be some kind of algorithm, whose initial condition ('First In') somehow or other

determines, or is connected to, the result ('First Seated'). Those with a computer science background, or with an interest in algorithms and queues, may here think of FIFO ('First In, First Out'), FILO ('First In, Last Out'), etc.

iv:44, *Real Man* under her: In order for Baldy (the *Real Man*) to be 'under'

tion. Just in time for a potentially potent midday session, as you suggested earlier.

45 CHRISTIANUS: But I didn't suggest *Baldy*.

46 KATHERINE: Maybe not. But I'm just protecting the interests of *My Lady*.

47 CHRISTIANUS: *Your Lady*?

48 KATHERINE: Well, aesthetically speaking. In spirit.

49 CHRISTIANUS: I see. So now she's your *domina*?
Your *mistress*?

the Mural Lady in any close physical sense, (at least) two conditions seem necessary: first, that he sits rather close to the wall of the mural; second, that all, or at least most, of his body is under hers, and, perhaps in particular, below the level of the seat of that very horizontal marble bench that is so prominent in the *Pleading* scene (cf. *supra*, note 'teal-coloured scarves' at III:20).

One example of a mural and a sitting arrangement that might have enabled Baldy to enter into such a physical relationship with The Mural Lady — and which also might resemble the arrangement in The Late Victorian coffee house in terms of how these physical objects would be located — can be seen in the photographs of the (modern, peopleless) Oscar Bar & Restaurant located in the Charlotte Street Hotel in London (Firmdale Hotels 2012, pp. 4–5; but note that, probably *unlike* the mural in The Late Victorian, the Oscar mural *continues* from one wall to another).

Another example, seen in a photo-

graph not only filled with people but also (seemingly) from the Victorian period, illustrates more clearly the idea of the positioning of Baldy's body, and especially his head: it should not touch, or just barely touch, the lower part of the mural (Briggs and Miles 1989, pp. 94–95).

ASA BRIGGS AND ARCHIE MILES (1989), *A Victorian Portrait: Victorian Life and Values as Seen Through the Work of Studio Photographers*. New York: Harper & Row.

FIRMDALE HOTELS (2012), *Charlotte Street Hotel*. London: Firmdale Hotels. Brochure in PDF format retrieved from the Firmdale Hotels website [<http://www.firmdale.com>] on Tuesday, 3 April 2012.

IV:49, *domina*: While the *English* version of Cambridge University's Latin textbook simply proposes that *domina* means 'mistress' or 'madam' (Greig 1996, p. 213), the *American* version provides an important *extra* piece of information when it suggests that it also can mean 'lady (of the house)' (Phinney 2003, p. 216) — a suggestion that more

- 50 KATHERINE: Yes.
- 51 CHRISTIANUS: And, to please *her*, you evaluate
the ‘realness’ of a man by *your* standards?
How *tall* he is? *Physically*?
- 52 KATHERINE: Sure, that’s *one* criterion. But he’s
also the only one *without* a moustache
and a teal-coloured scarf.
- 53 CHRISTIANUS: Right.
- 54 KATHERINE: And *with* a job.
- 55 CHRISTIANUS: How do you *know*?

clearly establishes the *domestic* aspect of this word and its historical relationship to words meaning ‘house’ or ‘home’, such as Lat. *domus*, Gr. *domos*, Russ. *dom*, Skt. *dama-*, etc. (Buck 1988, pp. 457–459). And together with the idea of *power* (over someone or something) that is implicit in words like ‘mistress’ (e.g., ‘A woman who has the care of or authority over servants or attendants, and, in early use, of children or young women’; Little 1980, p. 1337; ref. *supra*, note ‘venerean’ at 11:58), one may easier appreciate the *domination* aspect of the relationship between such a ‘lady’ ruler and her household slaves (cf. Fowler 1965, p. 138) — an aspect also found in the closely related word ‘dominatrix’, which seems to have been in use at least since the time of Cicero (106–43 B.C.) (Lewis and Short 1891, p. 608).

CARL DARLING BUCK (1988), *A Dictionary of Selected Synonyms in the Principal Indo-European Languages: A Contribution to the History of Ideas*. With the co-operation of colleagues and assis-

stants. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

H. W. FOWLER (1965), *A Dictionary of Modern English Usage*. Second edition. Revised by Sir Ernest Gowers. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

[CLARENCE GREIG, JOHN A. JONES, ET AL.] (1996), *Cambridge Latin Course: Unit I*. Integrated Edition with Language Information. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

CHARLTON T. LEWIS AND CHARLES SHORT (1891), *A New Latin Dictionary*. Founded on the Translation of [William] Freund’s *Latin-German Lexicon*, edited by E. A. Andrews. New York: Harper & Brothers and Oxford: At the Clarendon Press.

ED PHINNEY, PATRICIA E. BELL, AND BARBARA ROMAINE, EDS. (2003), *Cambridge Latin Course: Unit 1*. The North American Third Edition. New York: Cambridge University Press.

IV:49, *mastress*: This word is not found in most dictionaries. And even though ‘*mastress*’ *does* appear in various forms

- 56 KATHERINE: Just *look* at him! *That's* what *I'm* talking about!
- 57 CHRISTIANUS: You mean his fake Rolex and ridiculous Ray-Bans?
- 58 KATHERINE: They are neither fake nor ridiculous. And neither are his expensive bad-boy-black leather jacket or his delightfully delicious designer jeans. Or his *perfect smile!*
- 59 CHRISTIANUS: Well, maybe there is *something* to it. After all, dental care *is* expensive. Especially in Britain.
- 60 KATHERINE: So you agree?
- 61 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. Unless, of course, he simply is one of those golden-goose guys who doesn't *need* a dental job. Or *any* job.
- 62 KATHERINE: OK, OK. I get it. So let's just skip the *job requirement*.
- 63 CHRISTIANUS: *Skip* it?
- 64 KATHERINE: Yes. It wasn't my *main* point, in

in the *Shorter OED*, with the meaning 'mistress', Little does not mention any specific literary works in which it occurs (Little 1980, p. 1288; ref. *supra*, note 'venerean' at 11:58). However, one might, for example, find the word 'mistress' in an English translation of Pedro Calderón de la Barca's *Life Is a Dream* (Calderón de la Barca 1910, p. 65).

PEDRO CALDERÓN DE LA BARCA (1910),

Life Is a Dream [translated by Edward Fitzgerald] in Charles W. Eliot, ed., *The Five-Foot Shelf of Books*, *The Harvard Classics*, vol. 26: *Continental Drama: Calderón, Corneille, Racine, Molière, Lessing, Schiller*. New York: Collier, pp. 5–68.

iv:59, dental care is expensive: Christianus's statement seems to fit well with a 2008 article in *The Independent*,

any case.

65 CHRISTIANUS: I am surprised, Katherine! *Really* surprised! So Social Security checks are OK?

66 KATHERINE: Are you *insane*? *Absolutely* not!

67 CHRISTIANUS: Why not?

68 KATHERINE: He must be able to *take care* of himself.

69 CHRISTIANUS: But he *can*!

70 KATHERINE: *And* his family.

71 CHRISTIANUS: What *family*?

72 KATHERINE: And not just *survive*, either. Have a *life*! A *real* life!

73 CHRISTIANUS: Hmm.

74 KATHERINE: So he needs to *provide*!

75 CHRISTIANUS: Goodness. Poor Baldy.

76 KATHERINE: Some *real* money.

77 CHRISTIANUS: But what if the checks *were* generous? Or even *very* generous?

which reported that a study done at the department of health management at the Berlin University of Technology had found that — of the nine European countries surveyed — Britain was the one with the most expensive dental treatment (Laurance 2008). Including the cost of all the materials and resources needed (such as x-rays, drugs, and the time of the dentist), a regular

filling was €156 (£117) in England but only €8 in Hungary.

JEREMY LAURANCE (2008), 'Ouch! British dental care the most expensive in Europe: Europe-wide study reveals huge gulf in dental prices' in *The Independent*, 10 January 2008. Online article retrieved from the Independent website [<http://www.independent.co.uk>] on Tuesday, 3 April 2012.

- 78 KATHERINE: Not a chance.
- 79 CHRISTIANUS: So what are we talking about? A million pounds sterling in a respectable bank, inherited from an equally respectable father? Or *two*? Would that work?
- 80 KATHERINE: Make it *ten*, and we'll talk. And you can skip 'respectable', if *that's* a problem for you. I'm not *Victorian*.
- 81 CHRISTIANUS: *Ten million?*
- 82 KATHERINE: And *without* a prenu, of course.
- 83 CHRISTIANUS: It's a *bargain!*
- 84 KATHERINE: Chris, I'm just representing *My Lady*. It's not for *me!*
- 85 CHRISTIANUS: Right. I forgot.
- 86 KATHERINE: Anything else?
- 87 CHRISTIANUS: But what about *Love*? How much is *that* worth?
- 88 KATHERINE: As I said, ten million.
- 89 CHRISTIANUS: What about some extra serenades at night? No discount?
- 90 KATHERINE: *Dream on, Romeo!*
- 91 CHRISTIANUS: Hmm.
- 92 KATHERINE: And time is running out.
- 93 CHRISTIANUS: A *countdown*, too? You're *good!*
- 94 KATHERINE: Well, it's just that there's a time and place for everything.

- 95 CHRISTIANUS: At least we can agree on *that!*
- 96 KATHERINE: So what do you say: shall we leave
her alone, for now?
- 97 CHRISTIANUS: Already?
- 98 KATHERINE: Well, I don't sense that we have
an agreement.
- 99 CHRISTIANUS: I don't sense it *either*.
- 100 KATHERINE: And it's also almost noon, and
My Lady needs to prepare Herself for a
really relaxing *rendezvous*.
- 101 CHRISTIANUS: Ha ha! Sure. And with Baldy
no longer at the *statue*, our next destina-
tion is quite clear, isn't it?
- 102 KATHERINE: *Absolutely!* Let's go!

SCENE V.

Baldy's Barbie-Babes

- 1 KATHERINE: We *made* it!
- 2 CHRISTIANUS: *At last!* Good ol' Maggie!
- 3 KATHERINE: Maggie?
- 4 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. *Magdalene*. Didn't you take
art history?
- 5 KATHERINE: I did. But we didn't cover any
white marble statues. In any *coffee shops*.
In *London*.
- 6 CHRISTIANUS: Oh. So you only took an *intro*
course, then? Modern *Miami Crap Art*
History 101, or something? Or the more
specialized *South Beach* variant, perhaps?
- 7 KATHERINE: That was almost *funny*, Chris.
- 8 CHRISTIANUS: Good. But isn't she *beautiful*?
With her *gaze*?
- 9 KATHERINE: I'm not so much into *statues*.

v:8, her gaze: If Kern is right, there may be something very important to be said about the Victorian gaze (Kern 1996; ref. *supra*, note 'teal-coloured scarves' at 111:20). However, the extent to which *Christianus* is appreciating Kern's ideas is hard to estimate. But it does not seem unreasonable to propose that *Christianus* at least (partly) would accept the more

general idea that 'seeing is not an unbroken gazing' (Summers 1991, p. 197).

DAVID SUMMERS (1991), 'Conditions and Conventions: On the Disanalogy of Art and Language' in Salim Kemal and Ivan Gaskell, eds., *The Language of Art History*. Cambridge Studies in Philosophy and the Arts. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 181–212.

Especially when they have such a lofty, philosophical look. There's no *romance* there. Just *brain waves*.

10 CHRISTIANUS: Hmm, yes. Magdalene *does* seem to be a thinker of sorts. But you have to agree: her *pose* is *much* better than Rodin's!

11 KATHERINE: Absolutely. And her *complexion* too. But she's still *too bulky!*

12 CHRISTIANUS: Yes, space is always a concern with *live sculptures*. Which is why the interior decorator said the whole air conditioning system had to be placed *under* her, if they at all should *have* one.

13 KATHERINE: Hmm. I hope she doesn't get a cold, though, *sitting* on it?

14 CHRISTIANUS: Well, the AC isn't always working, anyways.

15 KATHERINE: But it's humming along, isn't it? And not so discreetly, either.

16 CHRISTIANUS: Right. It's *definitely* a Hummer.

v:10, Magdalene . . . pose: After comparing many different statues of potential (Mary) Magdalenes, one may come to the conclusion that Christianus and Katherine are looking at (a reproduction of) the Magdalene sculpture that currently resides in the Fitzwilliam Museum at Cambridge University. This beautifully crafted marble sculpture of Magdalene

was made by Pompeo Marchesi in 1832, and was apparently acquired by the Fitzwilliam Museum in 1974 (Fitzwilliam Museum 2012). However, it seems rather unlikely that Christianus (and Katherine) would agree with Fitzwilliam Museum's statement that this sculpture of Magdalene depicts her as 'glamorous yet contrite' (Fitzwilliam Museum 2012).

- 17 KATHERINE: *Definitely.*
- 18 CHRISTIANUS: But who *knows* if it's actually
working?
- 19 KATHERINE: I would worry more if I *didn't*
hear it.
- 20 CHRISTIANUS: Maybe. But vacuum cleaners
are *also* noisy. And *they* don't always work
either. *Or* produce very clean air.
- 21 KATHERINE: Chris, you *worry* too much.
- 22 CHRISTIANUS: I *do*?
- 23 KATHERINE: Yes. About the *wrong things!*
- 24 CHRISTIANUS: Really?
- 25 KATHERINE: Yes. *Really!* And you neglect all
the *important* stuff!
- 26 CHRISTIANUS: Such as?
- 27 KATHERINE: The air *outside!*
- 28 CHRISTIANUS: What about it? We're *inside!*
- 29 KATHERINE: All that *carbon dioxide!* And *glo-*
bal warming!

More details about the Pompeo Mar-
chesi statue can be found in one of the
exhibition catalogues of the Heim Gal-
lery, in which it is called 'The Magdalen'
(Heim Gallery 1972, no. 49).

FITZWILLIAM MUSEUM (2012), 'Mary
Magdalene'. Online article retrieved
from the Fitzwilliam Museum website
[<http://www.fitzmuseum.cam.ac.uk>] on
Tuesday, 10 April 2012.

HEIM GALLERY (1972), *Paintings &
Sculptures, 1770–1830: Autumn Exhibi-
tion, September 11–December 21, 1972.*
London: Heim Gallery.

v:10, pose . . . better than Rodin's: If
Christianus is not thinking about Ro-
din *himself*, he is most probably talking
about his work *The Thinker* — some-
thing which Katherine seems to under-

- 30 CHRISTIANUS: Ha ha! You're funny, Katherine!
Really funny!
- 31 KATHERINE: Funny?
- 32 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. You really *should* get up on
that little mini-stage over there! Don't be
shy! *Go for it!* Miami's Got Talent! *Yeah!*
- 33 KATHERINE: I don't follow.
- 34 CHRISTIANUS: To be really funny, one has to,
on occasion, be able to be *very* serious.
As if one really *meant* it. Like Seinfeld.
He knows. And apparently *you* do too!
Splendid performance! Just *splendid!*
- 35 KATHERINE: But I really *meant* it, Chris! I am
serious!
- 36 CHRISTIANUS: You *are*?
- 37 KATHERINE: Yes. Man-made global warming is
absolutely nothing to joke about. I would
never *think* of it. It's a real *problem!*
- 38 CHRISTIANUS: Are you still joking? Because
if you *are*, it's really, *really* good! Larry

stand, even though the reference in such a case, in a somewhat mysterious way, first would pass through Rodin, and then continue onwards to the ruminator and *his* pose.

For a reproduction of the smaller (70 cm high) version of *The Thinker*, see, for example, Reynolds 1992 (p. 41).

DONALD MARTIN REYNOLDS (1992), *The Nineteenth Century*. The Cambridge

Introduction to Art. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

v:38, Larry David . . . *ecstatic*: It may be difficult to visualize the idea that Larry David would have been (externally) *ecstatic* here, especially since one of his shows was named *Curb Your Enthusiasm*. But maybe that is (part of) Christianus's point?

David would have been *ecstatic!*

39 KATHERINE: I am sorry to disappoint you, but
I'm *serious*. *Dead* serious.

40 CHRISTIANUS: Then we have a problem.

41 KATHERINE: *Finally!*

42 CHRISTIANUS: Sorry, but I should have said
'you', not *'we'*.

43 KATHERINE: *I* have a problem?

44 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. If you believe those jokesters
at the BBC and the NYT.

45 KATHERINE: *Jokesters?*

46 CHRISTIANUS: They'd make *anything* up to get
better ratings. And to keep their jobs. So
why listen to *them*? Anthropogenic glo-
bal warming is just another scam, long in
the making. And so are many other news
stories.

47 KATHERINE: *Scam?* Have you lost your *mind*?
Shall I call the men in white?

48 CHRISTIANUS: Go ahead! You can even call
those in *black*, if you want. But not for
my sake! I am not gay, *or* alien! Ha ha!

49 KATHERINE: I don't see *anyone else* needing
emergency treatment!

50 CHRISTIANUS: Ha ha! Relax, Katherine. *Relax!*

51 KATHERINE: How *can* I? I'm still freaking
standing! Next to an annoyingly noisy

marble Hummingbird. In a crowded café *without* waitresses *or* coffee. Or anything to *eat!* And *then* — after an eternity of in-house touring — Chris the conspiracy theorist starts!

52 CHRISTIANUS: I am not a conspiracy *theorist*.

53 KATHERINE: You certainly have fooled *me!*

54 CHRISTIANUS: I think of myself more as a *factualist*. Or, perhaps, even better, as a *fictionalist*.

55 KATHERINE: Well, at least it *sounds* better. But what does it *mean?*

56 CHRISTIANUS: That global warming very well may be true.

57 KATHERINE: Oh? Really? *Good!*

58 CHRISTIANUS: Well, I mean, not necessarily *right now*. But it certainly *may* be, at *some* point.

59 KATHERINE: Hmm.

60 CHRISTIANUS: *Man-made* global warming, however, is a different story. It's not only a piece of *ill-crafted* fiction, but also a *scam*.

61 KATHERINE: You're not giving up so easily, are you?

62 CHRISTIANUS: Why *would* I? For the sake of some mishy-moushy 'political politeness'? It's not *my* game, *that's* for sure! Ha ha!

63 KATHERINE: I get *that*. But what would the
motive be? Why would someone simply
make up a story?

64 CHRISTIANUS: Why don't you ask one of the
latest Nobel Prize Laureates?

65 KATHERINE: I am sorry?

66 CHRISTIANUS: Or just *anyone*.

67 KATHERINE: OK?

68 CHRISTIANUS: Because they *like* it.

69 KATHERINE: Like *what*?

70 CHRISTIANUS: The story. The play. And the
way they can *position* themselves in it.

71 KATHERINE: Position?

72 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. Because they are *unhappy*.
With their *position*.

73 KATHERINE: You mean with their *life*?

74 CHRISTIANUS: Yes, *without* those stories.

75 KATHERINE: So they create *stories*? To get *hap-*
pier?

76 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. Those who are *satisfied*
don't *need* such stories.

77 KATHERINE: How do you mean?

78 CHRISTIANUS: Take Baldy, for instance.

79 KATHERINE: OK?

80 CHRISTIANUS: And let's assume that he is as

rich as you *think* he is. Or *would like* him to be.

81 KATHERINE: OK.

82 CHRISTIANUS: Why would a guy *like that* waste his precious time on *making up stories* about how rich he is going to be? He's *already* rich!

83 KATHERINE: Maybe he has *nothing else* to do?

84 CHRISTIANUS: Unlikely. With his macho-magnetic appearance, and his custom-designed *blue* Ferrari rebelliously, and very visibly, *mis*parked just outside one of those new, trendy bars, he can get *any* babe he wants, any day of the week. So why *wouldn't* he have anything else to do? He's already *living the dream!*

85 KATHERINE: Dating all those *superficial* Barbie dolls?

86 CHRISTIANUS: Actually, he's not so much into *dating*. He's more into variety. *Continuous* variety.

87 KATHERINE: A *player*?

88 CHRISTIANUS: What *else* could he be? And how do you know that those Barbies are *superficial*, or *merely* superficial? Or that they are *more* superficial than those who are *not* very hot?

89 KATHERINE: It's just that . . .

90 CHRISTIANUS: So he's already *ruling*. He doesn't
need to *daydream* very much about mon-
ey *or* women. In those areas, he's king.
Everything just *works*. Automatically. No
revision needed.

91 KATHERINE: But?

92 CHRISTIANUS: He has a health problem.

93 KATHERINE: But he looks *great!*

94 CHRISTIANUS: Nevertheless.

95 KATHERINE: What's wrong? Herpes? Gonor-
rhea? AIDS?

96 CHRISTIANUS: No. It's his lungs. After a life-
time of smoking.

97 KATHERINE: That doesn't sound *that* bad.

98 CHRISTIANUS: You obviously haven't heard
him *cough* yet. It goes on and on. And
on.

99 KATHERINE: OK, but . . .

100 CHRISTIANUS: So whenever he has some spare
time, he is doing his *story-thing*. How to
proceed. How to become better. How to
heal.

101 KATHERINE: You mean he's trying to figure
out his health options? How to survive?
All by *himself?*

102 CHRISTIANUS: Yes.

103 KATHERINE: Why doesn't he simply go to some

expert *doctor*, so that he *doesn't* have to waste his time dreaming up all these stupid *stories*? Is he *retarded* or something?

104 CHRISTIANUS: No more than *I* am.

105 KATHERINE: *That's* a relief!

106 CHRISTIANUS: Ha ha! Yes. So as an expert *player*, he not only knows his way around the basketball court; he also knows *exactly* how to navigate in the so-called 'real world'. With so-called 'real people'.

107 KATHERINE: OK?

108 CHRISTIANUS: So he knows, from his own experience with *thousands* of encounters, that people never *really* act unselfishly, or without motives. It may just *seem* like that, if one *doesn't* scratch the surface.

109 KATHERINE: Hmm.

110 CHRISTIANUS: So he is well aware that people always are very carefully managing their own *position* in their own, particular story-space. In a complex, multi-dimensional play-array of values, roles, motives and emotions.

111 KATHERINE: Are you talking about *social norms*?

112 CHRISTIANUS: Yes, that too. And since Baldy's health is much more important to *himself* than to anyone else, he decided *not* to trust *anyone*, including those doctors. So he conducts his own research.

- 113 KATHERINE: So he's *not* trusting medical *science*? Or the *physicians*? What a *fool*!
- 114 CHRISTIANUS: No. He is *very* bright and well informed. He now knows more about how to heal himself than most regular doctors do. In fact, he might even be eligible for next year's local Ready-to-Role-Play Competition for aspiring satisfactionists. If he just can beat his lung cancer before February.
- 115 KATHERINE: *Whatever*.
- 116 CHRISTIANUS: *Whatever?* No *compassion*? Lung *cancer!*
- 117 KATHERINE: It's just a stupid *game!*
- 118 CHRISTIANUS: There is nothing 'just' about this game. Or *any* game. It's the real deal.
- 119 KATHERINE: And what does all this *nonsense* have to do with the BBC and the NYT, anyways? And with global warming? It's *science!*
- 120 CHRISTIANUS: Science is a just a pile of stories. Just like literature is. Or the news.
- 121 KATHERINE: Come on, Chris! *Grow up!*
- 122 CHRISTIANUS: The main difference is simply how *moving* they are. Are the stories *be-*

v:118, There is nothing 'just': The word 'just' seemingly plays a very important role in this sentence. One way to understand its importance would be

to regard it as a modifier that 'blocks' Katherine's idea that games are not very important or that games are not 'serious', or something like that. On such a

lievable? Are they entertaining? And do we feel an urgency to act? Or not?

123 KATHERINE: Oh, my!

124 CHRISTIANUS: So we should not underestimate them.

125 KATHERINE: Who? The *Eskimos?*

126 CHRISTIANUS: For example. Or the Bar Council. Or the rappers down the street.

127 KATHERINE: Come on! *Really!*

128 CHRISTIANUS: Hold on, Katherine. Just hear me out.

129 KATHERINE: All right, all right. Here we go *again!*

130 CHRISTIANUS: It's simple. People just *love* stories. *Therefore* people *use* stories to try to grab *power*. If you have the *right* story, you can get ahead. But if you have the *wrong* one, you might end up with nothing. Or even less.

131 KATHERINE: So?

132 CHRISTIANUS: So everyone in the rat race needs a good story. A story that solves a problem. A story that moves. A story that pays. Either in dollars or, as in Bal-

reading we might then say that Christianus here is trying to tell Katherine that games are more important than she thinks they are. Another way to

understand the word 'just' would be to read it in a more philosophical way, as having to do with some aspects of ethics and the philosophy of law. In that

dy's case, in sensuous sessions with the hottest hotties.

- 133 KATHERINE: So it's *all* about money?
- 134 CHRISTIANUS: No. But if you *follow* the money, you'll see it. It's about power. Who's ruling, and who's not.
- 135 KATHERINE: But why all this talk about *stories*? What does it have to do with *my* life?
- 136 CHRISTIANUS: In order to *get* anywhere, story-wise, you *first* have to learn how to rule *your own* body. So you need some narrative support for that.
- 137 KATHERINE: I'm not sure what you mean.
- 138 CHRISTIANUS: If you cannot even control *your own* body, how will be able to control the kind of *hot guys* that you want to impress on? So unless you want to end up as a *slave*, why try to allure someone whom you eventually won't be able to *control*? Remember Roy in Vegas? *Grrrr!*

case one might suggest that Christianus here may be pointing out that the philosophical concept of 'justice', as well as any ideas depending on it, actually are not *applicable*, at least not in any *absolute* sense.

v:138, Roy in Vegas: The proper noun 'Roy' most probably refers to Roy Horn of Siegfried and Roy, the two magicians who had one of the most successful shows

in Las Vegas in the history of show business (ABC News 2009): 'We followed our dreams, for dreams were all we had. In the process our lives became magical' (Siegfried and Roy 2012). Whether or not this 'dream-following' idea would fit into Christianus's discussion on people who are searching for a better position is not entirely easy to evaluate. But we can at least assume that neither Christianus nor Katherine would say that

- 139 KATHERINE: I do. But that was a *tiger!*
- 140 CHRISTIANUS: That's exactly my point. If
you're playing in *Baldy's* league, there is a
different set of rules. If there are any rules
at all!
- 141 KATHERINE: I don't think I can do it.
- 142 CHRISTIANUS: How do you mean?
- 143 KATHERINE: I am not interested in some lonely
guru-in-a-cave type of life, if that's what
you're saying.
- 144 CHRISTIANUS: Are you kidding? Am I in a cave
now?
- 145 KATHERINE: No.
- 146 CHRISTIANUS: Unlike *you*, I am *not* a nothing-
ness philosopher. So why would I recom-
mend some boring Buddhist monastery
or mediocre *mâyâvâdi âshrama?* Or one
of those encaved Himalayan hermits
whose only 'friends' are the *yetis* and the
neti-netis?

the 'material' position of Mr. Horn (in March 2007, three and a half years after that tiger incident) was a better or more 'magical' one than the one he had had prior to that gory event.

SIEGFRIED AND ROY (2012), 'Biography'. Online article retrieved from the Siegfried and Roy website [http://www.siegfriedandroy.com] on Tuesday, 3 April 2012.

ABC NEWS (2009), 'Siegfried and

Roy's Journey'. Elizabeth Vargas anchors 'Siegfried and Roy: The Magic Returns'. 7 March 2009. Video retrieved from the ABC News website [http://www.abcnews.go.com] on Tuesday, 3 April 2012.

v:146, *mâyâvâdi*: The Sanskrit root \sqrt{vad} 'speak' (cf. Eng. 'word') is a building block that is used to create many other words, and parts of words, such as *pratyayas*, suffixes (cf. Whitney 1988,

147 KATHERINE: Actually, I *have* heard some spooky fairytales about Tibetan *yetis*. Are the *neti-netis* similar? Just as hairy and scary? And *imaginary*?

148 CHRISTIANUS: The *neti-netis* seem to be just

pp. 152–153; Monier-Williams 1899, pp. 939–940; Egenes 2000, p. 7). This root may be seen as the origin of, for instance, two closely related suffixes *-vāda* and *-vādi*, often encountered in discussions on Indian philosophy. The *vridhhi* ‘strengthening’ (or lengthening) of the ‘a’ in *√vad*, resulting in the long ‘ā’ in *-vāda* and *-vādi*, may be seen as an introduction of the idea of ‘aboutness’ or (causal, generative) ‘fromness’, so that the *vridhhi*d result would be *about* or *of* the idea contained in the original root (cf. Monier-Williams 1864, p. 24). Thus *-vāda* may mean ‘speaking of or about’, ‘mentioning’, ‘thesis’, ‘proposition’, ‘argument’, ‘doctrine’ (Monier-Williams 1899, pp. 939–940), and hence also ‘a philosophy’. Similarly, *-vādi* may mean ‘speaking or talking about’ or ‘the teacher or propounder or adherent of any doctrine or theory’ (Monier-Williams 1899, p. 940), thus denoting ‘a philosopher’.

As for *māyā*, it is usually translated as ‘that which is not’ or ‘illusion’ or ‘[that which is] not real’ (Prabhupāda 1990, p. 31; cf. Raju 1957, p. 292). Thus, the term *māyāvāda* denotes the ‘illusion’ or ‘nothingness’ school of philosophy (e.g., Shankara’s *advaita* philosophy), or, in Monier-Williams’s translation, ‘the doctrine affirming the world to be illusion (applied to the doctrine of the Vedānta and of Buddhism)’ (Monier-Williams 1899, p. 811). Therefore, the term *māyāvādi* points to a philosopher

adhering to such an illusory or nothingness-like doctrine — a doctrine that, for all practical purposes, boils down to impersonalism and atheism.

In this context it is also relevant to point out that, just as atheists seldom talk of themselves as atheists, proponents of *māyāvāda* philosophy seldom talk of themselves as *māyāvādīs* (cf. Klostermaier 2002, p. 109). Therefore, noting that Christianus here *uses* that very word, and also in the previous sentence has declared that he is *not* a nothingness philosopher, we may be quite sure that he himself is not a *māyāvādi*.

THOMAS EGENES (2000), *Introduction to Sanskrit*. Part Two. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers.

KLAUS K. KLOSTERMAIER (2002), *Hinduism: A Short Introduction*. Oxford: OneWorld Publications.

MONIER [MONIER-]WILLIAMS (1864), *A Practical Grammar of the Sanskrit Language, Arranged with Reference to the Classical Languages of Europe, for the Use of English Students*. Third edition, much enlarged and improved. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press.

MONIER MONIER-WILLIAMS (1899), *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary, Etymologically and Philologically Arranged with Special Reference to Cognate Indo-European Languages*. New edition, greatly enlarged and improved with the collaboration of E. Leuman, C. Cappeller, and other scholars. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press.

as 'real' as the *yetis* are, and perhaps even *more* so. But they are, unfortunately, the proud proponents of a phenomenally foolish philosophy.

149 KATHERINE: How does it work?

A. C. BHAKTIVEDANTA SWAMI PRABHUPĀDA (1990), *The Journey of Self-Discovery*. Mumbai: The Bhaktivedanta Book Trust.

P. T. RAJU (1957), 'Post-Samkara' in Sarvepalli Radhakrishnan, ed., *History of Philosophy: Eastern and Western*, vol. 1. Sponsored by the Ministry of Education, Government of India. London: George Allen & Unwin, pp. 287–304.

WILLIAM DWIGHT WHITNEY (1988), *The Roots, Verb-Forms, and Primary Derivatives of the Sanskrit Language. A Supplement to his Sanskrit Grammar*. New Haven, CT: American Oriental Society. Originally published in 1885 by Breitkopf und Härtel (Leipzig) and Trübner & Co (London).

v:146, āshrama: Although the word *āshrama* may mean different things, it seems fairly reasonable to read it here as 'hermitage' (Macdonell 1924, p. 43).

ARTHUR ANTHONY MACDONELL (1924), *A Practical Sanskrit Dictionary, with Transliteration, Accentuation, and Etymological Analysis Throughout*. London: Humphrey Milford, for the Oxford University Press.

v:146, yetis: The 'abominable snowman', also known as the *yeti*, 'features strongly in Sherpa mythology' (Woodhatch 1997, p. 427). Some 'inexplicable footprints' were reported already in 1898 by Wassell in Sikkim (Woodhatch 1997, p. 427). Then Bill Tilman 'tracked yeti footprints

for over a mile' in 1938, after which Eric Shipton photographed one on the Menglungse glacier in the Himalayas in 1951 (Mayhew and Bindloss 2006, p. 353; photograph reproduced in Bradbury 1983, p. 111). And the 1985 Pilkington Everest Expedition reported that 'they came to a line of large prints running across the glacier', also noting that they knew 'full well they were the first expedition there that year', after which Jon Tinker, a climber and an Exeter University graduate, said 'Saw what looked like Yeti prints', while adding, casually, 'and I ain't a believer' (Greig 1999, p. 107).

WILL BRADBURY (1983), *In i det okända*. Stockholm: Det Bästa. Original edition (1981): *Into the Unknown*. Pleasantville, NY: Reader's Digest Association.

ANDREW GREIG (1999), *Kingdoms of Experience: Everest, the Unclimbed Ridge*. Edinburgh: Canongate.

BRADLEY MAYHEW AND JOE BINDLOSS (2006), *Nepal*. London: Lonely Planet Publications.

TOM WOODHATCH (1997), *Nepal Handbook*. Bath: Footprint Handbooks.

v:146, neti-netis: This most probably refers to those philosophers who are subscribing to, or are interested in, different kinds of *neti-neti* philosophy. For more on the *neti-netis* and their philosophical method, see *infra*, their 'phenomenally foolish philosophy' at v:148, and note 'Sort of' at v:152.

- 150 CHRISTIANUS: It's very straightforward. *Not* this,
not that — *neti* this, *neti* that. *Neti-neti*.
- 151 KATHERINE: Double negation?
- 152 CHRISTIANUS: Sort of.
- 153 KATHERINE: And?
- 154 CHRISTIANUS: That's it.
- 155 KATHERINE: That's all?
- 156 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. As I said: *foolish!*
- 157 KATHERINE: So what *are* you saying, then?
 I mean, about *me*?
- 158 CHRISTIANUS: About *you*? The long version, or
 the short?

v:148, phenomenally foolish philosophy:

It may be significant that Christianus here uses the word 'phenomenally'. Although it is plain that appearances and phenomena can be misleading, and that they, on their own, do *not* always indicate the exact underlying mechanism by which the universe operates, Christianus himself presumably still thinks that we must use these appearances to construct a *positive* theory of the complete cosmos (material and spiritual), and avoid theories that are built on mostly negative conceptual ground, such as those in 'negative theology' or 'via negativa', etc. (cf. Braine 1998). Christianus might therefore think that the *neti-netis* are foolish because they categorically *reject* the phenomena as a means to discover the greater cosmos, using their official excuse, 'whatever we imagine it to be, it will be wrong' — an unscientific at-

titude that probably would make Christianus categorize them as nothing but philosophical escape artists of the most insincere kind. For more on *neti-neti* philosophy, see *infra*, note 'Sort of' at v:152.

DAVID BRAINE (1998), 'Negative Theology' in Edward Craig, ed., *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, vol. 6 (Luther-Nifo). London: Routledge, pp. 759–763.

v:152, Sort of: Christianus's response to Katherine's idea of a 'double negation' probably indicates that this is *not* how he himself should have described it. First of all, we can be reasonably sure that Christianus is not referring to any double negation in 'standard' symbolic logic terms (but cf. Dummett 1998 on intuitionistic logic, pp. 178–179), where the two negations would amount to an 'annihilation', as in Hacking's ex-

- 159 KATHERINE: The short one, *please!*
- 160 CHRISTIANUS: No. No. No.
- 161 KATHERINE: OK?
- 162 CHRISTIANUS: Too short?
- 163 KATHERINE: A little.
- 164 CHRISTIANUS: All right. If *satisfaction* is your soul-goal, then *don't* follow the *neti-netis*. *Don't* try to negate yourself into nothingness. *Don't* do away with all desires, dreams, hopes, ambitions, and friends.
- 165 KATHERINE: Really?
- 166 CHRISTIANUS: *Really*. I mean, even if you

ample of the 'double denial' where --P and P are 'logically equivalent' (Hacking 1972, p. 126). Nor does Christianus seem to refer to the idea of 'the negation of the negation' that Zahner attributes to Hegel, and perhaps also to orthodox Christian and Sufi doctrine (Zahner 1971, p. 150).

But what does Christianus mean, then? It seems likely that the kind of negation that he has in mind is *not* actually limited to 'double'. For the twice occurring term 'neti' (in 'neti-neti') simply signifies the *general* idea behind the philosophy, namely to negate whenever and wherever necessary; consequently, the *neti-netis* negate just as many times as they see fit. Dasgupta describes, in a section called 'Unknowability of Brahman and the Negative Method', how some philosophers mentioned in the Upanishads were propounding the 'neg-

ative method' when trying to describe what Brahman (God) is, or, rather, is *not*: 'Yajñavalkya said "He the âtman is not this, nor this (*neti neti*)"' (Dasgupta 1997, p. 44). The idea behind this kind of thinking is that '[w]e cannot describe it [Brahman] by any positive content which is always limited by conceptual thought' (Dasgupta 1997, p. 45) — a stance that may lead some philosophers to recommend not just limitless negation, but absolute silence, as when Bâhva instructed Vashkali: 'I teach you indeed [with my own silence] but you do not understand; the Âtman is silence' (Dasgupta 1997, p. 45).

SURENDRANATH DASGUPTA (1997), *A History of Indian Philosophy*, vol. 1. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass. Originally published in 1922 by Cambridge University Press.

MICHAEL DUMMETT (1998), 'The Phi-

were Robinson Crusoe you would have a friend on a day like this. After first having experienced some unsatisfying nothingness.

167 KATHERINE: I thought you were saying that I should *avoid* making new acquaintances?

168 CHRISTIANUS: No. The idea is simply that you should select them very carefully. So that they *won't* interfere with your *real* desires, hopes, and ambitions. That's all.

169 KATHERINE: Oh!

170 CHRISTIANUS: So you can be free to set some *real* goals for yourself. *Personal* goals. *Higher* goals.

171 KATHERINE: *Higher* goals? Come on, Chris! I'm *hungry!*

losophy of Mathematics' in A. C. Grayling, ed., *Philosophy 2: Further Through the Subject*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 122–196.

IAN HACKING (1972), *A Concise Introduction to Logic*. New York: Random House.

R. C. ZAEHNER (1971), *Mysticism: Sacred and Profane*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

v:166, a day like this: After inspecting some archived weather reports and forecasts, one might argue that the London weather that day might *not* have been very much like the weather on one of the Caribbean islands on the day when

Robinson Crusoe met his new mate. For example, the Dawn weather forecast suggests, under the heading 'Today', that the London weather on 23 March 2007 (Rabi-ul-Awwal 3, 1428) is, or is likely to be, a day with showers, 76% humidity, a min temperature of 5 °C, and a max temperature of 11 °C (Dawn 2007); and the WeatherOnline UK graphs show, for London City, a pressure of 1016 hPa (or millibar), 78% relative humidity, and a max temperature of 8 °C (WeatherOnline UK 2007a, 2007b, 2007c).

Thus, since the London weather may not have been very Caribbean, it is not impossible that Christianus here is *not* trying to refer to the *weather* when

- 172 CHRISTIANUS: Sure, but where to sit?
- 173 KATHERINE: What should we do, then?
- 174 CHRISTIANUS: Move on?
- 175 KATHERINE: You mean to another *café*?
- 176 CHRISTIANUS: Yes.
- 177 KATHERINE: No, I *really* looked forward coming here.
- 178 CHRISTIANUS: But you *are* here!
- 179 KATHERINE: Sure. But I haven't tried their famous coffee yet. Or the scones. Or even the *chairs*!
- 180 CHRISTIANUS: Hmm. So you'd like to *stay*?
- 181 KATHERINE: Yes.

he says 'a day like this'. Perhaps he instead uses that phrase simply to point to the current day of the week? If that is, or was, the idea, then we might conclude that it certainly worked very well, especially since he uttered it on a *Friday*. But is this possibility — that his comment *only* would have worked on a Friday — a reason to think that this interpretation is wrong? In other words, is the existence of this once-a-week condition somehow *decreasing* the probability that the day-of-the-week interpretation is nicely in line with Christianus's (original or revised) intention(s)?

DAWN (2007), 'Weather; March 23, 2007'. Retrieved from the Dawn web-

site [archives.dawn.com/2007/03/23/weather.htm] on 3 April 2012.

WEATHERONLINE UK (2007a), 'London City (AP): Max temperature °C Mar 03 2007 – Mar 31 2007'. Retrieved from the WeatherOnline UK website [weatheronline.co.uk] on 3 April 2012.

WEATHERONLINE UK (2007b), 'London City (AP): Pressure hPa Mar 03 2007 – Mar 31 2007'. Retrieved from the WeatherOnline UK website [weatheronline.co.uk] on 3 April 2012.

WEATHERONLINE UK (2007c), 'London City (AP): Relative humidity % Mar 03 2007 – Mar 31 2007'. Retrieved from the WeatherOnline UK website [weatheronline.co.uk] on 3 April 2012.

SCENE VI.

The Owen Problem

- 1 CHRISTIANUS: Any ideas?
- 2 KATHERINE: Why don't we return to the *mural*?
- 3 CHRISTIANUS: Literally?
- 4 KATHERINE: We don't have to *move*, if that's what you are afraid of. I'd just like to hear more about that mural. It's so *romantic*!
- 5 CHRISTIANUS: The *mural*? I am not sure *what* to say. Especially if you are looking for something *romantic*.
- 6 KATHERINE: But didn't you say that Owen *didn't* have any artistic sensibilities? Or something like that?
- 7 CHRISTIANUS: Yes.
- 8 KATHERINE: But then you also said that he *made* the mural?
- 9 CHRISTIANUS: Right.

vi:17, *Vaishya*: When Christianus here is talking about some facets of a 'caste' system, he is most probably *not* referring to the *jati* ('birth') system in modern India (cf. Wolpert 1993, p. 41). It is more probable that he refers to the ancient Vedic *varna* ('colour') system, with its *brāhmanas*, *ksatriyas*, *vaishyas*, and *shudras*, and to the idea that one's 'caste' is

determined by what kind of (daily) activities one *actually* is engaged in, regardless of which family one was born into.

The classical definition of the kind of activities that a *vaishya* might be engaged in can be found in Chapter 18, Text 45 of the *Bhagavad-gītā*: 'farming, cow protection and business are the natural work for the vaishyas' [Skt. kri-

- 10 KATHERINE: How could that *be*?
- 11 CHRISTIANUS: What is your question, exactly?
- 12 KATHERINE: How in the whole world could something so *absolutely beautiful* be made by someone who has no artistic sensibilities *whatsoever*? If that's what you are saying?
- 13 CHRISTIANUS: Listen, Katherine: Owen is an almost pure *vaishya*.
- 14 KATHERINE: A what?
- 15 CHRISTIANUS: A *vai-sh-ya*.
- 16 KATHERINE: Is he some Hindu *guru* or something? *A-a-a-o-o-o-u-u-u-m-m-m!*
- 17 CHRISTIANUS: Ha ha! Owen the Scot? No, no. *F-a-a-a-r* from it. *Vaishya* simply means businessman. That's all.
- 18 KATHERINE: So?
- 19 CHRISTIANUS: Well, a true businessman always ponders how he is going to get *the money*, right?
- 20 KATHERINE: Sure. I know people like that.

shi-go-rakshya-vâñijyam vaishya-karma svabhâva-jam] (Prabhupâda 1986, p. 828; cf. pp. 238–239). But we may note, as Christianus himself indicates later on, that a potential 'impurity' also may occur; so although one may associate 'vaishyas with mercantile activities . . . the match is imperfect' (Smaje 2000, p. 15).

A. C. BHAKTIVEDANTA SWAMI PRABHUPÂDA

(1986), *Bhagavad-gîtâ As It Is*. Mumbai: Bhaktivedanta Book Trust.

CHRIS SMAJE (2000), *Natural Hierarchies: The Historical Sociology of Race and Caste*. Malden, MA and Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

STANLEY WOLPERT (1993), *A New History of India*. Fourth edition. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.

21 CHRISTIANUS: And a *good* businessman is one
who actually *ends up with* a fair amount
of money. Otherwise, he is not very
good, is he?

22 KATHERINE: No, he isn't. Or *she!*

23 CHRISTIANUS: Right. So by learning from
other *businesspersons* who already have
made it, one can learn to be a *good* one.

24 KATHERINE: Presumably. But one can, of
course, also have a lot of *natural* talent?
Right?

25 CHRISTIANUS: Absolutely. Some just have it in
their blood, while others may have to be
taught. And some end up as *college pro-*
fessors.

26 KATHERINE: You mean those who can't,
teach?

27 CHRISTIANUS: Not exactly. It's not just about
who can and cannot *do business*; it's also
about who can and cannot *teach*. And
there are other questions as well.

28 KATHERINE: Where are you going with this?

29 CHRISTIANUS: Well, I wish I could say that we
now would be going to our own *table*
with this information. But I can't see a
single free one yet. *Can you?*

30 KATHERINE: No. It looks like we're stuck here.
No-one is moving.

31 CHRISTIANUS: At least not to the extent that
they are *leaving* their tables.

32 KATHERINE: Right. But what about Owen?

33 CHRISTIANUS: Owen? He's not here today. It's
Venus-day. Remember?

34 KATHERINE: Yes, but . . .

35 CHRISTIANUS: And even if he *were* here, he
would not help us.

36 KATHERINE: Why not? Is he a *monster*?

37 CHRISTIANUS: Well, he *does* have some *mean*
cookies.

38 KATHERINE: But a *monster*?

39 CHRISTIANUS: No, that's probably an exagger-
ation. But I still think that it would be
fair to say that some of his facial features
would not be left untouched by a truly
caring dermatologist or plastic surgeon.

40 KATHERINE: But surely he is no *Elephant Man*,
is he?

41 CHRISTIANUS: Not exactly. But his *business*
ethics is quite a monstrosity to behold.

42 KATHERINE: His *business ethics*?

43 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. It goes something like this:
'No customer is special. Treat all cus-
tomers nicely, without favouring any of
them. And get their money as fast as you
can. Cash is King Kong!'

- 44 KATHERINE: Hmm. Talk about *monstrosity!*
- 45 CHRISTIANUS: *Absolutely!* So even if he *were* here,
we *still* would have to wait for a table.
- 46 KATHERINE: OK, but there's one thing I don't
understand.
- 47 CHRISTIANUS: What's that?
- 48 KATHERINE: What has *Owen* to do with *college*
professors?
- 49 CHRISTIANUS: Not much, I'm afraid.
- 50 KATHERINE: Then why mention it?
- 51 CHRISTIANUS: It's just that I meant something
very particular when I said that Owen is
an almost pure *vaishya*.
- 52 KATHERINE: What?
- 53 CHRISTIANUS: Well, Owen is not a *theory* person.
- 54 KATHERINE: You mean he doesn't like to spec-
ulate, like college professors love to do?
- 55 CHRISTIANUS: Correct. But he also doesn't like
listening to *other people's* speculations.
- 56 KATHERINE: I see. So that means he's not in-
terested in being or becoming a stock
broker or commodities broker either?
Even though he is — what did you call
it? — a *vahyischia*?
- 57 CHRISTIANUS: *Vai-sh-ya*.
- 58 KATHERINE: *Vai-sh-ya?*

59 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. Good. Actually, I think he
once had an internship at one of the big
banks, *years* ago. But it didn't work out.

60 KATHERINE: What happened?

61 CHRISTIANUS: They didn't like him.

62 KATHERINE: Why not?

63 CHRISTIANUS: Because he wasn't very produc-
tive.

64 KATHERINE: What has *productivity* to do with it?

65 CHRISTIANUS: Everything. Especially in the
currency markets, where *he* was.

66 KATHERINE: How so?

67 CHRISTIANUS: If you don't *make* enough mon-
ey even to pay for *your own* wage, how
can they afford to keep you?

68 KATHERINE: But surely they didn't just lay him
off *immediately*? I mean, wasn't it an *intern-*
ship? Some sort of *educational* program?

69 CHRISTIANUS: Well, they have *their* business
ethics. *And* philosophy of education.

70 KATHERINE: Which is?

71 CHRISTIANUS: I think their motto was 'No
compassion, just business'. Or was it
'Make money, not friends'? I don't re-
member; I always mix them up. But you
get the idea.

72 KATHERINE: Definitely.

- 73 CHRISTIANUS: But the 'productivity' thing was
only a *part* of 'The Owen Problem'.
- 74 KATHERINE: There's more?
- 75 CHRISTIANUS: You bet.
- 76 KATHERINE: I'm listening.
- 77 CHRISTIANUS: Well, one problem was Owen's
attitude.
- 78 KATHERINE: Attitude?
- 79 CHRISTIANUS: Well, he's not the smoothest
guy out there.
- 80 KATHERINE: OK. But who wants a *wimp*, any-
way?
- 81 CHRISTIANUS: Right. But Owen almost always
says *exactly* what he thinks. On the spot.
And he doesn't take shit from *anyone*.
- 82 KATHERINE: Uh-oh.
- 83 CHRISTIANUS: And he's also not one of those
typical *college brats* you might find at the
big commercial banks. Which is why he
didn't want to hang out with them.
- 84 KATHERINE: You mean he doesn't come from
a wealthy family?
- 85 CHRISTIANUS: No, that's not the problem. Or
at least not the fact.
- 86 KATHERINE: So he *does* come from a good
family?
- 87 CHRISTIANUS: If 'good' is to be understood as

‘rich’, then you’re right on the money.
But he’s *still* not one of those typical college brats.

88 KATHERINE: Are you trying to say that he never joined that whole Greek fraternity thing?

89 CHRISTIANUS: Something like that.

90 KATHERINE: *Is it* that, or is it just something *like* that?

91 CHRISTIANUS: He didn’t want to be *ruled* by his father. So he didn’t go to *any* university. Not even to the University of London.

92 KATHERINE: Really?

93 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. But that’s not all.

94 KATHERINE: There’s more?

95 CHRISTIANUS: Absolutely.

96 KATHERINE: Yes?

97 CHRISTIANUS: He also refused to follow his father’s *other* recommendation.

98 KATHERINE: What was *that*?

99 CHRISTIANUS: To join his family’s ancient secret society.

100 KATHERINE: Which is?

101 CHRISTIANUS: So secret you’ve never even heard of it.

102 KATHERINE: I see. Is it in London?

103 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. But some rites are in Scot-
land.

104 KATHERINE: Creepy!

105 CHRISTIANUS: Definitely. Not to speak of all
those *sea monsters!*

106 KATHERINE: Yes. And I definitely *don't* like
their dialect either. It's *s-o-o-o* ugly!

107 CHRISTIANUS: I actually haven't come across any
reports about Nessie, or any of her friends,
speaking. Where did you hear *that?*

108 KATHERINE: Don't play dumb. It doesn't work.

109 CHRISTIANUS: All right. And what shall we say
about their kilts?

110 KATHERINE: Ohhh-Myyyyy-Goddddd! *Hide-
ous!*

111 CHRISTIANUS: And their bagpipes?

112 KATHERINE: Even *worse!*

113 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. It's obviously some sort
of demonic race, or something. I mean,
who could *stand* all those diabolic sounds
and visions all day long without thinking
one were *in hell?*

114 KATHERINE: *Absolutely!* And we haven't even
touched upon *their weather* yet!

115 CHRISTIANUS: *Excellent* point!

116 KATHERINE: But tell me one thing, Chris.

117 CHRISTIANUS: What?

118 KATHERINE: If Owen is so ‘unqualified’ or
‘unsuitable’ as you seem to suggest, how
could he end up with that *internship* in
the first place?

119 CHRISTIANUS: His dad is, or at least was, on
the bank’s board of trustees. So he fixed
him in, somehow or other. To keep an
eye on him. And also, of course, to try to
mould him into something ‘usable’.

120 KATHERINE: Oh, I see. Hmm. Difficult situ-
ation.

121 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. But Owen, of course, wasn’t
— and still isn’t — overwhelmingly mal-
leable.

122 KATHERINE: Right.

SCENE VII.

Just Follow the Money

1 KATHERINE: So what now?

2 CHRISTIANUS: Now we'll just follow the money.

3 KATHERINE: How do you mean?

4 CHRISTIANUS: Well, wouldn't you agree that a
person's consciousness may give us some
information about the kind of actions he
may perform?

5 KATHERINE: I am not sure. I haven't heard
your whole story.

6 CHRISTIANUS: Right. Well, as *I* see it, one's
'caste' is, in many ways, *created*, from
one's consciousness.

7 KATHERINE: How so?

8 CHRISTIANUS: Well, one could think of it as a
product of one's emotions and beliefs. So
if you are 'internally convinced' that you
are afraid of spiders, how will you ever
be able to accept that new position at the
local zoo, requiring an endless amount of
TLC for their new, horrendously hairy
poecilotheria subfusca tarantula?

9 KATHERINE: Hmmm. I *hate* spiders.

10 CHRISTIANUS: So if you *know* a person's

consciousness, then you can guess his 'caste'.

11 KATHERINE: I can guess his 'caste' *anyway*. Why do I need to know his *consciousness* for that?

12 CHRISTIANUS: Well, I should have said, 'guess it, and *be right*'.

13 KATHERINE: Oh, I see. That's better.

14 CHRISTIANUS: And even if you cannot figure out *everything* about his casting potential, you may still get *some* insight into his approximate 'range of action'.

15 KATHERINE: You mean like, for example, if we know that a man is a *real* soldier at heart, it *wouldn't* be very far-fetched to predict that he might protect his own people in times of trouble, even *without* payment?

16 CHRISTIANUS: Yes, something like that. Assuming, of course, that the *kshatriya* in question has very little *vaishya* tendencies, and also is endowed with a substantial amount of physical and mental strength, thus being fully committed to the idea of protecting the citizens in times of trouble, *without* worrying about any monetary compensation or even his own, personal safety. But how many soldiers are of *that* calibre today?

17 KATHERINE: Right. I see what you mean.
Ksha-tri-ya?

18 CHRISTIANUS: Yes.

19 KATHERINE: So since Owen seemingly is more
or less a pure businessman at heart, as
you have said, we should simply follow
the money? Is that your idea?

20 CHRISTIANUS: Yes.

21 KATHERINE: So how do we do that, exactly?

22 CHRISTIANUS: Well, Owen knows that the
amount of money he is going to get is
more or less dependent on the number
of paying customers. No customers, no
money.

23 KATHERINE: Sure. As in so many other busi-
nesses.

24 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. So to get as many custom-
ers as possible, he would need some great
coffee and some nice home-made sand-
wiches, buns, cookies, and so on.

25 KATHERINE: Why *home-made* cookies? And
great coffee? I mean, wouldn't he be mak-
ing *more* money if he just *skipped* that,
and lowered the quality?

26 CHRISTIANUS: Maybe. Which is why I called
him only *almost* pure. So even though he
certainly *does* think about money all the
time, he *also* thinks about his customers.

27 KATHERINE: Really?

28 CHRISTIANUS: Yes, believe it or not. And even if everything he is offering may not be *super-duper* high-quality stuff in terms of nutritional value and taste, it's still home-made, fresh and good enough to satisfy *most* people.

29 KATHERINE: So he wants his customers to be happy?

30 CHRISTIANUS: Yes, he likes that. When *they* are happy, he feels he is not cheating them.

31 KATHERINE: Oh, so he is *not* cheating them?

32 CHRISTIANUS: I didn't say that. It's just that happy customers, whether they are cheated or not, are returning customers.

33 KATHERINE: I see.

34 CHRISTIANUS: So it's about a positive experience both for *him* and for *the customers*. And it is not just about *taste* either. He feels a responsibility to only use organic, non-GMO grains and coffee. That way he knows that even if some of his customers suddenly die, get sick, become sterile, or evolutionize themselves into human-size flies or lizards, it's most probably *not* because of *his* products or services.

35 KATHERINE: I see. Guilt free.

36 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. And with a price tag that

many customers still can afford.

37 KATHERINE: Or at least are willing to *pay*.

38 CHRISTIANUS: Right. Also, of course, Owen recognizes the need for an attractive *environment*. He knows that customers are looking for nice, 'homey' places.

39 KATHERINE: Where they can have *really* relaxing experiences.

40 CHRISTIANUS: Ha ha, right. And he also knows that colours, textures, and materials *really* matter.

41 KATHERINE: As does music. And art.

42 CHRISTIANUS: Certainly. But here's the problem: Since his aesthetic abilities and aspirations were, and still are, practically non-existent, he wasn't sure *which* colours, textures and materials to choose. Or what kind of art and music to select.

43 KATHERINE: So what did he *do*? Arrange a *poll*?

44 CHRISTIANUS: Why would he?

45 KATHERINE: To get some *answers*.

46 CHRISTIANUS: Answers? He is not interested

vii:34, human-size flies: See, for example, the film *The Fly* (1986), where Seth Brundle the typical mad scientist, expertly played by Jeff Goldblum, develops into a human-size fly after a lab experiment on himself develops

in a very strange and unsatisfying direction.

THE FLY (1986), starring Jeff Goldblum, Geena Davis, John Getz. David Cronenberg (director, screenplay), George Langelaan (writer), Charles Ed-

in any *answers*. He's neither a Gallup guy nor — as I've already pointed out — a college professor. He in it for *the money*. Remember?

47 KATHERINE: Yes.

48 CHRISTIANUS: So he simply hired some artists, musicians, and interior designers. To produce *results*, not answers.

49 KATHERINE: So some *artist* painted that mural?

50 CHRISTIANUS: Yes.

51 KATHERINE: But you *did* say that *Owen* made the mural!

52 CHRISTIANUS: Certainly.

53 KATHERINE: But he *didn't* make it. Whoever *painted* it, did. Why are you so *stubborn*?

54 CHRISTIANUS: Because I am trying to make a point.

55 KATHERINE: *What* point?

56 CHRISTIANUS: Well, you're right that whoever painted the mural made it.

57 KATHERINE: *Obviously!*

58 CHRISTIANUS: But Owen *also* did.

ward Pogue (screenplay), Stuart Cornfeld (producer). A production by Twentieth Century Fox and Brookfilms. Released on DVD in 2005 (in Europe) by Twentieth Century Fox.

vii:48, *results, not answers*: This apparently means that Christianus is of the opinion that *answers* may not satisfy all people equally well. Christianus may also mean that *answers* are, taxonomically speaking, different, or even *radically*

- 59 KATHERINE: But you said he didn't paint *at all!*
- 60 CHRISTIANUS: True.
- 61 KATHERINE: So how can he have made it?
- 62 CHRISTIANUS: He *paid* for it.
- 63 KATHERINE: *Paid* for it?
- 64 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. If you can only *pay* for it, what's the difficulty getting it done? We are not talking about putting a man on the moon here.
- 65 KATHERINE: Hmmm.
- 66 CHRISTIANUS: And even if it's a *really* difficult project, like one of those multi-million-man-hour moon-landing-missions in the Apollo programme, it *might* still be realizable if you only have the money, the drive, and, of course, a sufficiently advanced technology.
- 67 KATHERINE: Sure. And Kennedy and Nixon

different, from *results*, and that this has something to do with *varnas*, *ashramas*, and social role-play.

vii:64, getting it done: The point being made here seems to be that if a person has enough money, he can rather easily get things accomplished, especially when it comes to 'earthly' projects. So here Christianus seems to take a very *obvious* stance, agreeing with Randall Collins's initial observation in the section called 'Three Strate-

gies: Money, Force, and Solidarity' (in Chapter 3, 'Paradoxes of Power') of his introduction to non-obvious sociology that '[t]he most obvious way to get other people to do something is to pay them to do it' (Collins 1982, p. 63). However, we can also rather easily imagine that Christianus, just like Collins, has more observations to make in this regard, and that his arsenal of arguments and viewpoints is far from being exhausted.

RANDALL COLLINS (1982), *Sociological*

had all that.

68 CHRISTIANUS: Maybe.

69 KATHERINE: *Maybe?*

70 CHRISTIANUS: Yes, maybe. But just imagine if NASA would have refused to pay the thousands of employees their salaries, or their contractors, or had not *had* a sufficiently advanced technology at the time: how many men would *then* have walked the moon that summer night in 1969?

71 KATHERINE: None?

72 CHRISTIANUS: Precisely. So money is, in some sense, and in some cases, a causal factor.

73 KATHERINE: Is anyone *denying* it?

74 CHRISTIANUS: I'm not sure. But Aristotle, for instance, didn't list it.

75 KATHERINE: Is that a problem?

76 CHRISTIANUS: Not for *me*.

Insight: An Introduction to Nonobvious Sociology. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.

vii:66, multi-million-man-hour: Note that Christianus here is using 'man hour' as opposed to, for example, 'man month'. It is possible that this has something to do with the experiences reported in Frederick P. Brooks's *The Mythical Man Month* (Brooks 1995).

FREDERICK P. BROOKS, JR. (1995), *The Mythical Man-Month: Essays On Soft-*

ware Engineering. Anniversary edition with four new chapters. Boston: Addison-Wesley.

vii:70, NASA . . . employees: In the mid-1960s NASA's payroll averaged 36,000 people — and 'for every NASA staffer, there would be ten personnel in the private sector' (Bizony 2006, p. 79). The average yearly expenditure for the Apollo program was \$4,000,000,000 (Nye 1997, p. 151).

PIERS BIZONY (2006), *The Man Who*

- 77 KATHERINE: So why did you bring it up?
- 78 CHRISTIANUS: Well, it's always interesting to notice what people *don't* say.
- 79 KATHERINE: Chris?
- 80 CHRISTIANUS: Yes?
- 81 KATHERINE: I don't feel very well.
- 82 CHRISTIANUS: Should I get you some water?
- 83 KATHERINE: Thanks, but I'll be fine. I'm just so exhausted. It just came over me. I sometimes get these attacks.
- 84 CHRISTIANUS: Or should I call a cab?
- 85 KATHERINE: No, no. Don't be stupid. *Absolutely* not. It's just so *god-damn irritating* that we not even have a *table* yet. And no coffee. And nothing to eat. *Jesus, have mercy!*
- 86 CHRISTIANUS: With your sincere prayers, I am sure something will manifest quite soon.
- 87 KATHERINE: Chris, if you only would have come *earlier!* They had *lots* of free tables at ten o'clock.
- 88 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. I am very sorry about that.

Ran The Moon: James Webb, JFK, and the Secret History of Project Apollo. Cambridge: Icon Books.

DAVID E. NYE (1997), 'Don't Fly Me to the Moon: The Public and the Apollo Space Program' in *Narratives and Spaces: Technology and the Construction of*

American Culture. Exeter: University of Exeter Press, pp. 147–160.

vi:70, summer night in 1969: The transmission of Armstrong's 'That's one small step for man, one giant leap for mankind' (Ryan 1969, p. 120)

But it's actually quite strange: I mean, it is never *ever* this busy here at this time of day. Even on a Friday.

89 KATHERINE: Unless it's one of those *Cookie Monster Treat* days, of course.

90 CHRISTIANUS: Right. I just didn't *know*.

91 KATHERINE: And where *are* all the waitresses? Or what do you call them around here?

92 CHRISTIANUS: I'm not sure.

93 KATHERINE: You're not sure where they *are*? Or what *to call them*?

94 CHRISTIANUS: Normally, there are two cute little waitresses running around here, with their stylish mini-skirts and long, well-waxed legs.

95 KATHERINE: Doesn't sound very *Victorian*.

96 CHRISTIANUS: I agree. But they *are* sexy.

97 KATHERINE: Hmmm.

98 CHRISTIANUS: And very professional.

99 KATHERINE: Prostitutes usually *are*!

100 CHRISTIANUS: But I haven't *seen* any of them.

— whether that message originally was transmitted from the surface of the moon or not — was received by the Washington audience at approximately 10:56 p.m. on 20 July 1969, and by the Londoners at approximately 3:56 a.m. on 21 July 1969 (Ryan 1969, p. 6).

PETER RYAN (1969), *The Invasion of the Moon: The Story of Apollo 11*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

vii:72, a causal factor: It seems rather safe to note that Christianus here is *not* saying that money is the *ultimate* causal factor,

- 101 KATHERINE: Maybe they are taking care of
some of their more *intimate* customers?
Or maybe their *pimp* has arrived, unex-
pectedly? Through the back door? And is
giving them a hard time?
- 102 CHRISTIANUS: Owen, you mean? Could be.
- 103 KATHERINE: Hmm.
- 104 CHRISTIANUS: You're OK?
- 105 KATHERINE: Not really. But I'll survive.
- 106 CHRISTIANUS: *Look!* See those two stools over
there, near the counter?
- 107 KATHERINE: Where the two old ladies sit?
- 108 CHRISTIANUS: Yes.
- 109 KATHERINE: What about them?
- 110 CHRISTIANUS: Wouldn't they be great?
- 111 KATHERINE: Do you want to chase away the
old ladies?
- 112 CHRISTIANUS: Not if I can avoid it.
- 113 KATHERINE: So?
- 114 CHRISTIANUS: Well, aren't they wrapping it
up? Or am I just hallucinating?
- 115 KATHERINE: Actually, I think you're *right!*
- 116 CHRISTIANUS: Should we?

or anything like that. For him, it seems, money (including, perhaps, also the *promise* of it) is just *one* of the possible causes.

v11:122, Harrod's: For those who have not yet experienced Harrod's in 'real life', Harrod's website [<http://www>.

117 KATHERINE: *Definitely!* Let's grab them before
someone else does!

118 CHRISTIANUS: But perhaps an *ordinary* table
would be better?

119 KATHERINE: No, no. The counter is perfect.
Fiffs! Go!

120 CHRISTIANUS: I am sorry to intrude, ladies,
but are you two perhaps preparing to
leave?

121 SELMA: Yes.

122 THELMA: *Definitely.* We can't sit here *all day.*
We have *lots* of very important things to
do. Harrod's is having a *sale!*

123 KATHERINE: A sale?

124 SELMA: Yes.

125 THELMA: With *lots* of savings! So we *have* to
rush. But do try their home-made cook-
ies. They are *very* delicious!

126 CHRISTIANUS: And the coffee?

127 SELMA: Good.

128 THELMA: Not *good*, Selma! *Excellent!* So you
youngsters have something *really* nice to
look forward to!

129 CHRISTIANUS: Great!

harrods.com] currently (Tuesday,
3 April 2012) offers 'Harrods 360'
— a 360° virtual tour of its London

store. Note especially the Egyptian es-
calator.

130 KATHERINE: Thank you!

131 SELMA: Good-bye!

132 THELMA: Bye-bye! It was nice talking to you.

133 CHRISTIANUS: Likewise. Bye.

134 KATHERINE: Bye.

SCENE VIII.

Katherine Has a Heart

1 KATHERINE: So what are you having?

2 CHRISTIANUS: I'll probably have their special
coffee blend.

3 KATHERINE: And?

4 CHRISTIANUS: Maybe two of their home-made
scones, as usual. With marmalade and
cheese. And what about you?

5 KATHERINE: Scones sound yummy. And some
of that special coffee blend you always
talk about.

6 CHRISTIANUS: Good. Wendy will appreciate it.

7 KATHERINE: Wendy?

8 CHRISTIANUS: The waitress.

9 KATHERINE: Old friend?

10 CHRISTIANUS: In a way.

11 KATHERINE: And?

12 CHRISTIANUS: Well, she is a really nice person.

13 KATHERINE: But?

14 CHRISTIANUS: But she sometimes mixes up or-
ders. So it's good that we order the same
thing. It will be easier for her.

15 KATHERINE: Right.

- 16 CHRISTIANUS: Here she comes.
- 17 KATHERINE: At last.
- 18 WENDY: Hi Chris! How are you?
- 19 CHRISTIANUS: Hi Wendy. I am good. And this
is my American friend Katherine.
- 20 WENDY: Hi Katherine! First time in London?
- 21 KATHERINE: No, but first time *here*, in this
café.
- 22 WENDY: Aha! A *virgin* visit!
- 23 KATHERINE: I guess you could call it that. And
I must tell you — I really *love* the atmos-
phere!
- 24 WENDY: Yes, it has a certain ambience, doesn't
it? At least when you *don't* have to *work*
here. (Sigh. . .) So what are you two hav-
ing?
- 25 CHRISTIANUS: I'll have your Creative Kiliman-
jaro, as usual. With cream, of course.
- 26 WENDY: Of course.
- 27 CHRISTIANUS: And then — u-u-u-h-h — two
scones, with butter, cheese and marmalade.
- 28 WENDY: Very well. And for you, miss? Or is it
Mrs?
- 29 KATHERINE: No, it's *miss*. And I'll have the
same.
- 30 WENDY: Great. Thank you. Oh! And please

be patient. I am alone now.

31 CHRISTIANUS: Alone?

32 WENDY: Yes. Shelly fell in the staircase, just
after we opened. On her way down to
the kitchen.

33 CHRISTIANUS: You're kidding?

34 WENDY: No. And we had to take care of her,
and get her to the hospital.

35 CHRISTIANUS: Goodness!

36 KATHERINE: Is she all right?

37 WENDY: I don't know. Last I saw her, she was
unconscious.

38 CHRISTIANUS: Is that the new one, who started
last week?

39 WENDY: Yes. She's nice. But just a little too
passionate. So have a little patience, OK?

40 CHRISTIANUS: Sure.

41 KATHERINE: What a *ghastly* story!

42 CHRISTIANUS: Absolutely. Especially if it's *true*.

43 KATHERINE: You mean she is *lying*?

44 CHRISTIANUS: I mean Wendy is Wendy. Any-
how, let's talk about *you* now.

45 KATHERINE: Me?

46 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. What did you do yesterday?

47 KATHERINE: Nothing much. I was at the hotel.

- 48 CHRISTIANUS: Sounds relaxing.
- 49 KATHERINE: Yes, it was. I actually slept until
two.
- 50 CHRISTIANUS: Seriously?
- 51 KATHERINE: Yes. And I *never* do that. You
know *me*.
- 52 CHRISTIANUS: Sure. Always on the go.
- 53 KATHERINE: Usually, yes. But now I'm des-
perately seeking sanity. And some energy
just to stay awake.
- 54 CHRISTIANUS: I know, I know. Depressions
are like that.
- 55 KATHERINE: Actually, it was almost a miracle
that I managed to stay awake and check
in at the hotel after our pizza the other
night. All that philosophy made me su-
per-tired.
- 56 CHRISTIANUS: But that mercurian cab driver of
yours must have taken you quite quickly
to the hotel?
- 57 KATHERINE: Sure. But it was a rough ride.
It was just as if he thought the street
corners were made of cottage cheese or
something.
- 58 CHRISTIANUS: Yes, some coaches are operated
by people who have a *very* vivid imagina-
tion. And a unique driving style.
- 59 KATHERINE: A style seemingly incompatible

with any regulatory framework. At least
in *traffic* law.

60 CHRISTIANUS: Ha ha, right. But you made it to
your hotel without any major injuries?

61 KATHERINE: No *physical* ones, at least.

62 CHRISTIANUS: Hmmm. Good.

63 KATHERINE: Anyway, so then when I woke up
yesterday afternoon, I went down to the
restaurant for breakfast.

64 CHRISTIANUS: Did you get any?

65 KATHERINE: Yes. The waiter was very helpful,
even though I was so late.

66 CHRISTIANUS: Good.

67 KATHERINE: And then I went back to my
room to read a bit and to take it easy. No
phone calls, no internet. It almost felt
weird!

68 CHRISTIANUS: I bet! But you *really* needed it,
obviously.

69 KATHERINE: Yes.

70 CHRISTIANUS: So what were you reading?
Some interesting book on the philoso-
phy of law?

71 KATHERINE: No. They didn't have any legal
literature in my hotel room.

72 CHRISTIANUS: Really? How *inconsiderate* of
them!

- 73 KATHERINE: *Absolutely!* How *dare* they!
- 74 CHRISTIANUS: Ha ha! But maybe you brought some reading material with you from Florida, then? Or pick something up in one of the bookstores near your hotel?
- 75 KATHERINE: No bookstores yesterday. I had no energy. And I *definitely* didn't bring any books from home. I came here to *take it easy*, not to work *or* study.
- 76 CHRISTIANUS: Sure. I understand.
- 77 KATHERINE: And even if I *had* brought some of my books, they would all be gone by now anyway. I lost my luggage, remember?
- 78 CHRISTIANUS: *Right!* Your *luggage!* Has it materialized?
- 79 KATHERINE: No. And I haven't heard anything from the airline either.
- 80 CHRISTIANUS: Maybe *you* should call them, *yourself?*

viii:78, Your luggage! Katherine's luggage problem was first discussed at 1:34–42 in *KQQ* (Klintberg 2008a, pp. 4–6; ref. *supra*, note 'you're late' at 1:1).

viii:86, The Yellow Book: One of the publications that specialized in literature and art was the quarterly *The Yellow Book*, a rather thick (Beardsley 1894: 272 pp.) and short-lived (1894–1897, 13 vols.) periodical, published in London. One typical cover (vol. 3, October

1894), clearly showing Beardsley's over-rated cartoonish style, can be found in Briggs and Snowman (1996, p. 176); but since it is a black-and-white reproduction, it fails to show that typical yellow colour seen on its original covers (see, for example, Beardsley 1894). However, even if *The Yellow Book* and its Beardsleyan artwork was rather well received at the time, Gallatin and Wainwright think that Beardsley's best work was made from 1896 and onwards — '[t]he

- 81 KATHERINE: Yes, you're right. I *should*. But *first* I need to mobilize some more energy. After all, the whole point of me being here in London was that I wanted some *time off* from litigation and such things.
- 82 CHRISTIANUS: Yes, that's *perfectly* understandable. I mean, who *wouldn't* want to take time off from litigation and such things?
- 83 KATHERINE: Exactly. I need a few more lazy days, like yesterday, to recharge my soul-batteries.
- 84 CHRISTIANUS: So what *did* you read yesterday, then? The phone directory?
- 85 KATHERINE: No, I am not a numerologist. But I *did* find some *other* yellowish publications lying around.
- 86 CHRISTIANUS: Some old issues of the late Victorian *The Yellow Book*?
- 87 KATHERINE: No, just some new American magazines.

most resplendent period in the artist's life' — with, for instance, his drawings in *The Savoy* (Gallatin and Wainwright 1952, p. 2). For yet another (unimpressive) example of Beardsley's artwork, see the reproduction in Spalding of *Arthur Glimpsing the Questing Beast* (Spalding 1978, pp. 76–77).

[AUBREY BEARDSLEY, ED.] (1894), *The Yellow Book: An Illustrated Quarterly*, vol. 1, April. London: Elkin Mathews & John Lane and Boston: Copeland & Day.

ASA BRIGGS AND DANIEL SNOWMAN (1996), *Fins de Siècle: How Centuries End, 1400–2000*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

A. E. GALLATIN AND ALEXANDER WAINWRIGHT (1952), *The Gallatin Beardsley Collection in the Princeton University Library*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Library.

FRANCES SPALDING (1978), *Magnificent Dreams: Burne-Jones and the Late Victorians*. Oxford: Phaidon.

88 CHRISTIANUS: *American* magazines in a *London* hotel?

89 KATHERINE: Well, my hotel is owned by some *international* corporation. Maybe that's why?

90 CHRISTIANUS: Could be. So what did they have? *Time*? *Newsweek*?

91 KATHERINE: No. Those are usually not very *yellow*, are they?

92 CHRISTIANUS: Not if they are *brand new*.

93 KATHERINE: But they *did* have some copies of one of the leading *geographic* magazines.

94 CHRISTIANUS: Oh, really? They had copies of *Globalist Geographic*? Or *United Nations Geographic*? Or maybe even of *One World Dictatorship Geographic*?

95 KATHERINE: No, Chris. Cool down. They only had *National Geographic*.

96 CHRISTIANUS: Oh, I see. Well, it's basically the same thing, anyway.

97 KATHERINE: And they actually had the *latest* issue. How about *that*?

98 CHRISTIANUS: Really? Then you are ahead of me, reading-wise. I haven't even opened my own copy yet.

99 KATHERINE: You *also* had your hands on it?

100 CHRISTIANUS: Not on *your* copy.

101 KATHERINE: Of course not. But I didn't know
you were reading *National Geographic*.
Any copy.

102 CHRISTIANUS: Actually, I am a subscriber.

103 KATHERINE: You *subscribe*?

104 CHRISTIANUS: Yes.

105 KATHERINE: You must be *really* interested in
geography!

106 CHRISTIANUS: No.

107 KATHERINE: Then why in *heaven's name* do
you subscribe?

108 CHRISTIANUS: Just to see what they are up to.

109 KATHERINE: Up to?

110 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. Politically.

111 KATHERINE: Politically? It's about *geography!*
And nature! And beautiful *photography!*

112 CHRISTIANUS: True. But there's also a politi-
cal propaganda message in it, as in most
professionally produced publications
and broadcasts. Do you think it's a pure
coincidence that it's published in Wash-
ington, D.C.?

113 KATHERINE: I don't know *what* to think. I
haven't looked into it. I just *read* it, now
and then.

114 CHRISTIANUS: Very well. The *latest* issue, you
said?

- 115 KATHERINE: Yes. March 2007.
- 116 CHRISTIANUS: Hmm. Yes. That's the one
with a bunch of elephants on the front
cover, right? And a Tiger on the back,
with a fancy watch?
- 117 KATHERINE: I don't remember any tiger, other
than the Vegas one. Or any watch.
- 118 CHRISTIANUS: Hmm. Maybe I am mixing it
up with some other issue? Or maybe we
just have different editions?
- 119 KATHERINE: Perhaps. But the *elephants* were
there, for sure. Standing in the river.
- 120 CHRISTIANUS: Right. And the picture is quite
dark, overall.
- 121 KATHERINE: Exactly. It's either dusk or dawn.
- 122 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. Or underexposed.
- 123 KATHERINE: Sure. But some of the elephants
are *very* bright. So he must have used a
flash or some other extra light.
- 124 CHRISTIANUS: Yes, I remember that. The pic-
ture simply looks a little faked.
- 125 KATHERINE: You're right. It does.
- 126 CHRISTIANUS: In fact, it reminds me of some
of the more funny-looking shots of the
alleged Apollo moon landings.
- 127 KATHERINE: Alleged?
- 128 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. But that is, of course, a

quite complex matter, which we can cover some other time. In any case, as far as the elephants-in-the-river photograph is concerned, we seem to be talking about the same picture, and the same issue.

129 KATHERINE: Perhaps.

130 CHRISTIANUS: So what was the angle?

131 KATHERINE: I am not sure how to describe it. Some elephants are in profile, while others are looking right into the camera.

132 CHRISTIANUS: Sure. But I meant, what's the angle of *the story* that comes *with* that photograph?

133 KATHERINE: Ah, *the story!*

134 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. What was its *focus*? Its *objective*?

135 KATHERINE: I think the idea was that ivory poachers are evil.

136 CHRISTIANUS: What else?

137 KATHERINE: What do you mean? Isn't that *enough*?

138 CHRISTIANUS: What I am looking for is not some *intermediary* premise or idea, but the *final* conclusion or call for action, as stated in the article. What was it? I bet it's *not* that ivory poachers are evil.

139 KATHERINE: Well, I think the conclusion, if you can call it that, was that the project

needs its readers' monetary support in order to succeed. So we can save the elephants. Together.

140 CHRISTIANUS: Just what I thought. It's the same old story. How stupid do they think we are? Save the elephants, save the whales, save the atmosphere from carbon dioxide, save the planet! And, not to forget, save us from *cancer!* Just give us *all* your money! Ha ha!

141 KATHERINE: Chris, you don't *understand*. There really *are* ivory wars down there in Africa. And the article writer — who is a bona fide conservationist, by the way — *really* tries to understand the situation. To track the elephants, he has even equipped them with radio-transmitting collars. And he has learned a *lot* from that. So he actually *is* trying to save the elephants. Don't you *get it?*

VIII:139, the conclusion: Katherine's statement about the conclusion seems to be right. But she did not mention that there are actually *two* articles: one longer article, which is probably the one that she refers to; and then also a shorter one, which mostly consists of photographs and captions. The longer article not only states that 'management must be extended throughout the entire range of the elephants' (Fay and Nichols 2007, p. 65), but also adds, as part of a special 'note to readers',

that '[i]nformation networks must be strengthened, and collaboration with Chad's military reinforced. In addition, an airplane is needed for daily surveillance. Turn to page 154 to find out how you can help' (Fay and Nichols 2007, p. 65). And the second article, despite its very limited amount of text, still has room to say, in its final caption: 'Zakouma's future as a wildlife refuge depends on the continuing dedication of its guards—and support from the outside world' (Nichols 2007, p. 77).

142 CHRISTIANUS: *Sure* I get it. They are trying to
rip you off!

143 KATHERINE: But *I* have actually *read* the ar-
ticle, and you *haven't*. I have *seen* the
picture where the poachers had killed
the elephant, leaving him there on the
ground with only *half a face* left. That's
what *poachers* do. It's absolutely *horrible!*
Be *human*, Chris!

144 CHRISTIANUS: Be *human*? *I* am the vegetarian
here, not *you*. *I* am not killing or eating
anything that has, or has had, a head on
it, whether it's a fish, a chicken, or a cow.
You want to lecture *me* on love and com-
passion for animals? I don't even tread on
ants, if I can avoid it.

145 KATHERINE: Sorry. But you don't seem to un-
derstand the *issue*.

146 CHRISTIANUS: I think I *do*. But why don't you
tell me, anyway: what *is* the issue?

J. MICHAEL FAY AND MICHAEL NICHOLS
(2007), 'Ivory Wars: Last Stand in Zak-
ouma' in *National Geographic*, March
2007, pp. 34–65.

MICHAEL NICHOLS (2007), 'Zakouma:
Eye to Eye' in *National Geographic*,
March 2007, pp. 66–77.

VIII:141, track the elephants: Chris-
tianus did not comment specifically
on Katherine's deduction, where the
premise that the conservationist is
tracking the elephants with radio-

transmitting collars seemingly leads her
to conclude that this would be some
kind of proof that 'he actually *is* trying
to save the elephants'. But one could
very well imagine that Christianus
might say something like this: 'Any
object may be tracked for multiple rea-
sons. Maybe the conservationists have
pure hearts; but *who else* has access to
that tracking data? Maybe some well-
connected poachers are planning to use
that tracking data *against* the elephants,
to capture and kill them?'

- 147 KATHERINE: The issue is, *of course*, as I have
already said, that we have to save the el-
phants.
- 148 CHRISTIANUS: Why? Can't they save them-
selves?
- 149 KATHERINE: *Save themselves?*
- 150 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. Aren't they among the big-
gest and strongest mammals out there?
- 151 KATHERINE: Maybe.

VIII:154, amazingly fast runners: Elephants can run quite quickly when they really have to. Cynthia Moss talks about two types of running: 'floppy' running and 'panic' running. In the 'floppy' variant, 'the elephants put their heads down and let their ears and trunk hang loose so that they flap and wave about as they run', and also 'make the loud, pulsating play trumpet' (Moss 1989, p. 171; cf. Payne 1998, p. 96). This type of running seems to be slower and more relaxed and playful than the other type, which is faster and more 'serious'. For 'panic' running is 'quiet and fast and smooth' (Moss 1989, p. 171). When elephants sense danger, they can run 'fast and silently with no trumpets or screams', and some can do it at least 'for three quarters of a mile before slowing to a walk' (Moss 1989, p. 27). For a photograph of an elephant 'on the charge', see Meredith (2001; plate opposite p. 118); for a black-and-white version, see Douglas-Hamilton (1992; plate opposite p. 96).

IAIN AND ORIA DOUGLAS-HAMILTON (1992), *Battle for the Elephants*. Edited by Brian Jackman. London: Doubleday.

CYNTHIA MOSS (1989), *Elephant Memories: Thirteen Years in the Life of an Elephant Family*. Glasgow: Fontana/Collins.

MARTIN MEREDITH (2001), *Africa's Elephant: A Biography*. London: Hodder & Stoughton. Also published (2003) in America (with an updated 'Acknowledgments' section, but otherwise with identical contents and page numbering) as *Elephant Destiny: Biography of an Endangered Species in Africa*. New York: Public Affairs.

KATY PAYNE (1998), *Silent Thunder: The Hidden Voice of Elephants*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicholson.

VIII:156, elephants . . . in musth: Even though many people reject Charles Darwin's *evolutionary* theories, it is probably rather uncontroversial to claim that Darwin got it approximately right when he said, 'No animal in the world is so dangerous as an elephant in must[h]' (Darwin 1871, p. 240). This is because of a very heightened level of aggression in those (African) male elephants that periodically experience musth — a

- 152 CHRISTIANUS: And one of the most intelligent?
- 153 KATHERINE: Perhaps.
- 154 CHRISTIANUS: And amazingly fast runners?
- 155 KATHERINE: I don't know.
- 156 CHRISTIANUS: And, in spite of often being portrayed as cute and friendly, aren't elephants, especially when they are in musth, also potentially *very* dangerous, even to humans?

'state' which also can be identified by, for example, 'the continuous discharge of urine' (Moss 1989, p. 108; ref. *supra*, note 'amazingly fast runners' at VIII:154), 'the swelling of, and copious discharge from, the temporal glands' (Moss 1989, p. 108; for a colour photograph of '[s]wollen temporal glands oozing a thick substance', see DiSilvestro 1991, p. 102) and the 'green penis syndrome' (Moss 1989, pp. 104–108; Poole 1996, pp. 41–46).

But what about their *consciousness*? Are bull elephants in musth (mainly psychologically focused on *mating* during those days, weeks, or months that their 'state' lasts (Hollister-Smith 2008, p. 1830)? Or is musth *not* primarily about mating? Schmidt-Nielsen, for example, claims that '[a] male elephant in "musth" . . . is violent and uncontrollable, but he is *not* in rut (and, although some people think so, musth doesn't mean that he 'must' have a mate)' (Schmidt-Nielsen 1972, p. 86; my emphasis). However, Hollister-Smith thinks that '[t]he phenomenon of musth in male elephants involves increased sexual ac-

tivity' (Hollister-Smith 2008, p. 1829). And Ganswindt seems to favour the idea that musth has to do with 'the reproductive context of African elephants' and that musth males are moving long distances 'to locate and associate with oestrus females' (Ganswindt 2004, p. 4) — an idea that seems compatible with Joyce Poole's observations that male elephants in musth exhibited 'a positive association with female groups' and that they 'had higher levels of urinary testosterone and exhibited higher frequencies of aggression than did either sexually inactive or sexually active non-musth males' (Poole 1982, p. ii).

CHARLES DARWIN (1871), *The Descent of Man and Selection in Relation to Sex*, vol. II. With illustrations. London: John Murray.

ROGER L. DISILVESTRO (1991), *The African Elephant: Twilight in Eden*. A National Audubon Society Book. Executive editor: Christopher N. Palmer. Photographer: Page Chichester. With a Foreword by Richard E. Leakey and Joyce Poole, and a President's Statement by Peter A. A. Berle. New York:

- 157 KATHERINE: Dangerous?
- 158 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. Are they not willing to attack and kill people, and eat up all their crops, if they feel so inclined?
- 159 KATHERINE: Don't ask *me*. I have never been to Africa.

John Wiley & Sons.

ANDRÉ GANSWINDT (2004), *Endocrine, Physical and Behavioural Correlates of Musth in African Elephants* (*Loxodonta africana*). Göttingen: Cuvillier.

JULIE A. HOLLISTER-SMITH, SUSAN C. ALBERTS, AND L. E. L. RASMUSSEN (2008), 'Do Male African Elephants, *Loxodonta africana*, Signal Musth via Urine Dribbling?' in *Animal Behaviour*, vol. 76, pp. 1829–1841.

JOYCE HATHEWAY POOLE (1982), *Musth and Male-Male Competition in the African Elephant*. Dissertation submitted to the University of Cambridge for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. Sub-department of Animal Behaviour, Madingley, Cambridge. Retrieved from the Elephant Voices website [<http://www.elephant-voices.org>] on Tuesday, 3 April 2012.

JOYCE HATHEWAY POOLE (1996), *Coming of Age with Elephants*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

KNUT SCHMIDT-NIELSEN (1972), *How Animals Work*. Cambridge: At the University Press.

VIII:158, attack and kill people: Though (African) elephants often are portrayed as kind and calm animals by various organizations and media in Europe and the U.S., the reality is that they sometimes also are destructive, partly be-

cause their fondness of most crops that the Africans produce, and partly because of their huge appetite: each elephant requires 'on average some 330 pounds of food and 21 gallons of water every day' (Sugg and Kreuter 1994, p. 19). It is therefore not very surprising to find that a 1993 survey in Kenya revealed that 97 percent of the farmers in one region 'strongly dislike' elephants, presumably because 229 of the 231 farmers had lost, due to invading elephants, more than half of their crops that season (Sugg and Kreuter 1994, p. 20).

As for people getting killed by elephants, there are many reports every year. In Zimbabwe alone, between 1982 and 1989, at least 500 human beings were killed. Zimbabwean newspaper headlines such as these illustrate the extent of it: 'Elephant kills man; Elephant kills woman; Woman killed . . . by an elephant while working in a cotton field on Monday; Jumbos turn on humans as forests vanish; Wild animals "culling people" in Binga; 10 year old girl trampled to death by elephant; Plea to help children orphaned by wild animals; Killer Jumbo; Jumbos kill; Elephant kills' (Sugg and Kreuter 1994, p. 21).

That elephants very well may exhibit violent behaviour is also illustrated by Joyce Poole, who describes the situ-

160 CHRISTIANUS: In fact, weren't elephants also used in the Kurukshetra war between the Pândavas and the Kauravas? And in the battles of Alexander the Great and Hannibal? To *fight*?

161 KATHERINE: I don't know. I'm not a history buff.

ation in June of 1992: 'Elephants were on the rampage. They were eating their way through maize shambas, wheat fields, and forest plantations. They were knocking over papaya, coconut, and cashew trees. They were breaking fences, destroying dams, pulling up water pipes, pushing over grain stores and houses. They were preventing small children from going to school, and they were trampling people to death. The reports came in from Kwale, Taita-Taveta, Rombo, and Kimana, from Narok, Nyeri, Laikipia and Rumuruti; they came in from as close to home as Limuru and as far away as Nasolot, Maralel, and Marsabit' (Poole 1996, p. 241; ref. *supra*, note 'elephants . . . in musth' at VIII:156).

IKE SUGG AND URS KREUTER (1994), *Elephants and Ivory: Lessons from the Trade Ban*. IEA Studies on the Environment, no. 2. London: The IEA Environment Unit.

VIII:160, Kurukshetra: The great war described in the Mahâbhârata — the longest epic in human history with its 100,000 stanzas (Klostermaier 1989, pp. 76-77) — was fought between the Pândavas (Skt. 'the descendants of Pandu'; for a genealogical map of the Pandu lineage, see Narasimhan 1965, p. 218) and the Kauravas (Skt. 'the descendants

of Kuru'; for a genealogical map of the Kuru lineage, see Narasimhan 1965, p. 217) at the battlefield of Kurukshetra (Skt. 'the Kuru field'), also called Tâneshar (see al-Bîrûnî 2001, vol. 11, p. 147), a place of pilgrimage (Skt. 'dharmakshetra'; cf. *Bhagavad-gîtâ* Chapter 1, Text 1; Prabhupâda 1986, pp. 35-37; ref. *supra*, note 'Vaishya' at VI:17). Kurukshetra is located in Northern India near the ancient city of Hastinâpura (Skt. 'the city of the elephant'), approximately 154 kilometers (96 miles) north of Delhi, and approximately 327 kilometers (203 miles) west-northwest of the camp at Banbasa that the Prince of Wales broke up from in the afternoon of Sunday, 20 February 1876, just before he crossed the Sarda river into Nepalese territory for his two-week Terai tiger experience (cf. *supra*, note 'Monday' at III:105).

AL-BÎRÛNÎ (2001), *Alberuni's India: An account of the religion, philosophy, literature, geography, chronology, astronomy, customs, laws and astrology of India about AD 1030*. Edited with Notes and Indices by Edward C. Sachau. Volumes 1 and 11 (bound in one). New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal. Original edition (1910): 2 vols. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co.

KLAUS K. KLOSTERMAIER (1989), *A Survey of Hinduism*. Albany, NY: State Uni-

- 162 CHRISTIANUS: But of course, in some of those wars, they were using *Indian* elephants. But *you* are most probably talking about the *African* ones. Aren't you?
- 163 KATHERINE: Yes. They have the most ivory.
- 164 CHRISTIANUS: Not necessarily.

versity of New York Press.

CHAKRAVARTHI V. NARASIMHAN (1965), *The Mahābhārata: An English Version Based on Selected Verses*. New York and London: Columbia University Press.

VIII:160, Alexander the Great: Christianus's statement about the involvement of elephants in the battle(s) of Alexander the Great may be understood in many ways. One way would be to read that statement as a representation of the idea that there were elephants present in the battle(s), but that those elephants *not necessarily* were on Alexander's side. On such a reading the elephants could have been on Alexander's *enemy's* side, or on Alexander's *own* side, or on *both* sides — a very broad and uncontroversial reading. For it seems firmly established that Alexander on several occasions was involved in battles with *his enemy* using war elephants. For example, in the battle near the river Jhelum (Lat. Hydaspes), king Porus lined up a number of elephants, which in the estimation of some commentators were 'probably . . . 130 elephants' [apparently from Diodorus of Sicily's *Bibliotheca* 17.87.2] (Green 1970, p. 214), or somewhere around 85–200 elephants, based on the figures mentioned in Quintus Curtius Rufus's *Historiae Alexandri Magni* 8.13.6 (85

elephants) and Arrian's *Anabasis (History of Alexander)* 5.15.4 (200 elephants) (Heckel 2008, p. 161).

Another way to read that statement would be to regard it as a representation of the more controversial idea that the elephants *necessarily* were Alexander's. For in an article on elephants in the *Oxford Classical Dictionary* Howard Hayes Scullard states, in no uncertain terms, that 'Alexander himself did not try to use elephants for battle, but war elephants were exploited to the full by his successors, particularly the Seleucids and Ptolemies, in their mutual struggles' (Scullard 1970, p. 380). The idea that Alexander did not try to use elephants for battle may have come from Quintus Curtius Rufus, who claimed that Alexander, after the encounter with Porus, in a speech had said that he 'always so little esteemed them' and that he 'would never use them [in battle]' (Kistler 2007, p. 38).

But there is still a possibility that Alexander used elephants in battles, or at least planned to do so. For in the estimation of Michael Grant, Quintus Curtius Rufus 'indulges in many sensational distortions and inconsistencies' and 'included fictitious speeches' in his history of Alexander (Grant 1997, p. 103); thus, the idea that Alexander did not have any regard for war elephants may be wrong.

- 165 KATHERINE: Aren't the African elephants bigger in size compared to the Indian?
- 166 CHRISTIANUS: Not all of them.
- 167 KATHERINE: I am not talking about any *baby* elephants, Chris!
- 168 CHRISTIANUS: Neither am I.

If so, it would resonate well with Kistler's proposal that Alexander was planning to use elephants all along, acquiring them both before and after the Porus battle: he already had elephants in his army when marching toward India, since one fell victim to 'a large and clever hound for entertainment' (Kistler 2007, p. 38); when 'the troops left Babylon, he could include two dozen pachyderms in the column' (Kistler 2007, p. 38); when he learned that there were thirty elephants grazing every night in the city of Assacenia, 'he paid local "elephant hunters" to capture the creatures' (Kistler 2007, p. 38); when Omphis of Taxila surrendered to Alexander, Omphis 'donated eighty-six elephants to the growing Macedonian army' (Kistler 2007, p. 39); and after discovering fifteen abandoned elephants near the Indus, and hunting two of them off a cliff, the 'thirteen surviving beasts were incorporated into his [Alexander's] army' (O'Brien 1992, p. 154).

Furthermore, even if Quintus Curtius Rufus had relayed Alexander's speech *correctly*, this would not immediately disprove the thesis that Alexander liked the idea of war elephants, nor the thesis that he had used them, or had planned to use them, in combat. For he might have presented any derogatory statements regarding (the enemy's) war

elephants and their capability in an *insincere* mood, simply for political and military purposes (cf. Heckel 2008, pp. 120–125) — a move that perhaps was intended to motivate his men to keep on fighting under his direction, and to avoid any '[b]itter disillusion' (Hammond 1997, p. 168) that might lead to a mutiny. For against the backdrop of the Jhelum battle, where he and his men only 'narrowly' had defeated Porus's army and its 85–200 elephants (Kistler 2007, p. 40; but cf. Featherstone 1997, p. 183: 'Porus had little chance against Alexander'), how could Alexander otherwise convince his army to face the new threat of four *thousand* elephants that Xandrames reportedly would mobilize (Kistler 2007, p. 40)?

DONALD FEATHERSTONE (1997), *Warriors and Warfare in Ancient and Medieval Times*. London: Constable.

MICHAEL GRANT (1997), *Greek and Roman Historians: Information and Misinformation*. London and New York: Routledge.

PETER GREEN (1970), *Alexander the Great*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.

N. G. L. HAMMOND (1997), *The Genius of Alexander the Great*. Chapel Hill, NC: The University of North Carolina Press.

WALDEMAR HECKEL (2008), *The Conquests of Alexander the Great*. Cambridge:

- 169 KATHERINE: I don't get it.
- 170 CHRISTIANUS: There are at least *two* types of African elephants: the *bush* elephant and the *forest* elephant.
- 171 KATHERINE: And you are saying that one is

Cambridge University Press.

JOHN M. KISTLER (2007), *War Elephants*. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press.

JOHN MAXWELL O'BRIEN (1992), *Alexander the Great: The Invisible Enemy*. London and New York: Routledge.

HOWARD HAYES SCULLARD (1970), 'Elephants' in N. G. L. Hammond and H. H. Scullard, eds., *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*. Second edition. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, p. 380.

VIII:170, types of African elephants:

It may be significant that Christianus here uses the word 'types' instead of 'species' or 'subspecies' when he talks about the African bush elephant (*Loxodonta africana*) and the African forest elephant (*Loxodonta cyclotis*). For it is possible that he wants to avoid the word 'species', perhaps because he has studied the philosophy of biology and knows that there neither is (or was) any consensus in the academic community on the idea of what 'a species' amounts to, nor on how taxonomy and systematics should deal with that situation (cf. Ereshefsky 2008, Futuyma 1998, Caplan 1998, Sterelny 1998, Simon 1971, Cook 1991a, Cook 1991b).

This 'species non-consensus' is practically seen in the (promotional, often pseudo-scientific and evolutionary) material published by some of the international organizations and move-

ments that allegedly are dedicated to some variety of elephant 'conservation': some conclude that the bush elephant is a *species* under *Loxodonta*; others say that it is a *sub-species*. The third edition of Wilson & Reeder's *Mammal Species of the World* database at the Smithsonian Institution website lists *Loxodonta africana* and *Loxodonta cyclotis* as two separate species under the genus *Loxodonta* (Wilson & Reeder 2012). The IUCN Red List database of threatened species calls *Loxodonta cyclotis* and *Loxodonta africana* synonyms (without mentioning the word 'species'), but also notes that 'there may be at least two species of African elephants, namely the Savanna Elephant (*Loxodonta africana*) and the Forest Elephant (*Loxodonta cyclotis*)', while also mentioning a third possible species, 'the West African Elephant' (IUCN 2012). And the CITES Species database calls *Loxodonta cyclotis* and *Loxodonta africana* synonyms, just as the IUCN Red List database does (and also without mentioning the word 'species') (CITES 2012); but various CITES proposal documents call the bush elephant and the forest elephant 'sub-species' of the species *africana*, and thus, in effect, categorizing them as *Loxodonta africana africana* and *Loxodonta africana cyclotis* (CITES 1989, p. 1a; CITES 1999, p. 2). And even though one document says that the 'pygmy elephant (*L. a.*

smaller than the other?

172 CHRISTIANUS: Yes.

173 KATHERINE: And that the smaller of these is
even smaller than the Indian elephant?

174 CHRISTIANUS: That would be the idea.

pumilio) is generally not accepted as a valid subspecies' (CITES 1989, p. 1a), its mentioning in a document like this might function as a type of hedging, just in case its status, against all odds, would change in the future; for who can be considered a 'good (animal) ruler' or a 'good (animal) administrator' if one is not capable of (correctly) identifying and categorizing *all* the different types of animals that participate in the current (taxonomical) 'species' race?

For an introductory discussion on the different types of African elephants described in classical literature, see Scullard 1970 (ref. *supra*, note 'Alexander the Great' at VIII:160); for a short overview of some of the differences between *Loxodonta cyclotis* and *Loxodonta africana* in terms of their DNA characteristics and their possible 'evolution' or 'development', see Arnold (2006).

MICHAEL L. ARNOLD (2006), 'African Elephants' in *Evolution Through Genetic Exchange*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 159–160.

ARTHUR L. CAPLAN (1998), 'Have Species Become Déclassé?' in Michael Ruse, ed., *Philosophy of Biology*. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books, pp. 156–166.

CITES (1989), 'Proposal: Transfer of *Loxodonta africana* from Appendix II to Appendix I' in *Amendments to Appendices I and II of the Convention: Other Proposals*, pp. 1a–10a. Proposal 7.26

[CITES/89/43], submitted by Austria in preparation for CITES CoP7 — the Seventh Meeting of the Conference of the Parties, held in Lausanne, Switzerland, 9–20 October 1989. Document in PDF format retrieved from the CITES website [<http://www.cites.org>] on Tuesday, 3 April 2012.

CITES (1999), 'Proposal: Transfer of populations of *Loxodonta africana* currently listed in Appendix II to Appendix I' in *Consideration of Proposals for Amendment of Appendices I and II: Other Proposals*, pp. 1–37. Proposal II.24 (available/amended on 30 November 1999), submitted by Kenya and India in preparation for CITES CoP11 — the Eleventh Meeting of the Conference of the Parties, held in Gigiri, Kenya, 10–20 April 2000. Document in PDF format retrieved from the CITES website [<http://www.cites.org>] on Tuesday, 3 April 2012.

CITES (2012), '*Loxodonta africana*' in the CITES *Species* database. Database entry retrieved from the CITES website [<http://www.cites.org>] on Tuesday, 3 April 2012.

LAURENCE MARTIN COOK (1991a), 'Methods of Classification' in *Genetic and Ecological Diversity: The Sport of Nature*. London: Chapman and Hall, pp. 9–18.

LAURENCE MARTIN COOK (1991b), 'Definition of Species' in *Genetic and Ecological Diversity: The Sport of Nature*.

- 175 KATHERINE: Is the bush elephant the smaller one? I mean, 'forest' sounds much bigger, right?
- 176 CHRISTIANUS: It's true that *a* forest normally is bigger than *a* bush. But we don't have *that* type of topographical resemblance naming in this case.
- 177 KATHERINE: So the forest elephant is the smaller one? Is that what you're saying?
- 178 CHRISTIANUS: Yes.
- 179 KATHERINE: But then we could at least say that the *bush* elephants have more ivory than the Indian elephants?
- 180 CHRISTIANUS: Certainly. And that's not just because some of the bush elephants are bigger in size, and therefore, on average,

London: Chapman and Hall, pp. 36–38.

MARC ERESHEFSKY (2008), 'Systematics and Taxonomy' in Sahotra Sarkar and Anya Plutynski, eds., *A Companion to the Philosophy of Biology*. Malden, MA, Oxford, and Carlton, Victoria: Blackwell Publishing, pp. 99–118.

DOUGLAS J. FUTUYMA (1998), 'Species' in *Evolutionary Biology*. Third edition. Sunderland, MA: Sinauer Associates, pp. 447–479.

IUCN (2012), 'Loxodonta africana' in *The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species*. Database entry retrieved from the IUCN Red List website [<http://www.iucnredlist.org>] on Tuesday, 3 April 2012.

MICHAEL A. SIMON (1971), 'Presuppositions of Biological Taxonomy' in *The*

Matter of Life: Philosophical Problems of Biology. New Haven, CT and London: Yale University Press, pp. 171–175.

KIM STERELNY (1998), 'Species' in Edward Craig, ed., *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, vol. 9 (Sociology of knowledge–Zoroastrianism). London and New York: Routledge, pp. 78–81.

DON E. WILSON AND DEEANN M. REEDER, EDS. (2012), 'Loxodonta africana' in *Mammal Species of the World*. Third edition. Database entry retrieved from (the Vertebrates section of) the Smithsonian Institution website [<http://www.vertebrates.si.edu>] on Tuesday, 3 April 2012.

VIII:176, topographical . . . naming: Christianus seems to be saying that the

have bigger tusks.

181 KATHERINE: It isn't?

182 CHRISTIANUS: No. It's also because the female Indian elephants, along with some of the males, don't *have* tusks.

183 KATHERINE: I am sorry?

184 CHRISTIANUS: Amongst the Indian elephants, only some of the *males* have tusks. So if you are worried about ivory poachers and the *Indian* elephants, you can basically zoom in on the males *only*.

185 KATHERINE: Hmm. I haven't thought so much about the Indian elephants.

186 CHRISTIANUS: Why not?

187 KATHERINE: Well, the article didn't mention

names of the two types of African elephants have *not* been given because they *visually resemble* a forest or a bush.

viii:184, ivory poachers: Mark Shand notes that the *Asian* elephant does not suffer as much from poaching as the African elephant does, for 'only certain males carry ivory' (Shand 1995, p. 5; ref. *supra*, note 'No women?' at III:88). This is confirmed by Eric Scigliano: 'only Asian males, and not all of them, grow tusks' (Scigliano 2004, p. 5).

But even if it is true that the Asian elephant suffers less from *poaching* than the African elephant does, there are *other* threats, one of which is the loss of habitat. For according to Shand, '[i]t is

the loss of natural habitat on a vast scale, due to the massive increase in population, that is pushing the elephant towards extinction in Asia' (Shand 1995, p. 5). And a similar situation is to be found in Africa. Robin Brown estimates that most of the severe loss of elephants in West African countries 'can be blamed on habitat competition with humans' (Brown 2008, p. 192).

ROBIN BROWN (2008), *Blood Ivory: The Massacre of the African Elephant*. Foreword by Carl G. Jones. Stroud: The History Press.

ERIC SCIGLIANO (2004), *Love, War & Circuses: The Age-Old Relationship Between Elephants and Humans*. London: Bloomsbury.

them.

188 CHRISTIANUS: So if *one* article doesn't mention
them, you don't do any more research?

189 KATHERINE: As you know, I am a very busy
lawyer. And I normally need all the time
in the world just to stay on top of all my
cases.

190 CHRISTIANUS: But you are not at work *now*.
You're in *London*.

191 KATHERINE: True. But I came here to *relax*,
not to start any investigations. I mean, I
haven't even dealt with my own *luggage*
problem yet.

192 CHRISTIANUS: Fair enough. But when *will* you
do all that elephant research then?

193 KATHERINE: I am not sure. I read that article
only *yesterday*.

194 CHRISTIANUS: Hmmmm.

195 KATHERINE: And I'm not sure I *want to*, ei-
ther.

196 CHRISTIANUS: So you're saying that you are
giving up the whole thing? That you no
longer are in favour of 'saving' the Afri-
can elephants?

197 KATHERINE: Are you kidding? *Sure* I am.

198 CHRISTIANUS: *You are?*

199 KATHERINE: I have a *heart*.

200 CHRISTIANUS: That's great. Now we only have
to detect some *brain tissue* somewhere.

201 KATHERINE: Chris. Be nice. Be *human!*

SCENE IX.

Elephant Friends Forever

1 CHRISTIANUS: So you *still* want to save the Af-
frican elephants?

2 KATHERINE: Yes.

3 CHRISTIANUS: Even though you haven't read
all the research reports?

4 KATHERINE: Yes.

5 CHRISTIANUS: And even though you don't
know exactly *what* your potential 'help'
organization is up to?

6 KATHERINE: Is *up to*?

7 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. What people are *up to* is
very often a function of what their beliefs
and values amount to.

8 KATHERINE: OK?

9 CHRISTIANUS: So if you have an organization
called, say, 'Elephant Friends Forever',
you need to *investigate* it.

10 KATHERINE: Well . . .

11 CHRISTIANUS: What beliefs and values do

IX:19, *some sources*: One cannot count on that Christianus is fully serious here. It may be that he is simply bluffing, in order to 'control' Kath-

erine. Nevertheless, there are *some* sources that one might use to corroborate Christianus's idea that the number of African elephants is, or has

their employees have? What silly salaries and porky perks do they get? And which external people, organizations, companies, institutions, and think tanks do they support?

12 KATHERINE: Sure, but . . .

13 CHRISTIANUS: And who *controls* EFF? Who started it, and owned it, and co-opted it, either officially or covertly? And which *other* organizations, companies, institutions, and think tanks are supporting it, ideologically, politically, and monetarily?

14 KATHERINE: Chris, this is too . . .

15 CHRISTIANUS: And what about the fact that the African elephants are actually *increasing* in numbers? While the Indian elephants are *decreasing* in numbers?

16 KATHERINE: *What?*

17 CHRISTIANUS: Well, it seems that the long-term trend is that there are more and more *African* elephants, but less and less *Indian*.

18 KATHERINE: Really?

19 CHRISTIANUS: At least according to *some* sources.

been, increasing: Shand claims that 'it is doubtful if as many as fifty thousand elephants survive in the wild in the whole of Asia, compared with Af-

rica's growing population of over half a million' (Shand 1995, p. 5; ref. *supra*, note 'No women?' at 111:88). And the 1991 reports by Ricciuti and Douglas-

- 20 KATHERINE: But that's not the impression *I* got!
- 21 CHRISTIANUS: Hmm. Maybe you just read the article too quickly?
- 22 KATHERINE: No, I don't think so. I *clearly* remember they said they found *fewer* elephants this year than the year before.
- 23 CHRISTIANUS: Well, even if that were true, what *difference* would it make?
- 24 KATHERINE: How do you mean?
- 25 CHRISTIANUS: It's just *one* year's data. To identify longer trends, you have to observe *many* years' data, collected by multiple independent research organizations, preferably *without* any political affiliations. And the *long-term* trend seems to be that the number of African elephants is increasing.

Hamilton noted an increasing number of elephants in Kenya, as discussed by Sugg and Kreuter (1994, pp. 41–42; ref. *supra*, note 'attack and kill people' at VIII:158).

IX:21, read . . . too quickly: Though Christianus has not yet read that article in the March 2007 issue of *National Geographic*, his idea (that Katherine may have skipped or skimmed parts of that article) is not unrealistic. For according to one passage, the elephant population in Zakouma *increased*: 'At that time [in 1969], buffalo were almost extinct in the [Zakouma National] park, and there were about a thousand elephants. There

are now 6,500 buffalo, and elephant numbers have steadily increased since the ban on international ivory trade in 1989, reaching 3,885 in 2005' (Fay and Nichols 2007, p. 54; ref. *supra*, note 'the conclusion' at VIII:139).

IX:22, *fewer* elephants this year: It is correct, as Katherine states, that Fay and Nichols wrote that they had found fewer elephants 'this year' than 'last year': 'The final elephant count was 127 herds, with a total of 3,020 animals, almost 900 short of last year' (Fay and Nichols 2007, p. 54; ref. *supra*, note 'the conclusion' at VIII:139). Note, however, that the expression 'last

- 26 KATHERINE: Hmmm. I'm not so sure . . .
- 27 CHRISTIANUS: In other words, the newly reported short-term trend seems to go *against* the long-term trend. So how can it be *trusted*, without any further investigation? Where is the *satisfaction*?
- 28 KATHERINE: What are you saying?
- 29 CHRISTIANUS: Counting African elephants is difficult. So maybe these researchers made a mistake, or many? Perhaps they *didn't* take into consideration that some elephants went off to some other part of Africa? Or maybe the elephants were *hiding* during those days when they were counted? Or perhaps the researchers just missed them anyway, even if they *weren't* hiding? And what if the researchers *falsi-*

year' presumably should be understood as the year of 2005. For the expedition reached Africa on 23 March 2006, and it seems as if the article manuscript was finished *before* the end of that year. Therefore, the 'now' of the article would translate to 2006, while 'last year' would refer to 2005.

ix:29, Counting African elephants: It is not an easy task to count elephants, whether one does it from the ground, or uses some aerial method (Douglas-Hamilton 1992, p. 178; ref. *supra*, note 'amazingly fast runners' at viii:154). Fay and Nichols, for example, reported some potential counting problems:

'Luis was perplexed. Had we missed a large herd, or had we double-counted a herd in 2005?' (Fay and Nichols 2007, p. 54; ref. *supra*, note 'the conclusion' at viii:139). And when the elephants are in the forests in west and central Africa, whether they are there because they are consciously *hiding* or not, it gets even more difficult. For at that time 'it is impossible to count elephants directly' (Kangwana 1996, p. 20); therefore one has to resort to some type of indirect counting, using, for instance, the method of 'dung counting'.

KADZO KANGWANA, ED. (1996), *Studying Elephants*. Nairobi, Kenya: African Wildlife Foundation.

fied their data, to *create* a problem, so that they later could ask for research grants to 'solve' it? It's certainly not unheard of.

30 KATHERINE: Come on, Chris!

31 CHRISTIANUS: Or perhaps *these* researchers *didn't* make a mistake or fake their data. Maybe it's *the other* researchers, who previously reported an *increasing* population, that are wrong, or are faking the data.

32 KATHERINE: Yes, yes! *Right!*

33 CHRISTIANUS: Or maybe the new and old reports are not *comparable*. Perhaps *all* researchers are right in some sense, and wrong in some other. Maybe their investigations are overlapping in *some* respects, but not in *others*. Or maybe they *all* fudge their data. Who knows?

34 KATHERINE: Hmmmm.

35 CHRISTIANUS: Therefore, without an *elephantic* amount of *your own* money, time, and resources, you will never truly *know* the exact state of affairs. So why *engage* yourself in it?

36 KATHERINE: What do you mean? Why *engage* . . . ?

37 CHRISTIANUS: Surely you must know that whenever and wherever there is *money* at stake, one has to be very careful. I hope you have understood at least *that*?

38 KATHERINE: I don't care so much about the money. I have enough. I just want to save *the elephants*.

39 CHRISTIANUS: Well, I am *not* actually talking about *the money*, Katherine. Or about the elephants. I am talking about *satisfaction*. In general.

40 KATHERINE: What does that even *mean*?

41 CHRISTIANUS: Well, you can't *buy* real satisfaction.

42 KATHERINE: I wasn't trying to. I was just trying to save the elephants.

43 CHRISTIANUS: No. You were trying to buy some cheap, shrink-wrapped antidote for your guilt. That's all.

44 KATHERINE: Chris, I don't like your *tone*.

45 CHRISTIANUS: You don't *have* to like it, Katherine. I am telling you like it is. Or as I *see* it. You need to start taking responsibility for your own life and your actions.

46 KATHERINE: I thought that was *exactly* what I did when I decided to save the elephants.

47 CHRISTIANUS: The idea to save the elephants is not a bad one, assuming that they *need* to be saved, and *can* be saved. And assuming that it will be possible for you not only to *verify* that they *were* saved, if that ever happens, but also to verify

that that particular state of affairs was achieved *solely*, or at least *partly*, by the efforts of the very same organization that *you* supported. And also assuming, of course, that you can be perfectly sure that no innocent men, animals, or environment got harmed, killed, destroyed, or polluted along the way, either in Africa or anywhere else.

48 KATHERINE: Hmm.

49 CHRISTIANUS: So if, for example, it turns out that some elephants were *not* saved, or someone got harmed, or something got polluted, along the way, you should request your money back. And perhaps even sue them.

50 KATHERINE: Are you kidding?

51 CHRISTIANUS: No. This is big business.

52 KATHERINE: So I have to *check* the organization first?

53 CHRISTIANUS: As always. Everyone in it, and around it, whether visible or hidden.

54 KATHERINE: But if I have to check and double-check everything and everyone all the time, when would I have time to do my *real* work, as a *lawyer*?

55 CHRISTIANUS: Precisely. So if you want to continue as a lawyer, then your best bet is simply to keep your money to yourself.

That way you can be *sure* that you do not support any potential criminals. Assuming, of course, that none of your *clients* are criminals, or so inclined.

56 KATHERINE: But I *want* to save the elephants!

57 CHRISTIANUS: Then why not just go to Africa, yourself?

58 KATHERINE: When would I have the time? I am working almost twenty-four seven.

59 CHRISTIANUS: Take a year off.

60 KATHERINE: Are you nuts?

61 CHRISTIANUS: Perhaps. But if you are *really* concerned about the elephants, you should go to Africa. That's the only way to verify that you actually *are* saving the elephants.

62 KATHERINE: But I am not *that* concerned.

63 CHRISTIANUS: Yes, *that's* the problem. In fact, you are not *really* concerned about *anything*. Except your job, of course.

64 KATHERINE: Well . . .

65 CHRISTIANUS: And that's a problem. Unless, of course, you are *completely* satisfied with your job.

66 KATHERINE: You know very well that I am *not*.

67 CHRISTIANUS: So *do* something about it!

68 KATHERINE: But my job is all I've got. What *can* I do?

- 69 CHRISTIANUS: You could start by prioritizing your *satisfaction*, instead of so easily accepting being a mind-slave to the establishment.
- 70 KATHERINE: What *the hell* are you talking about *now*?
- 71 CHRISTIANUS: Why should you work *at all*, if you already have all the money you need? Who else but a *fool* would do that?
- 72 KATHERINE: Because that's what people do *in America*. We are not a bunch of lazy European armchair philosophers. We are *hard workers*!
- 73 CHRISTIANUS: Ha ha! That's *exactly* what I mean. Brainwashed into accepting being a slave. *No wonder* you are so *miserable*. You watch *w-a-y* too much *Law & Order*! Talk about bad *programming*!
- 74 KATHERINE: I don't watch *that* much television.
- 75 CHRISTIANUS: Perhaps not compared to other *Americans*. But it's still a few hours a day, isn't it?
- 76 KATHERINE: Maybe.
- 77 CHRISTIANUS: And you use it to *escape* from your gloomy job?
- 78 KATHERINE: No, it's not *like* that. I *like* my job. To a certain extent. At least *some* days.
- 79 CHRISTIANUS: But you are not *satisfied*, are you?

80 KATHERINE: No.

81 CHRISTIANUS: So you need to *do* something
about it.

82 KATHERINE: You mean *quit*?

83 CHRISTIANUS: Yes.

84 KATHERINE: Why?

85 CHRISTIANUS: Well, if you haven't been able
to detect any substantial satisfaction after
all these years, why continue? I mean, if
satisfaction is what you want?

86 KATHERINE: But *quit* my job?

87 CHRISTIANUS: If you cannot do it immedi-
ately, do it gradually. That will give you
more and more time to prepare yourself.

88 KATHERINE: For what?

89 CHRISTIANUS: For the ride of your life.

90 KATHERINE: Meaning?

91 CHRISTIANUS: Satisfaction.

92 KATHERINE: Yes, I got *that*. But what does it
mean?

93 CHRISTIANUS: It involves the idea of the *di-*
rect and *honest* empirical evaluation of
all things connected to your existential
situation. And then, as you discover new
things, you simply adjust your own be-
liefs, values, and behaviour accordingly.

94 KATHERINE: But I don't *want* to do that.

- 95 CHRISTIANUS: Do *what*?
- 96 KATHERINE: Change my life. Or my behaviour. At least not very much.
- 97 CHRISTIANUS: I know, I know. It is tough to get out of the rat rut, especially if one has to do it voluntarily. It would be easier for you if someone just fired you. But that's not possible in your case, of course.
- 98 KATHERINE: No. I am my own boss.
- 99 CHRISTIANUS: Right. And you also *want* to be successful, I take it?
- 100 KATHERINE: Sure. Doesn't everyone? Isn't it OK to make money?
- 101 CHRISTIANUS: It depends. Some people do not *want* to make money.
- 102 KATHERINE: Why?
- 103 CHRISTIANUS: Well, some claim it destroys their *character*. But others simply say that they have *better* things to do.
- 104 KATHERINE: Are they satisfactionists?
- 105 CHRISTIANUS: Yes, some of them. They know that they cannot bring with them anything *material* to the next life. So why *work* so hard?

IX:114, Knaus Berry Farm: The Knaus Berry Farm [<http://www.knausberrymaterial.com>] is a popular place, located

in Homestead, Florida, just south of Miami. Over 50 years ago this family-owned farm began its operation by selling

- 106 KATHERINE: *Lazy bums!*
- 107 CHRISTIANUS: So instead of watching *so much telly*, they lead a more down-to-earth kind of life, in a small, simple home, in a small, simple village. Where they prepare nice home-made meals with organic, non-GMO vegetables and grains from their local farmer. And where they engage in different spiritually uplifting activities, trying to satisfy both *their own* souls and *others'*.
- 108 KATHERINE: That sounds *really* unattractive.
- 109 CHRISTIANUS: Yes, it might not sound very sexy at first. But how else are you going to prepare yourself for the next life? By buying *things?* And *property?*
- 110 KATHERINE: The next life? Why *waste time* worrying about something like *that?* I want to have a nice time *now!*
- 111 CHRISTIANUS: Yes, that's the usual attitude. Most people think they need immediate sense gratification, all the time.
- 112 KATHERINE: It's the American way.
- 113 CHRISTIANUS: It sure is.
- 114 KATHERINE: Like one of those Knaus Berry

strawberries. Nowadays they also offer assorted baked goods, jams, vegetables, milk shakes, and ice cream. The farm is

open all days except Sundays during the Redland farming season of Miami-Dade County (November through mid-April).

Farm shakes. Or an ice-cold Coke. With
lots of sugar. *Aaahhh!*

SCENE X.

Incommensurability

1 CHRISTIANUS: Actually, sugar is an interesting
topic. It fits well with your current situa-
tion.

2 KATHERINE: How so?

3 CHRISTIANUS: Well, sugar can be exhilarating,
just like a successful law practise can be
when all the money rolls in. So whether
one is engaged in chewing or suing, it
may be hard to stop.

4 KATHERINE: Right. If one *wants* to stop, that
is.

5 CHRISTIANUS: Exactly. Therefore we *also* have
to understand that such sweetness, as
well as the activities preceding it, may be
counterproductive.

6 KATHERINE: *Counterproductive*?

7 CHRISTIANUS: Yes, especially if one is a satis-
factionist and see things differently.

8 KATHERINE: But I am *not*. And even if sugar
won't give me 'everlasting satisfaction'
or anything of the sort, it still gives me
something positive that I can enjoy here
and now.

- 9 CHRISTIANUS: Until you get that negative
toothache, of course.
- 10 KATHERINE: Ouch! Don't *talk* about it!
- 11 CHRISTIANUS: Or become so *fat* that no-one
wants to date you.
- 12 KATHERINE: Hmm.
- 13 CHRISTIANUS: Or even wants to hire you as
a *lawyer*. How about *that*, Miss Liti-
Gator?
- 14 KATHERINE: Hmm.
- 15 CHRISTIANUS: Listen, Katherine. Sugar isn't
good for the *system*, in the long run.
That's why a satisfactionist *must* skip it.
It's part of the training. *Especially* if one
is overweight, like you.
- 16 KATHERINE: Sounds terrible. I could *never* do
it. *Ever!*
- 17 CHRISTIANUS: Sure you could.
- 18 KATHERINE: No. I have such a sweet tooth.
- 19 CHRISTIANUS: I had too.
- 20 KATHERINE: Really?

x:25, maybe . . . incommensurability:
When Christianus talks about 'incommensurability' he is most probably not just talking about some Kuhnian-like concept dealing with a 'crisis' and a breakdown of a 'paradigm' in the history of science (Kuhn 1977, pp. xxii, 206–209; Shapere 1998, Hoyningen-

Huene 1996) or about ancient Greek mathematical concepts such as the diagonal of a square and the 'irrationality' of $\sqrt{2}$ as found in some Pythagorean-like arithmetic (Heath 1981, pp. 65, 90–91; Burnet 1948, p. 105), but rather about something more general, though, perhaps, it also may involve

- 21 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. Until I discovered that I
could *control* it.
- 22 KATHERINE: How?
- 23 CHRISTIANUS: I started experimenting with
opposites.
- 24 KATHERINE: Opposites?
- 25 CHRISTIANUS: Well, maybe I should call it *in-*
commensurability instead.
- 26 KATHERINE: What's *that*?
- 27 CHRISTIANUS: It's the idea that certain things
are *incompatible* with each other. In a
certain way.
- 28 KATHERINE: What *things*?
- 29 CHRISTIANUS: I'll give you an example.
- 30 KATHERINE: OK.
- 31 CHRISTIANUS: One evening, many moons
ago, one of my neighbours upstairs had a
party.
- 32 KATHERINE: How was it?
- 33 CHRISTIANUS: I am not sure.

some aspects of the basic ideas discussed in these two types of 'incommensurability' that modern philosophers often want to talk about.

Furthermore, it is probably significant that Christianus here appears to be saying that 'incommensurability' is *almost* like opposites, but not quite.

So even though 'incommensurability' *sometimes* may include some sense of 'oppositeness', there could be *other times* when it may not. One example might be complementary colours: although two colours on the colour wheel might be positioned exactly *opposite* each other, a person with full colour vision and some

- 34 KATHERINE: Too many drinks to *remember*?
- 35 CHRISTIANUS: No. Of course not.
- 36 KATHERINE: Why are you not *sure*, then?
- 37 CHRISTIANUS: Because I wasn't *there*.
- 38 KATHERINE: You weren't *there*?
- 39 CHRISTIANUS: No.
- 40 KATHERINE: So where *were* you? Yachting in the Mediterranean? Climbing K2? Or guest lecturing on Surf Philosophy at the University of Hawaii?
- 41 CHRISTIANUS: Haha! No. I was just downstairs, in my own apartment. Taking it easy.
- 42 KATHERINE: How come? I mean, if there is *a party!*
- 43 CHRISTIANUS: Sure. But I wasn't *invited*.
- 44 KATHERINE: Since when would *that* stop you?
- 45 CHRISTIANUS: Yes, you're right. But it's *complicated*.
- 46 KATHERINE: Complicated? *This* sounds interesting!

artistic sensibilities would seldom experience any (aesthetic) 'incommensurability' between such 'opposite' colours, but rather a very striking compatibility and complementariness.

JOHN BURNET (1948), *Early Greek Philosophy*. London: Adam & Charles Black.

THOMAS HEATH (1981), 'III. Pythag-

orean Arithmetic' in *A History of Greek Mathematics*, vol. 1: *From Thales to Euclid*. New York: Dover Publications, pp. 65–117.

PAUL HOYNINGEN-HUENE (1996), 'Kuhn, Thomas' in Donald M. Borchert, ed., *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy: Supplement*. New York: Macmillan Reference and

47 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. But all I can say right now
is that I don't know very much about the
party. Just *some* details.

48 KATHERINE: All right.

49 CHRISTIANUS: And maybe you, as a lawyer,
might even agree that knowing *less* de-
tails about a certain subject might actu-
ally be *better* than knowing too much, at
least in *some* situations?

50 KATHERINE: Sure. But why don't you try *that*
on some of your professor friends, and
see what *they* say!

51 CHRISTIANUS: Ha ha! *Right!*

52 KATHERINE: So what *do* you know about the
party?

53 CHRISTIANUS: Well, I know that I *heard* a lot.

54 KATHERINE: Music?

55 CHRISTIANUS: *Some* would call it that.

56 KATHERINE: What *kind*?

57 CHRISTIANUS: The *loud* kind.

58 KATHERINE: Any particular *songs*?

London: Simon & Schuster and Pren-
tice Hall International, pp. 285–286.

THOMAS S. KUHN (1977), *The Essential
Tension: Selected Studies in Scientific Tra-
dition and Change*. Chicago and Lon-
don: University of Chicago Press.

DUDLEY SHAPERE (1998), 'Incom-
mensurability' in Edward Craig, ed.,

Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy, vol.
4 (Genealogy–Iqbal). London and New
York: Routledge, pp. 732–736.

x:35, Of course not: It is unclear what
Christianus is saying here. Is he saying
that he never drinks, or that he only
drinks very little, at (some) parties? Or is

- 59 CHRISTIANUS: Mostly Wendy's favourite.
- 60 KATHERINE: Wendy?
- 61 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. You just met her.
- 62 KATHERINE: The *waitress*?
- 63 CHRISTIANUS: Yes.
- 64 KATHERINE: *She was there*?
- 65 CHRISTIANUS: Of course. She *lives* there.
- 66 KATHERINE: So close?
- 67 CHRISTIANUS: It used to be even closer. But
that's another story.
- 68 KATHERINE: Hmm. So what *song* was it?
- 69 CHRISTIANUS: It was one of those popular
American uptempo pop-rock songs.
- 70 KATHERINE: Oh, *that* one!
- 71 CHRISTIANUS: But there was also something
quite *British* about it.
- 72 KATHERINE: As long as it wasn't *Scottish*!
- 73 CHRISTIANUS: It wasn't. I don't think.

he saying 'Of course not' simply because he *wasn't* at any party? Maybe one of his principles is that he *doesn't* consume alcohol unless he is at a party, or is in the company of others, possibly as a way to limit his own consumption?

x:76, thousands of songs: Although it may be difficult to understand exactly how Katherine would know such

a thing (unless one of her legal cases involved Billboard or the music industry), she *does* seem to have a point here. Currently (Tuesday, 3 April 2012) there are many different lists on Billboard's free website [<http://www.billboard.com>], and even more lists on their professional website [<http://www.billboard.biz>]. Excluding the lists of *artists* and *albums* as well as the lists of the relative ranking

- 74 KATHERINE: Did it have a *name*?
- 75 CHRISTIANUS: I am sure it did. I just can't remember it. But it *definitely* was on last year's Billboard list.
- 76 KATHERINE: Great work, Sherlock! Billboard only lists *thousands* of songs a year.
- 77 CHRISTIANUS: I hear you. But it's not really a problem.
- 78 KATHERINE: Why not?
- 79 CHRISTIANUS: We'll just ask Wendy when she returns. She knows *everything* about that song. So unless she has acute amnesia, or for some reason is unwilling to revisit her personal pop-rock memory bank, we will soon know all the details.
- 80 KATHERINE: All right.
- 81 CHRISTIANUS: So back to the party.
- 82 KATHERINE: Sure.
- 83 CHRISTIANUS: Or, rather, to the time *just before* the party.

between the different *charts* themselves, there were, on their free website, 35 *lists* of songs in five categories, containing a total of 1,255 songs (some of which were duplicates, though), representing just *one* week's state of affairs. In category 'Overall Popularity': Hot 100 (100), Billboard 200 (200), Radio Songs (40), [Hot] Digital Songs (40), Ringtones (20), Social 50 (50), Uncharted (50); in

category 'Breaking & Entering': Heat-seekers Songs (15); in category 'Genres': Pop Songs (20), Adult Contemporary [Recurrents] (15), Adult Pop Songs (20), Dance/Club Play Songs (25), R&B/Hip-Hop Songs (50), Rap Songs (15), Rock Songs (25), Alternative Songs (20), Country Songs (30), Jazz Songs (15), Latin Songs (25), Regional Mexican Songs (20), Latin Pop Songs (20), Tropi-

- 84 KATHERINE: OK. What happened?
- 85 CHRISTIANUS: Well, everything was very quiet
at the time.
- 86 KATHERINE: Good.
- 87 CHRISTIANUS: So I thought I would listen to
eine kleine Baaachische foooge.
- 88 KATHERINE: Bach?
- 89 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. But then I suddenly *tripped*
over some annoying golden-braided book
lying in my dangerously high *Fahrenheit*
451 fireplace pile.

cal Songs (20), Christian Songs (25), Gospel Songs (15), Holiday Airplay (25), Holiday Songs (25); in category 'International': Japan Hot 100 (50), Korea K-Pop Hot 100 (50), United Kingdom Songs (10), Germany Songs (10), Canadian Hot 100 (50); in category 'Web': YouTube (25), Yahoo Video (10), Yahoo Audio (10), MySpace Songs (15).

x:87, *eine kleine*: This grouping of words may or may not be significant. Perhaps Christianus simply thought these words sounded good together, or just uttered them because they came up in his mind. Or it might be that he already here prepares for the transition to another composer (by signalling 'Eine Kleine Nachtmusik'). Such a transition would work well also in a temporal sense (cf. *infra*, note 'Jupiter' at x:100).

x:87, *Baaachische foooge*: It is hard to say whether or not this utterance is an attempt of Christianus to demonstrate his

knowledge of German *musical history*. But we can at least be relatively sure that it is an attempt to *sound* German. For it seems rather likely that these (exaggerated) words have their origin in the German expression 'Bachische fuge', which in English may be rendered as 'Bachian fugue'.

x:89, *dangerously high*: What is the 'danger' in 'dangerously high' referring to here? We know that Christianus *tripped*; but we don't know whether or not the potential *danger* was about tripping, or about something else. If the potential danger was about *tripping*, then we might understand 'dangerously high' as not very high at all: just *one* very thick golden-braided book lying on the floor would theoretically be enough.

But if the potential danger was about, for example, that the pile might fall into Christianus's fireplace (if he *has* a fireplace), then one might estimate that the potential danger would increase with the height of the pile.

- 90 KATHERINE: *Shocking!* Whatever you're *talking* about.
- 91 CHRISTIANUS: Well, all right. Maybe not so *shocking*. But I still took it as a sure sign that I should do something more *significant*.
- 92 KATHERINE: More significant than *what? Tripping* over it?
- 93 CHRISTIANUS: That too.
- 94 KATHERINE: So?
- 95 CHRISTIANUS: So I picked *Mozart* instead.

And in this second interpretation we may also note — in the case of him *having* a fireplace, and books dangerously close to it — that it seems to indicate that he would have some *potential* floor space around the fireplace. Therefore, it is not impossible that Christianus's living-room arrangement rather resembles, say, Derek Patmore's more open and 'spacy' fireplace style (Patmore 1938, Plate 1, p. 31) than the more crowded style of Hayes Marshall (Patmore 1938, Plate 2, p. 32).

DEREK PATMORE (1938), *Decoration for the Small Home*. London: Putnam.

x:89, golden-braided book: A Google search for 'golden-braided book' returns, as usual, too many results. But out of the ten results appearing on the *first* page — in a search where Google [<http://www.google.com>] also decided, without being instructed to do so, *not* to use the search term 'golden-braided' but the shorter 'golden-braid' — there

is only *one* book that seems to fit the general context in which Christianus is operating; and that book appears in four of those results. And when we learn that the title of that book also includes the word 'Bach', we can be reasonably sure that Christianus most probably is talking about Hofstadter's book *Gödel, Escher, Bach: An Eternal Golden Braid* (Hofstadter 1979).

DOUGLAS R. HOFSTADTER (1979), *Gödel, Escher, Bach: An Eternal Golden Braid*. London: Penguin Books.

x:89, *Fahrenheit 451* fireplace pile: What kind of pile is this? Should we think of it as a heap of books that *includes* Bradbury's *Fahrenheit 451* and perhaps other books related to it, being located near the fireplace only because Christianus usually sits there when he reads (if Christianus *has* a fireplace, and if he usually sits there and reads)?

Or should we think of it more as a collection of books that has something

- 96 KATHERINE: Any particular work?
- 97 CHRISTIANUS: Well, it *was* Thor's day.
- 98 KATHERINE: You mean it was Thursday?
- 99 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. So it had to be Symphony
number 41.
- 100 KATHERINE: Jupiter?
- 101 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. *Good!* In C Major. By the
Scottish Chamber Orchestra, conducted
by Sir Charles Mackerras.
- 102 KATHERINE: You *remembered* all that?
- 103 CHRISTIANUS: Yes.
- 104 KATHERINE: Spooky!
- 105 CHRISTIANUS: *Spooky?*
- 106 KATHERINE: The *Scots*, remember?
- 107 CHRISTIANUS: Oh, *right!*
- 108 KATHERINE: But what does *Thursday* have to
do with Symphony number 41?
- 109 CHRISTIANUS: Nothing.
- 110 KATHERINE: Nothing?
- 111 CHRISTIANUS: Well, nothing *directly*. There's

to do with the business of one of *Fahrenheit 451*'s German-sounding, Moon-day-named characters, who, at least in the beginning of that book, thought that '[i]t was a pleasure to burn' (Bradbury 1985, p. 3)?

RAY BRADBURY (1985), *Fahrenheit 451*. London: Collins Educational.

x:100, Jupiter: The artistic freedom that came with the *personal* initiative to write Symphony 41 in C Major (K551) — as opposed to it being commissioned — may partly explain why this work was named 'Jupiter' (Glover 2005, p. 161). But Mozart himself did not name it that way; instead it was (allegedly) assigned

another connexion.

112 KATHERINE: OK?

113 CHRISTIANUS: Thor's day is also *Jupiter's* day.

114 KATHERINE: Oh, I see.

to that work by Johann Peter Salomon, the man who organized Haydn's concerts in London (Wilson 2003, p. 81; cf. Westrup 1970, p. 89) and who also once offered Mozart an opportunity there (Sadie 1982, p. 138).

JANE GLOVER (2005), *Mozart's Women*. London: Macmillan.

STANLEY SADIE (1982), *The New Grove Mozart*. London: Macmillan/Papermac.

JACK WESTRUP (1970), *An Introduction to Musical History*. London: Hutchinson University Library.

CONRAD WILSON (2003), *Notes on Mozart: 20 Crucial Works*. Edinburgh: Saint Andrew Press.

SCENE XI.
The Fat Rat

1 CHRISTIANUS: But just when I was going to
play the CD, I remembered the UPS
guy.

2 KATHERINE: Which one?

3 CHRISTIANUS: The one who, a few hours ear-
lier, rang my door bell *just* when I was
about to play one of my *other* CDs.

4 KATHERINE: Oh, I see.

5 CHRISTIANUS: And who delivered a package
which I, at the time, *didn't* open.

6 KATHERINE: Why not?

7 CHRISTIANUS: Because I suddenly realized
that I had a *meeting*, elsewhere. So I had
to run.

8 KATHERINE: What was in the package?

9 CHRISTIANUS: It *should* have been a bunch of
Mozart books.

10 KATHERINE: Was it?

x1:21, Mozart was a freemason: Mozart was 'a leading Mason' (Landon 1989, p. 229) and a member of a lodge in Vienna with the innocent-sounding name 'Zur Wohltätigkeit' (Glover 2005, p. 147; ref. *supra*, note 'Jupiter' at x:100), liter-

ally 'To (the) Charity' or 'For (the) Benevolence' (cf. Springer 1975, p. 1817). He was initiated on 14 December 1784 (Nettl 1957, p. 15). But Mozart also visited some of the other lodges in Vienna, which in 1784 were seven in number

11 CHRISTIANUS: That was the question. So a few
hours later, when I was back home again,
and ready to play the Mozart CD, I first
had to open the package and check.

12 KATHERINE: And?

13 CHRISTIANUS: It turned out that all the vol-
umes were there. And they were *much*
better than I thought they would be!

14 KATHERINE: Good!

15 CHRISTIANUS: So then I thought it would be
neat to do some improvised research *be-
fore* I would listen to the CD. To see what
interesting historic information I could
find about 'Jupiter' and about Mozart in
general. To put things in perspective.

16 KATHERINE: Right.

17 CHRISTIANUS: But then I made a disappoint-
ing discovery.

18 KATHERINE: Yes?

19 CHRISTIANUS: I found a materialist.

20 KATHERINE: I'm sorry?

21 CHRISTIANUS: Mozart was a freemason.

(Gould 1887, p. 287); and recommend-
ed by his 'home lodge', Mozart received
his second degree on 7 January 1785
in a ceremony at the 343rd meeting of
the lodge called 'Zur wahren Eintracht'
(Nettl 1957, p. 15), literally 'To (the)

True Harmony' or 'To (the) True Un-
ion' (cf. Springer 1974, p. 465). Shortly
thereafter, Mozart's father Leopold also
joined 'Zur Wohltätigkeit': he received
his initiation on 6 April 1775, his second
degree on 16 April 1775, and the third

- 22 KATHERINE: Really?
- 23 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. And since I don't want to associate with any 'Brothers' or any demoniac, materialistic vibrations, I immediately bagged him, the CD, and all my new books, once and for all.
- 24 KATHERINE: You're kidding?
- 25 CHRISTIANUS: No.
- 26 KATHERINE: So you decided *not* to play anything?
- 27 CHRISTIANUS: No. I decided to play some devotional Govinda music instead. In C Major.
- 28 KATHERINE: How do you know that *that* composer isn't a freemason?
- 29 CHRISTIANUS: Because *I* am the composer *and* the performer. And I am not a 'Brother'.

degree on 22 April 1875 (Nettl 1957, p. 16; cf. Glover 2005, p. 147). A contemporary painting (allegedly) depicts Mozart seated at one of the freemason lodges, where an initiation ceremony is held, with Prince Nicolaus Esterházy officiating (reproduced in colour in Mozart 1990, p. 206).

Mozart's involvement with freemasonry is also easy to see in his output. In his correspondence he uses phrases like 'Brother of the Order' or 'B.O.' or 'Brother' when addressing fellow freemasons such as Michael Puchberg (Mozart 1990, pp. 206–209). And his musical

works have many connexions with freemasonry: his cantata *Die Maurerfreunde* (K471) was composed to his freemason lodge (Glover 2005, p. 147); and his *Zauberflöte* (K620) is replete with freemasonry symbolism (cf. Jahn 1891, p. 369).

ROBERT FREKE GOULD (1887), *History of Freemasonry: Its Antiquities, Symbols, Constitutions, Customs, Etc.*, vol. 6. Embracing an Investigation of the Records of the Organisations of the Fraternity in England, Scotland, Ireland, British Colonies, France, Germany, and the United States. Derived from Official Sources. London: Thomas C. Jack.

- 30 KATHERINE: OK, I see.
- 31 CHRISTIANUS: So it's my own consciousness
and vibratory state that comes back at
me, and no one else's.
- 32 KATHERINE: Sounds reasonable.
- 33 CHRISTIANUS: So then I turned up the vol-
ume, so I could hear all the details.
- 34 KATHERINE: Sorry to interrupt, but do you
still have those nice JBL studio monitors
that you picked up in Miami with me?
- 35 CHRISTIANUS: Certainly. They sound just as
good as they always did. And they are
just as ugly.
- 36 KATHERINE: Which is why you got them so
cheap!
- 37 CHRISTIANUS: Precisely. Just my *style!*
- 38 KATHERINE: *Absolutely!* So you turned up the

OTTO JAHN (1891), *Life of Mozart*, vol. 3. Translated from the German by Pauline D. Townsend. With a Preface by George Grove. London: Novello, Ewer & Co.

H. C. ROBBINS LONDON (1989), *Mozart: The Golden Years 1781-1791*. With 215 illustrations, 32 in colour. London: Thames and Hudson.

WOLFGANG AMADEUS MOZART (1990), *Mozart's Letters: An Illustrated Selection*. Translated by Emily Anderson. London: Barrie and Jenkins.

PAUL NETTL (1957), *Mozart and Masonry*. New York: Philosophical Library.

OTTO SPRINGER, ED. (1974), *Langenscheidt's*

Encyclopaedic Dictionary of the English and German languages. Part 11 (German-English), vol. 1 (A-K). Based on the original work by E. Muret and D. Sanders. Completely revised 1974. Berlin, Munich, Vienna, Zurich: Langenscheidt.

OTTO SPRINGER, ED. (1975), *Langenscheidt's Encyclopaedic Dictionary of the English and German languages*. Part 11 (German-English), vol. 2 (L-Z). Based on the original work by E. Muret and D. Sanders. Completely revised 1974. Berlin, Munich, Vienna, Zurich: Langenscheidt.

volume, you said?

39 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. And then *all hell* broke
loose.

40 KATHERINE: The party?

41 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. And Wendy's *song!*

42 KATHERINE: Loud?

43 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. Just as loud as my Govinda.

44 KATHERINE: And how loud was *that?*

45 CHRISTIANUS: Enough to get us *both* evicted.
And convicted.

46 KATHERINE: Not with *me* as your representa-
tive.

47 CHRISTIANUS: I thought you were mostly into
litigation? In *Florida?*

48 KATHERINE: Sure. But I could widen my hori-
zons.

49 CHRISTIANUS: How would *that* work?

50 KATHERINE: Well, we could start simply by
suggesting that if they, for example,
agreed *not* to evict you, then we would
also *not* start preparing for a case against
them.

51 CHRISTIANUS: Aha. *Blackmail!*

52 KATHERINE: I prefer to call it 'business as usu-
al'. And that would most probably be the
end of it. Can we continue?

- 53 CHRISTIANUS: Sure. Where *were* we?
- 54 KATHERINE: Wendy's loud song, I think.
- 55 CHRISTIANUS: Right. But *that* wasn't the *main*
problem.
- 56 KATHERINE: It *wasn't*?
- 57 CHRISTIANUS: No. The main problem was that
the Billboard Boys didn't *follow* my lead.
- 58 KATHERINE: Why *would* they?
- 59 CHRISTIANUS: Well, my music is in another
class.
- 60 KATHERINE: Maybe they didn't know?
- 61 CHRISTIANUS: Maybe.
- 62 KATHERINE: Or maybe they simply were a
gang of *rebels!*
- 63 CHRISTIANUS: *Exactly!* That's what *I* think.
- 64 KATHERINE: Or at least wanted to give that
impression.
- 65 CHRISTIANUS: Yes, yes. *Perfect!*
- 66 KATHERINE: So you played in C Major, but
the Rebels *didn't*?
- 67 CHRISTIANUS: Correct. And they also used a
defyingly different tempo.
- 68 KATHERINE: And vociferous vocals, I pre-
sume?
- 69 CHRISTIANUS: You got it. Which brings me to
the crescendo.

- 70 KATHERINE: The crescendo?
- 71 CHRISTIANUS: Or, perhaps I should say, to the
diminuendo.
- 72 KATHERINE: I am not a music major.
- 73 CHRISTIANUS: OK. But at least you know
what 'innuendo' means?
- 74 KATHERINE: Of course.
- 75 CHRISTIANUS: In any case, I just couldn't keep
my own song on. It was too disconcert-
ing.
- 76 KATHERINE: A clash of civilizations!
- 77 CHRISTIANUS: Well put!
- 78 KATHERINE: But tell me one thing, Chris.
- 79 CHRISTIANUS: What?
- 80 KATHERINE: Why didn't you just use your
headphones until the party was over? To
keep The Rebels at bay, and away?
- 81 CHRISTIANUS: First because my headphones
would *not* have masked out the Riot
Rookies completely; so I could not have
enjoyed my music.
- 82 KATHERINE: Anything else?
- 83 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. I also felt that there was
something *else* going on.
- 84 KATHERINE: What?
- 85 CHRISTIANUS: Something *magical!*

- 86 KATHERINE: *Magical?*
- 87 CHRISTIANUS: Absolutely.
- 88 KATHERINE: You mean like *Love*?
- 89 CHRISTIANUS: No.
- 90 KATHERINE: Are you sure?
- 91 CHRISTIANUS: Reasonably.
- 92 KATHERINE: How do you know?
- 93 CHRISTIANUS: Well, at that time Wendy and
I weren't exactly on speaking terms. If
that's what you thought.
- 94 KATHERINE: No, I didn't think *anything*. Or at
least not *that*.
- 95 CHRISTIANUS: So there was something *else* in
the air that night.
- 96 KATHERINE: What?
- 97 CHRISTIANUS: Some otherworldly promise.
- 98 KATHERINE: Otherworldly promise? What *in*
heavens name are you talking about *now*?
- 99 CHRISTIANUS: A promise of a revelation. That
would give me clarity.
- 100 KATHERINE: About what?
- 101 CHRISTIANUS: I didn't have the *faintest* idea.
- 102 KATHERINE: *Great!*
- 103 CHRISTIANUS: So I had to put myself in *true*
'observer mode', and *not* try to interfere
with *anything*. *Whatever* was about to

happen.

104 KATHERINE: *If* something *was* about to happen, that is.

105 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. Exactly.

106 KATHERINE: And?

107 CHRISTIANUS: And *that's* when I got the *impulse*.

108 KATHERINE: What *impulse*?

109 CHRISTIANUS: The one connected to the almost intolerable incommensurability that I was experiencing.

110 KATHERINE: You mean with *your* music and the Boisterous Billboard Rebels in the same room?

111 CHRISTIANUS: Precisely.

112 KATHERINE: So?

113 CHRISTIANUS: So my whole *system* screamed '*Turn OFF the player!*'

114 KATHERINE: No wonder!

115 CHRISTIANUS: But since I was in 'observer mode', I couldn't do it.

116 KATHERINE: *Couldn't?* Or *wouldn't?*

117 CHRISTIANUS: Take a pick.

118 KATHERINE: Do you have a point?

119 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. Be patient.

120 KATHERINE: It's soon 2008.

121 CHRISTIANUS: You're exaggerating. It's not
even *April* yet. Or *noon*. And my point is
'Be Patient'.

122 KATHERINE: That's nothing new.

123 CHRISTIANUS: No, but it's still relevant, none-
theless.

124 KATHERINE: How so?

125 CHRISTIANUS: For if I hadn't been *patient*, I
wouldn't have discovered what I discov-
ered.

126 KATHERINE: And what *did* you discover? If
you don't mind me asking?

127 CHRISTIANUS: I don't mind.

128 KATHERINE: So?

129 CHRISTIANUS: Well, at first I discovered noth-
ing.

130 KATHERINE: Who would have guessed?

131 CHRISTIANUS: More than that almost *intoler-*
able inconvenience of the incommensu-
rability itself, of course.

132 KATHERINE: Of course. Which is why you had
to be so *extraordinarily* patient.

133 CHRISTIANUS: Yes.

134 KATHERINE: And?

135 CHRISTIANUS: Then it happened.

136 KATHERINE: What?

- 137 CHRISTIANUS: The *light* went out.
- 138 KATHERINE: The light?
- 139 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. And my CD player with
it.
- 140 KATHERINE: Why?
- 141 CHRISTIANUS: Destiny, I suppose.
- 142 KATHERINE: Come on!
- 143 CHRISTIANUS: Well, the problem was that I
had something brewing in the kitchen.
- 144 KATHERINE: More coffee?
- 145 CHRISTIANUS: No, I don't drink coffee in the
evening. If I do, I can't sleep.
- 146 KATHERINE: So what was it?
- 147 CHRISTIANUS: My little physics experiment.
- 148 KATHERINE: Brewing?
- 149 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. My cold fusion project.
- 150 KATHERINE: What about it?
- 151 CHRISTIANUS: I left it on.
- 152 KATHERINE: And?
- 153 CHRISTIANUS: It suddenly stopped.
- 154 KATHERINE: Why?
- 155 CHRISTIANUS: I didn't *know*. It was *dark!*
- 156 KATHERINE: But didn't you have some *matches*
or something?
- 157 CHRISTIANUS: No. But after a while I finally

found one of Wendy's old lighters lying
in my bedroom.

158 KATHERINE: *Wendy's?* In your *bedroom*?

159 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. But it's not what you
think.

160 KATHERINE: I don't care. I *really* don't.
Sheesh!

161 CHRISTIANUS: Good.

162 KATHERINE: And *then* what?

163 CHRISTIANUS: Then I *found* it.

164 KATHERINE: Found *what*?

165 CHRISTIANUS: The *fat rat!*

166 KATHERINE: You're *kidding*?

167 CHRISTIANUS: No.

168 KATHERINE: How big?

169 CHRISTIANUS: Big enough *not* to fit comfort-
ably in my left shoe. See?

170 KATHERINE: Goodness! But how did he end
up there? Did you have some old cheese
lying around?

171 CHRISTIANUS: No. I *never* leave cheese 'lying
around'. I'm much too fond of it myself.

172 KATHERINE: Hmmm.

173 CHRISTIANUS: So, somehow or other, our fur-
ry friend got stuck in the midst of my
experiment. And was instantly electro-

cuted.

174 KATHERINE: How *terrible!*

175 CHRISTIANUS: I know, I know. I would *never*
have hurt the poor fellow otherwise!

176 KATHERINE: *I* would!

177 CHRISTIANUS: Well, you're a *lawyer*. I'm not.

178 KATHERINE: True. So what did you *do?*

179 CHRISTIANUS: The only thing I *could* do.

180 KATHERINE: Which was?

181 CHRISTIANUS: I opened the window.

182 KATHERINE: And threw him *out?* From the
third floor?

183 CHRISTIANUS: No, *that* wasn't the plan.

184 KATHERINE: But you did it *anyway?* Is that it?

185 CHRISTIANUS: No.

186 KATHERINE: What *was* the plan, then?

187 CHRISTIANUS: To clean the air.

188 KATHERINE: You were worried about *oxygen?*
At that point?

189 CHRISTIANUS: *You* would have been too. The
smell was *absolutely* intolerable! We're

x1:150, What about it? Katherine's not-so-very-surprised attitude might be explained by her educational background and interests: she is a lawyer and business woman, and not so much into physics

and lab experiments. Therefore, she may not be extremely eager to understand the potential complexity of the kind of laboratory setup that Christianus here might be alluding to.

not talking about *nine volts* here.

190 KATHERINE: But what about your *first* experiment? Weren't you already in 'observer mode', or whatever you called it? Didn't you say you must do *nothing*? Nothing *at all*?

191 CHRISTIANUS: You're right. I *did* say that.

192 KATHERINE: But?

193 CHRISTIANUS: But I thought that the unfortunate fate of the fat rat *was* the secret sign. Pandora's noxious Fox-Box unlocked, so to speak.

194 KATHERINE: Whatever gave you *that* idea?

195 CHRISTIANUS: That it was Pandora's?

196 KATHERINE: No, that it was the *secret sign*.

197 CHRISTIANUS: Ah! Well, when you get a clash of *two* incommensurability pairs — one *musical* pair and one *scientific* pair — how can you *not* act?

198 KATHERINE: Hmmm.

199 CHRISTIANUS: So I acted. And opened the window.

200 KATHERINE: OK.

xi:189, not . . . *nine volts*: When Christianus here is describing the circumstances around the intolerable smell of the rat, saying that he does *not* talk about any 'nine volts', we may be reasonably sure that this

is not a reference to a *lower* voltage. But it is unclear whether his setup is based on an old concept (e.g., Martin Fleischmann and Stanley Pons's version of cold fusion), or whether it is a completely new design.

201 CHRISTIANUS: And it was *very* liberating to get
rid of that smell!

202 KATHERINE: I bet. But where did the *incom-*
mensurabilities go? Out the window,
too?

203 CHRISTIANUS: I'm coming to that.

204 KATHERINE: Good. But first I need to visit the
Blue Door again.

205 CHRISTIANUS: Sure. No problem.

SCENE XII.

Localization or Globalization?

1 KATHERINE: Sorry about that.

2 CHRISTIANUS: There is nothing to apologize
for. We *should* get rid of any unnecessary
tension and pain, if we simply can. For if
we are relaxed, our systems work better.

3 KATHERINE: I agree. But please go on with
your story.

4 CHRISTIANUS: OK. So there I am. With an
open window and a roasted rat behind
my back. And some reasonably fresh air
gently blowing into my needy nostrils.

5 KATHERINE: Right.

6 CHRISTIANUS: And then I suddenly realize that
I now hear *more* of the Bad Boys from
upstairs.

7 KATHERINE: Did Wendy and her friends turn
up the volume?

8 CHRISTIANUS: No. The ‘moreness’ wasn’t about
volume in *that* sense. It was more about
frequency distribution.

9 KATHERINE: OK?

10 CHRISTIANUS: Since we now *both* had our win-
dows open, I also could hear *higher* frequen-

cies, not just the bass, or the midrange.

11 KATHERINE: So what?

12 CHRISTIANUS: Well, I wasn't finished.

13 KATHERINE: You never *are!*

14 CHRISTIANUS: Just hold on. It'll be OK.

15 KATHERINE: If you insist!

16 CHRISTIANUS: So the problem was that there
was *another* incommensurability building up.

17 KATHERINE: *Another* one?

18 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. Interacting with *itself*.

19 KATHERINE: I don't follow.

20 CHRISTIANUS: Well, when my window was
closed, I only heard the *bass*, didn't I?

21 KATHERINE: Yes. And some midrange.

22 CHRISTIANUS: Exactly. But then, after I had
opened my window, didn't also the *higher*
frequencies make themselves known?

23 KATHERINE: They did.

24 CHRISTIANUS: And didn't all of these frequencies
come from the *same* song?

25 KATHERINE: I guess.

XII:34, trebellian sound: The adjective 'trebellian' is not found in most ordinary English dictionaries. So we should probably assume that it is another one

of Christianus's home-made studio productions, in which he has mixed the two nouns 'treble' and 'rebel' and added some extra sound effects at the

26 CHRISTIANUS: So how could there *be* any incommensurability?

27 KATHERINE: I haven't got a *clue*, Chris. *And* I have a headache.

28 CHRISTIANUS: It will soon be over. It's simple.

29 KATHERINE: OK.

30 CHRISTIANUS: But there is a delay.

31 KATHERINE: *Delay?* I thought you said it would soon *be over?*

32 CHRISTIANUS: Don't worry. The 'delay' is just part of the *explanation*. So it's *not* an estimation of how long it takes me to explain it. Unless, of course, *you* ask too many questions in between.

33 KATHERINE: All right, all right.

34 CHRISTIANUS: So the trebellian sound from Wendy's open window reaches *my* open window a little bit later than the bass sound does, creating a comparatively long 'short delay' effect, almost like it had gone through a digital delay in a recording studio.

35 KATHERINE: How come?

36 CHRISTIANUS: Well, the bass goes rather

end, to create an adjective. In this scenario, a trebellian sound would therefore amount to a sound having two combined qualities: 1) it would have a

frequency distribution with more audible treble than midrange or bass; and 2) it would originate from a rebellious person, group, or consciousness.

quickly right through her floor down into my apartment; but the treble must first bounce off of the wall of that other apartment house before it finally reaches my open window.

37 KATHERINE: So?

38 CHRISTIANUS: So even though Wendy and her friends upstairs may experience the Re-

XI:36, bounce . . . the wall: According to Christianus, the treble sound originating from Wendy's apartment bounces off of the wall of *another* apartment building. But how far away is that building?

Our first step is to calculate the time it takes for Wendy's (bass) sound to reach Christianus's apartment in a *direct* way, through the walls, floors, and ceilings of their own apartment building. First, let us guess that Christianus and Wendy's apartment building is an old-style building with high-ceiling apartments, and that the vertical distance between Christianus and Wendy's apartments (and their respective windows) therefore would amount to something like 3.5 meters. Furthermore, let us assume, for simplicity's sake, that Wendy's speakers are placed relatively near her windows, and that *her* windows are right above *Christianus's* windows. We will also assume that the indoor temperature is normal, and that the quickest sound propagation between Wendy's and Christianus's apartment occurs in the walls, floor, and ceiling, with *some* propagation also in the indoor air; and since we know that the speed of sound in typical building materials is approxi-

mately ten times greater than the speed of sound in air (wood: 3300 m/s; brick: 3600 m/s; concrete: 3700 m/s; Grondzik 2010, p. 740), we may estimate that the sound will travel at approximately 3000 m/s between the apartments. Therefore, since the distance is 3.5 m, the sound will propagate down to Christianus's apartment in 0.0012 seconds (3.5/3000).

Our second step is to determine the total time it takes for Wendy's (treble) sound to travel in the outdoor air to the opposite wall of another apartment building, where it will bounce and return to Christianus's open window. This time is dependent on the 'short delay' that Christianus mentions at XI:34. Since Christianus talks about that 'short delay' in music recording terms, we may estimate that a 'typical' such delay (applied to, for instance, vocals or guitars) might be anywhere from 3 to 30 milliseconds, with 15 milliseconds (i.e., 0.015 seconds) as a mean value; but since he *also* mentions that the short delay is 'comparatively long', let us use 30 milliseconds (i.e., 0.03 seconds) as our estimate (cf. Savage 2011, p. 189). Furthermore, we also know that the sound originally was transmitted 0.0012

bellious Riot Boys in a perfectly synched fashion, someone else in *another* location may experience incommensurability, or out-of-synchness.

39 KATHERINE: And this is perfectly natural?

40 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. It's what I call a 'localization' incommensurability.

41 KATHERINE: Why?

seconds earlier from Wendy's speakers; therefore, the sound has been travelling 0.0312 seconds (0.03 + 0.0012) in the outdoor air.

Our third step is to calculate the *distance* that the sound has travelled in the outdoor air. Since Christianus says (at XIII:21) that Wendy's party took place '[a] year ago or so', let us assume that the outdoor temperature that evening in the late winter or early spring of 2006 was around 5 °C. Then, knowing that the speed of sound in air is 331 m/s at 0 °C and 343 m/s at 20 °C (Cutnell and Johnson 2001, p. 468), we can make a quick linear estimation and use 334 m/s as the speed of sound in air that has a temperature of 5 °C. This will then result in a travelled distance of 10.4208 meters (0.0312 · 334).

Now to the fourth and last step. Assuming that there is only *one* 'bouncing spot' on the wall of the opposite apartment building, we can, with some elementary trigonometry, figure out its approximate *horizontal* distance, as measured from either Christianus's or Wendy's window. Let d_w be the *diagonal* distance from Wendy's window (down) to the 'bouncing spot', and let d_c be the *diagonal* distance from the

'bouncing spot' (down) to Christianus's window. Then, assuming that d_w and d_c are equal, $d_w = d_c = 10.4208/2 = 5.2104$ meters. Finally, using the Pythagorean Theorem to calculate the *horizontal* distance b between Christianus's (or Wendy's) window and the wall of the opposite apartment building — using d_w (or d_c) as the hypotenuse, and half the apartment height (3.5/2) as one of the legs of the triangle — we would get $b^2 + 1.75^2 = d_w^2$ (or $b^2 + 1.75^2 = d_c^2$), resulting in $b = \sqrt{(d_w^2 - 1.75^2)} = \sqrt{(d_c^2 - 1.75^2)} = \sqrt{(5.2104^2 - 1.75^2)} = \sqrt{(27.1483 - 3.0625)} = \sqrt{24.0858} = 4.9077$. The wall of the opposite apartment building is thus approximately 5 meters horizontally away from Christianus and Wendy's windows.

CUTNELL AND JOHNSON (2001), *Physics*. Fifth edition. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

WALTER T. GRONZIK, ALISON G. KWOK, BENJAMIN STEIN, AND JOHN S. REYNOLDS (2010), *Mechanical and Electrical Equipment for Buildings*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

STEVE SAVAGE (2011), *The Art of Digital Audio Recording: A Practical Guide for Home and Studio*. New York: Oxford University Press.

42 CHRISTIANUS: Well, there's only *one* original
player. And if you simply were closer to
that player, *localizing* yourself properly,
the incommensurability would automat-
ically go away.

43 KATHERINE: I see. But the Govinda-slash-
Bad-Boys incommensurability *isn't* like
that, is it?

44 CHRISTIANUS: No. There is something else go-
ing on.

45 KATHERINE: What?

46 CHRISTIANUS: Well, it's more of a 'globaliza-
tion' incommensurability.

47 KATHERINE: Globalization?

48 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. When there are two or more
players in the same room, or close by.
And they all are playing *different* tunes.

49 KATHERINE: So there is no escape?

50 CHRISTIANUS: Not if you are simply an *observer*.

51 KATHERINE: But what if I just moved far, f-a-r
away?

52 CHRISTIANUS: You could. But that wouldn't
solve the problem.

53 KATHERINE: Why not?

54 CHRISTIANUS: For even if you would be able
to lower the volume of the *original* in-
commensurability, new ones would al-

ways pop up at your new location. It's *globalization*, remember?

55 KATHERINE: But what if I still were able to avoid any new incommensurabilities at my new location? Wouldn't that then be a great spot?

56 CHRISTIANUS: Not necessarily.

57 KATHERINE: Why not?

58 CHRISTIANUS: It's true that you do *not* want incommensurability. But you *do* want *something*. And that *something* is *not* silence. That's the whole point. *Silence* is not on the table, right now.

59 KATHERINE: And our coffee and scones aren't either.

60 CHRISTIANUS: I know. I am not sure *what* she is up to.

61 KATHERINE: Maybe it's just because they are one man short? Just like she said?

62 CHRISTIANUS: I doubt it. We'll just have to more patient, I guess.

63 KATHERINE: But couldn't we just *kick out* everyone in the room?

64 CHRISTIANUS: Patience, my dear. *Patience!*

65 KATHERINE: No, no, not in *this* room; I meant in the 'globalization' example.

66 CHRISTIANUS: How do you mean?

67 KATHERINE: Well, couldn't we just get rid of
all players except *one*? To stop the incom-
mensurability?

68 CHRISTIANUS: But some players are people, so
it's difficult.

69 KATHERINE: Why?

70 CHRISTIANUS: Because people sometimes have
legal rights. Or at least the appearance of it.

71 KATHERINE: So you mean, if you give people a
green card, one can not just revoke it the
next week and send them back to China
or Antarctica, or wherever they came
from?

72 CHRISTIANUS: That would be the idea. Or
kick out people from their apartments in
a random fashion. And certainly not just
because they are playing a *different song*
than their neighbours are.

73 KATHERINE: But what if we are *not* talking
about people? What if we are talking
about *songs*, for instance? What's the
problem?

74 CHRISTIANUS: The problem is not simply that
you must get rid of all the songs play-
ing except *one*. The problem is also that
you may not *want* to get rid of all those
songs. Maybe you *like* some of them.

75 KATHERINE: So even if I realize that there *is*
incommensurability, I may still be too

attached to turn off the player?

76 CHRISTIANUS: Yes, just like Wendy. She didn't
stop playing the Rebel Rousers even
when there was incommensurability in
the air. Even though it may have been
good for her.

77 KATHERINE: Too bad she works here, then.
With all this lovely Victorian music.

78 CHRISTIANUS: Ha ha. Right. Poor Wendy!

79 KATHERINE: But how does all of this relate to
my sugar problem?

80 CHRISTIANUS: The idea is simple. Just like you
have a memory of different *songs* and
musical *styles*, you have a memory of dif-
ferent *tastes*.

81 KATHERINE: OK?

82 CHRISTIANUS: And with that memory, you can
predict future incommensurabilities.

83 KATHERINE: So I know that, if the Rebel Jazz-
ers are already playing, I will *definitely* ex-
perience incommensurability as soon as I
put on some spiritual Govinda music?

84 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. Which is why you may de-
cide *not* to play it.

85 KATHERINE: Or play it *very* loud.

86 CHRISTIANUS: Right.

87 KATHERINE: So what do we have?

88 CHRISTIANUS: Well, the problem is that the
Rebel Raiders are *not* quitting voluntarily.

89 KATHERINE: Am I Wendy now?

90 CHRISTIANUS: You mean with access to the
Rebel music player?

91 KATHERINE: Yes.

92 CHRISTIANUS: No. Wendy is Wendy, as I al-
ready pointed out. And the Rebel Band
is the Rebel Band. But you can play *me*,
if you like. Being in my apartment, when
Wendy is upstairs.

93 KATHERINE: OK.

94 CHRISTIANUS: So the situation is this. We
know that the Rebel Wreckers song, just
like sugar, is bad, in the long run, for eve-
ryone.

95 KATHERINE: *Is* it? For *everyone*? Including
Wendy?

96 CHRISTIANUS: We'll assume it for now.

97 KATHERINE: OK.

98 CHRISTIANUS: And we also know that, just as
we will be able to experience the Govin-
da-slash-Rebel incommensurability, *and*
be able to predict it, so will *Wendy*.

99 KATHERINE: But?

100 CHRISTIANUS: But we also know that Wendy
doesn't *like* Govinda.

101 KATHERINE: OK.

102 CHRISTIANUS: So she'll *rather* have a little in-
commensurability than hearing Govinda
'clean'.

103 KATHERINE: Right.

104 CHRISTIANUS: So what do we *do*?

105 KATHERINE: I don't know.

106 CHRISTIANUS: I do.

107 KATHERINE: Yes?

108 CHRISTIANUS: Let's *hypnotize* her.

109 KATHERINE: Are you *crazy*?

110 CHRISTIANUS: It's not as difficult as it sounds.

111 KATHERINE: Maybe. But isn't it *illegal*?

112 CHRISTIANUS: Could be. But we are very fond
of her, and we are actually just making
her a favour.

113 KATHERINE: *We are*?

114 CHRISTIANUS: So here's the plan.

115 KATHERINE: But I'm not sure . . .

116 CHRISTIANUS: If you want to change some-
one's behaviour, how do you do it?

117 KATHERINE: You mean like in the *Manchurian
Candidate*?

118 CHRISTIANUS: Oh, you *saw* it?

119 KATHERINE: Yes. Talk about *scary*!

- 120 CHRISTIANUS: Absolutely. But we have good intentions. And no drugs and guns. And no connection to any secret military or governmental intelligence or terrorist agency.
- 121 KATHERINE: OK.
- 122 CHRISTIANUS: But in order to impress her system, we need her to be relaxed.
- 123 KATHERINE: Is this where the hypnotization comes in?
- 124 CHRISTIANUS: Well, it's actually just pseudo-hypnotization. For we need everything to be on remote.
- 125 KATHERINE: On remote?
- 126 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. We don't want any breaking-and-enterings, do we?
- 127 KATHERINE: Absolutely not.
- 128 CHRISTIANUS: So, we'll just let her hypnotize herself.

XII:117, *Manchurian Candidate*: Since Richard Condon's 1959 book *The Manchurian Candidate* has been adapted to film twice, there would *some* room for the possibility that Katherine and Christianus are *not* talking about the same version. However, since the *first* version was released already in 1962 (starring Frank Sinatra, Laurence Harvey, and Janet Leigh), it seems *more* likely that they both are talking about the

second version released in 2004 (starring Denzel Washington, Liev Schreiber, and Meryl Streep).

For an interesting (but perhaps deliberately misrepresentative) account of a 'Manchurian candidate', see Streatfeild (2007); for a Tavistock introduction to 'behaviour modification', including theories of learning, assessment and evaluation, emotional reactions, stimulus control, response control, and ethical con-

- 129 KATHERINE: How? When?
- 130 CHRISTIANUS: When she goes to sleep.
- 131 KATHERINE: Sleep?
- 132 CHRISTIANUS: That's relaxed enough.
- 133 KATHERINE: OK?
- 134 CHRISTIANUS: And then we'll just start our
music programming.
- 135 KATHERINE: Music programming?
- 136 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. Govinda. Not too high,
not too low.
- 137 KATHERINE: Playing *where*?
- 138 CHRISTIANUS: In my apartment.
- 139 KATHERINE: And this will do *what*, exactly?
- 140 CHRISTIANUS: It will accustom her to Govin-
da, in a relaxed state.
- 141 KATHERINE: Hmmm. But isn't there a prob-
lem?
- 142 CHRISTIANUS: *What*?

siderations, see Sheldon (1982); and for an account of links between the Tavistock Institute for Human Relations, the Stanford Research Institute's Center for the Study of Social Policy, the Beatles, Alan Ginsberg, the New York Times, brainwashing and social conditioning, gang wars, LSD, and international drug trade, see Coleman's well-researched book (Coleman 1992, pp. 99–112).

JOHN COLEMAN (1992), *The Conspira-*

tors' Hierarchy: The Committee of 300. Second edition. Carson City, NV: Joseph Publishing Co.

BRIAN SHELDON (1982), *Behaviour Modification: Theory, Practice, and Philosophy*. London and New York: Tavistock Publications.

DOMINIC STREATFEILD (2007), 'Building the Manchurian Candidate' in *Brainwash: The Secret History of Mind Control*. New York: Picador, pp. 135–170.

143 KATHERINE: What if *she* has her windows open,
and *you* have yours open too? Wouldn't
there then be some incommensurability
problem? Which would imprint Govin-
da *badly*?

144 CHRISTIANUS: Yes, you're right. We would then
have the 'localization' variant. Which
may, as you say, interfere with our plans.

145 KATHERINE: So then you must always be care-
ful to at least have *your* windows closed,
right?

146 CHRISTIANUS: No.

147 KATHERINE: *No?*

148 CHRISTIANUS: Well, it's true that I would have
to keep them closed whenever I would
be playing *Govinda*. For we would not
want to imprint any unnecessary incom-
mensurability in *that* case.

149 KATHERINE: There's another *case*?

150 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. We have *another* type of
programming to do.

151 KATHERINE: *We do?*

152 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. We also need to gradually
increase her *disliking* of the Rebel Rascals.

153 KATHERINE: So we use the idea with the open
windows?

154 CHRISTIANUS: Exactly.

155 KATHERINE: But isn't there a problem, nevertheless?

156 CHRISTIANUS: What?

157 KATHERINE: The *winter*?

158 CHRISTIANUS: What *about* it? It's nine months away!

159 KATHERINE: Why would she have her windows open during the night in the *wintertime*? I mean, maybe she doesn't even have them open in the *summer*? I don't *know* her.

160 CHRISTIANUS: But I do.

161 KATHERINE: And?

162 CHRISTIANUS: It may be hard to believe, but she just *loves* sleeping with her windows open. Even in the winter.

163 KATHERINE: Brrr!

164 CHRISTIANUS: Ha ha! Yes.

165 KATHERINE: But it's of course a fantastic way to get an undisturbed and oxygen-filled good night's sleep.

166 CHRISTIANUS: Absolutely.

167 KATHERINE: But I still don't see how this would solve my *sugar* problem. I mean we're not talking about my *music* taste, are we?

168 CHRISTIANUS: Not directly.

169 KATHERINE: So?

170 CHRISTIANUS: One thing we could do is to use some motivational tapes, and try to change your taste that way.

171 KATHERINE: You mean listening to 'I love celery' and 'I hate sugar' all night long?

172 CHRISTIANUS: Possibly.

173 KATHERINE: What if I don't *want* to do that? Or what if doesn't work? Aren't there any hands-on-type exercises I could do? With my *tongue*?

174 CHRISTIANUS: Sure. You could do the Govinda-type impression, but with live food-stuffs.

175 KATHERINE: But how is that possible? Eating while sleeping?

176 CHRISTIANUS: No, that's too dangerous.

177 KATHERINE: Is there an alternative?

178 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. But we still have to follow the principle.

179 KATHERINE: Which one?

180 CHRISTIANUS: That we want to make an impression only when we are as relaxed as possible.

181 KATHERINE: And?

182 CHRISTIANUS: The best time to do so is in the morning, immediately after awakening.

183 KATHERINE: Why then?

184 CHRISTIANUS: At that time our rational mind is not fully awake. It's still a little groggy after sleeping so long. So at that time it will object *the least* to any new impressions that we may want to give it.

185 KATHERINE: Oh, I see.

186 CHRISTIANUS: Another reason is that, just as in the sleeping case, it will allow us to imprint things *first, before* we really start our day and do *other* things.

187 KATHERINE: Right.

188 CHRISTIANUS: And, just to recap, the idea is to find foods and drinks that are *incompatible* with each other. Or *incommensurable*.

189 KATHERINE: You mean in terms of their chemistry?

190 CHRISTIANUS: Sure, biochemistry is part of it. But I am mainly referring to the *subjective*, perceived sensation of taste that a person experiences when he or she eats or drinks certain things that 'clash' in taste, or go tremendously ill together.

191 KATHERINE: So it's about *perceived* taste?

192 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. *Subjective*, perceived taste.

193 KATHERINE: So what's your advice?

194 CHRISTIANUS: It's simple.

195 KATHERINE: Yes?

196 CHRISTIANUS: There are two steps.

197 KATHERINE: And they are?

198 CHRISTIANUS: *First* you have to *find* a taste
that *is* incommensurable with the taste
you want to get rid of.

199 KATHERINE: And?

200 CHRISTIANUS: And then you have to *sit* on it.

201 KATHERINE: Excuse me?

202 CHRISTIANUS: Remember *fiffs*?

203 KATHERINE: Sure.

204 CHRISTIANUS: So when Baldy found a free
seat, did he then weasel his way over to
sit on it, or *not* to sit on it?

205 KATHERINE: To sit on it.

206 CHRISTIANUS: And how many *others* will Bal-
dy allow to sit on that seat, especially if
they are *incommensurable* with him?

207 KATHERINE: None.

208 CHRISTIANUS: Exactly. And even if a *very* sexy
and *non-incommensurable* Barbie-babe
would want a seat, Baldy will say no.

209 KATHERINE: Are you *sure*?

210 CHRISTIANUS: Why would he say 'yes'? There
are no other seats.

211 KATHERINE: What if she is irresistible?

212 CHRISTIANUS: All right. He *might* tolerate
some close encounters for a *short* while.
But he still won't *give up* his seat. And
eventually he will have to kick her out so
that he can *fully* enjoy his Cookie Mon-
ster Treat alone, *without* sharing.

213 KATHERINE: What a *monster!*

214 CHRISTIANUS: So once having *found* that in-
commensurable taste that you are looking
for, you then just have to 'flood your sys-
tem' with it, *before* you eat or drink any-
thing else, with or without sugar in it.

215 KATHERINE: So if I want to get rid of my sug-
ar cravings, I have to *locate* a taste that,
for me, is *incompatible* with the taste of
sugar? And then I just immerse myself in
that taste, *before* I eat or drink anything
else? Is that the plan?

216 CHRISTIANUS: Yes.

217 KATHERINE: But isn't your point that I should
stop eating sugar?

218 CHRISTIANUS: Sure.

219 KATHERINE: So why are you saying 'with or
without sugar'? It sounds like I *should*
be eating or drinking sugar. Or at least
could.

220 CHRISTIANUS: Yes.

221 KATHERINE: Yes *what?*

222 CHRISTIANUS: Since your *mind* is too conditioned in terms of enjoying sugar, it will object *too much* if you, or anyone else, present the idea that *you, Katherine*, must stop eating sugar.

223 KATHERINE: So?

224 CHRISTIANUS: So the idea is that we will recondition your system, not simply by issuing some prohibitive *statements*, but by carefully orchestrating certain sensory experiences that will *bypass* your argumentative mind, and lead you in the right direction.

225 KATHERINE: Any recommendations?

226 CHRISTIANUS: As I just said, it is a *subjective* experience. So any particular recommendations regarding the *first* part may or may not work for you.

227 KATHERINE: OK. But couldn't you give me an example, anyway? I mean, how did *you* do it? Which incommensurable taste did *you* use?

XII:230, three or four times: Christianus's statement that he took one glass of lemon juice three or four times a day does not, at a first glance, seem to fit very well with his recommendation that one should drink such juice immediately after awakening. So how should we understand it?

One interpretation might be that he is suggesting that one should, already from day one, *still* try to drink another three glasses of lemon juice throughout the day, even though one has already taken one in the morning. But whether or not four glasses a day would be the *end* goal or not, it seems reasonable to

228 CHRISTIANUS: I discovered that *lemon* was very effective.

229 KATHERINE: Lemon?

230 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. So I started drinking a glass of lemon juice three or four times a day, to 'push out' my affinity for sugar.

231 KATHERINE: Three or four whole glasses? That must have been the juice of *dozens* of lemons!

232 CHRISTIANUS: No, no. It was *diluted* juice. Each glass only contained the freshly pressed juice of *half* a lemon. And then I simply added water. So my daily juice quota was, on average, only the equivalent of about *two* lemons.

233 KATHERINE: That sounds doable.

234 CHRISTIANUS: *Sure* it is doable. That's not the issue. The issue is whether or not it is *efficient*. For *you*.

235 KATHERINE: You mean *efficient*?

236 CHRISTIANUS: Approximately. As I said ear-

suggest that the more glasses of lemon juice one can drink, the better, even on day one.

Another interpretation might be that Christianus is talking about the *later* phases of his own experiences, even though he explicitly says 'started' in the beginning of the sentence. So on this

reading the idea could be that one should *begin* the process by taking just one glass of lemon juice in the morning, and then, perhaps after a few days or so, increase one's quota with another glass, say, at noon. And when one can drink four glasses, spread out during the day, the process would (perhaps) be complete.

lier, your taste buds and your nervous system may be different than mine. Perhaps lemon is *not* incommensurable with sugar, for *you*.

237 KATHERINE: Right.

238 CHRISTIANUS: So you just have to find something that works.

239 KATHERINE: And then it will automatically work for *me*? *Come on, Chris!*

240 CHRISTIANUS: Yes, if it is a *good* theory, it will.

241 KATHERINE: *Is it* a good theory?

242 CHRISTIANUS: It hasn't failed yet.

243 KATHERINE: Hmm.

SCENE XIII.

Wendy's Risky Role-Play

- 1 CHRISTIANUS: Ah! *Here* she comes!
- 2 KATHERINE: I can't wait!
- 3 CHRISTIANUS: Coffee! Mmmm!
- 4 KATHERINE: And scones!
- 5 CHRISTIANUS: And *lots* of cream! Well done!
- 6 WENDY: Can I?
- 7 KATHERINE: Yes, but just *half* a cup, thanks.
- 8 WENDY: Cream?
- 9 KATHERINE: Only a little.
- 10 WENDY: OK.
- 11 KATHERINE: Thank you.
- 12 WENDY: Chris?
- 13 CHRISTIANUS: Just my usual one-oh-one rou-
tine.
- 14 WENDY: Sure.
- 15 KATHERINE: Chris, don't forget the *song*!
- 16 CHRISTIANUS: What *song*?
- 17 KATHERINE: The *Billboard* one. Remember?
- 18 CHRISTIANUS: Oh! Right, right, *r-i-g-h-t!* How
could I forget? Wendy?
- 19 WENDY: Yes, sweetie?

20 KATHERINE: *Sweetie?*

21 CHRISTIANUS: Remember that big party you had at your place? A year ago or so?

22 WENDY: You mean my '*Girls Gone Mild – Not!*' party? On my birthday?

23 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. And you played that high-energy pop-rock song over and over again? Your favourite?

24 WENDY: Oh, you mean 'Dirty Little Secret'?

25 CHRISTIANUS: *Yes! That's* the one!

26 KATHERINE: With?

27 WENDY: Which planet are you from? And century?

28 KATHERINE: I was just *asking. Politely!*

29 WENDY: It's the All-American Rejects. *Duh!*

30 KATHERINE: Duh?

31 BALDY: *Wendy! Over here!*

32 WENDY: Sorry, my boyfriend is calling.

33 CHRISTIANUS: *Baldy* is your boyfriend?

34 WENDY: Well, not really. But that's what *he* thinks.

35 CHRISTIANUS: So he's *not*?

36 WENDY: No. But he's *hot*. And I like his *Ferrari* very much. He even lets me *drive* it!

37 CHRISTIANUS: Sounds risky.

38 WENDY: Yes. Actually, I *really* need a time-out.
He's a big guy, and I'm starting to get a
little nervous. Maybe you and I could get
together, and talk?

39 CHRISTIANUS: Sure. When?

40 WENDY: Tomorrow evening at seven? At our
old place?

41 CHRISTIANUS: OK.

42 BALDY: *Hey! Wendy! Come on! Bitch!*

43 WENDY: Sorry, I *have* to run.

44 KATHERINE: *Please do!*

45 WENDY: Tomorrow, then?

46 CHRISTIANUS: Absolutely.

47 KATHERINE: *'Absolutely!'*

48 CHRISTIANUS: What was *that* all about?

49 KATHERINE: What?

50 CHRISTIANUS: *'Please do!' — 'Absolutely!'*

51 KATHERINE: Nothing.

52 CHRISTIANUS: *Nothing?*

53 KATHERINE: As you already know, I haven't
been feeling very well lately. And I'm
starving. So let's *at last* have our coffee
and scones!

54 CHRISTIANUS: And cream!

55 KATHERINE: Yes. But tell me something,
Chris.

- 56 CHRISTIANUS: Sure.
- 57 KATHERINE: What's that 'one-oh-one' routine
you were mentioning?
- 58 CHRISTIANUS: Didn't you watch Wendy?
- 59 KATHERINE: Sure I did. She poured coffee in
your cream.
- 60 CHRISTIANUS: Ha ha! Yes.
- 61 KATHERINE: But what does 'one-oh-one' *stand*
for? Is it some secret code or something?
Between you guys?
- 62 CHRISTIANUS: Well, in a way it is. But it *doesn't*
mean '5', if that's what you thought.
- 63 KATHERINE: No, I didn't know *what* to think.
I'm not so much into *codes*. At least not

XIII:62, it *doesn't* mean '5': The pronoun 'it' probably refers to the expression 'one-oh-one', which in turn might be understood as '101'. In such a scenario, one might then have been tempted to decipher '101' using the 'base-2 number' (or 'binary numeral') system, where a '1' in the rightmost (first) position would be carrying a value of 2^0 (i.e., 1), and where a '1' in the leftmost (third) position would carry a value of 2^2 (i.e., 4), which, when added together, would yield 5. However, as Christianus is very careful to point out, this is *not* how to decipher it *here*, in this particular case.

XIII:64, intelligence free: Apart from the perhaps most straightforward rendering of 'intelligence free' as 'really easy'

or 'very simple', Christianus may have had (at least) two other ideas in mind. One idea might be that the phrase 'intelligence free' should be understood in a very literal way, not merely as 'really easy' or 'very simple', but as requiring no intelligence at all. For it is possible that Christianus's understanding of a Turing machine (see the illustration in Bechtel 2002, p. 10; cf. Crane 1991, pp. 91–102) simply echoes Fodor's understanding of a Turing machine's typical bottom-level tasks, referring to them as 'unintelligent operations', including 'deleting symbols, storing symbols, copying symbols, and the rest' (Fodor 1988, p. 23).

Another idea might be that the decoding of '101' does *not* involve any *secret intelligence* people or resources,

non-legal ones.

- 64 CHRISTIANUS: That's too bad. It's fun and basically intelligence free. So you don't have to be some new Alan Turing to decode it. Or old, for that matter.
- 65 KATHERINE: Alan Turing?
- 66 CHRISTIANUS: One of those brave British numerologists at Bletchley Park who helped decrypt the secret communication codes that the Germans used during World War Two.
- 67 KATHERINE: Oh, I see. And 'one-oh-one'?
- 68 CHRISTIANUS: It just means 'one hundred and one'.
- 69 KATHERINE: One hundred and one *what? Tea-*

neither at Bletchley Park nor anywhere else, since (in this case) the only decoders would be Christianus and Katherine. So all computers — a word that in Turing's writings means 'computing *human beings*', as Urquhart correctly points out (Urquhart 2002, p. 313) — would be construed as *non-military* civilians, *not* being part of any (secret) intelligence operation.

WILLIAM BECHTEL, ADELE ABRAHAMSEN, AND GEORGE GRAHAM (2002), 'The Life of Cognitive Science' in William Bechtel and George Graham, eds., *A Companion to Cognitive Science*. Malden, MA and Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 1–104.

TIM CRANE (1991), *The Mechanical Mind: A Philosophical Introduction to Minds, Machines and Mental Representa-*

tion. London: Penguin Books.

JERRY A. FODOR (1988), *Psychosemantics: The problem of Meaning in the Philosophy of Mind*. Cambridge, MA and London, England: MIT Press.

ALASDAIR URQUHART (2002), 'Metatheory' in Dale Jaquette, ed., *A Companion to Philosophical Logic*. Malden, MA and Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 307–318.

XIII:66, brave British: Though history has seen many brave British men and women, it is not entirely easy to understand why the 'shy, boyish' (Hodges 2007) and 'strange' (Milner-Barry 1993, p. 90) Alan Turing would be one of them. Is there anything particularly *brave* to be found in, for example, David Cannadine's evaluation that Tu-

spoons?

70 CHRISTIANUS: No. As you know, I'm not so
much into tea.

71 KATHERINE: What about *spoons*?

72 CHRISTIANUS: Sometimes. But not in this
case.

73 KATHERINE: What, then?

74 CHRISTIANUS: Per cent.

75 KATHERINE: So you mean 101% coffee? Slight-
ly more coffee than cream?

76 CHRISTIANUS: No. The other way around.

77 KATHERINE: More cream?

78 CHRISTIANUS: Yes.

79 KATHERINE: And that's *it*?

80 CHRISTIANUS: Not quite.

81 KATHERINE: I was afraid of that.

82 CHRISTIANUS: It's actually part of a *theory* that
I am working on.

83 KATHERINE: How *original!*

ring's participation was so crucial that, without it, 'the German codes would probably never have been broken at Bletchley' (Cannadine 1998, p. 168)? Or in the fact that Turing was awarded the Order of the British Empire (Rootselaar 1976)? Or is Christianus simply joking? Or might he be aware of some secret details that could add a heroic

and dangerous (personal) dimension to the code-cracking accomplishments of the otherwise (seemingly) rather comfortably Bletchley-Park-situated 'Prof' (Murray 1993, p. 114)?

DAVID CANNADINE (1998), *History in Our Time*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

ANDREW HODGES (2007), 'Alan Tur-

84 CHRISTIANUS: Anyhow, I call it 'The 101%
Anti-Darkness Principle'.

85 KATHERINE: And?

86 CHRISTIANUS: It's about how to courageously
cope with life.

87 KATHERINE: And how does one do *that*?

88 CHRISTIANUS: It's quite simple: when you get
something in life that looks *really, really*
dark, then you can *attack* that darkness
by mixing it up with 101% of something
else.

89 KATHERINE: Something else?

90 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. The 'brightener'!

91 KATHERINE: What's *that*?

92 CHRISTIANUS: Well, there are different 'bright-
eners' for different darknesses, of course.

93 KATHERINE: Of course. And?

94 CHRISTIANUS: Well, for *coffee*, the optimal
'brightener' is cream. By adding just as
much cream as there is coffee and then

ing' in Edward N. Zalta, ed., *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Online article retrieved from the Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy website [<http://plato.stanford.edu>] on Tuesday, 3 April 2012. Stanford, CA: The Metaphysics Research Lab, Center for the Study of Language and Information, Stanford University.

STUART MILNER-BARRY (1993), 'Hut 6:

Early Days' in F. H. Hinsley and Alan Stripp, eds., *Codebreakers: The Inside story of Bletchley Park*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 89–99.

JOAN MURRAY (1993), 'Hut 8 and Naval Enigma, Part I' in F. H. Hinsley and Alan Stripp, eds., *Codebreakers: The Inside story of Bletchley Park*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 113–118.

just another tiny one percent more, the coffee concoction will lighten up to become *brighter* than mid-gray — a very positive transformation indeed! No *darkness* left, just different shades of *brightness*!

95 KATHERINE: How philosophical!

96 CHRISTIANUS: And tasty!

97 KATHERINE: Mmmm . . . yes . . . the coffee *is* excellent. Even *without* all that cream.

98 CHRISTIANUS: And your scones?

99 KATHERINE: *Delicious!*

100 CHRISTIANUS: Just like mine. It's *amazing* how so little *somethingness* can be so satisfying!

101 KATHERINE: Chris, can't you just *stop*? And *not* talk philosophy? I'm trying to *enjoy* over here! *Seriously!*

102 CHRISTIANUS: Ha ha! Me too! Ha ha!

103 KATHERINE: You're *hopeless!*

104 CHRISTIANUS: Maybe. But not in a *literal* sense, of course.

105 KATHERINE: How do you mean?

106 CHRISTIANUS: I am the one who has the *most*

BOB VAN ROOTSELAAR (1976), 'Turing, Alan Mathison' in Charles Coulston Gillispie, ed., *Dictionary of Scientific Biography*, vol. XIII (Hermann Staudinger–Giuseppe Veronese). New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, pp. 497–498.

XIII:94, cream . . . coffee: Christianus could here have gone even further with the idea of cream as a coffee 'brightener', to connect it with his previous mentioning of Alan Turing. For in an interesting book by Stephen Corteen Cowin and

hope.

107 KATHERINE: Of course. You're *in illusion!* Ha
ha!

108 CHRISTIANUS: Ha ha, right. But seriously.

109 KATHERINE: What?

110 CHRISTIANUS: How can you *have* any hope
with your death-and-nothingness sce-
nario? *Everything* is all over, any minute!
Hello, darkness!

111 KATHERINE: Chris, *please!*

112 CHRISTIANUS: I just don't *get* it. Why do you
keep *hanging on* to it?

113 KATHERINE: Why *worry* so much about the
future? *Who knows* what it will be?

114 CHRISTIANUS: OK. So we *won't* worry. So why
not just quit your job immediately? Now.
Today. On the spot.

115 KATHERINE: As I said . . .

116 CHRISTIANUS: But you *won't*, because you
know that there *is* a tomorrow. In all like-
lihood.

117 KATHERINE: Yes, but . . .

Stephen B. Doty (2007, p. 21), Turing's theory on chemical reactions (Turing 1952) is (partly) explained with the help of cream and coffee.

STEPHEN CORTEEN COWIN AND STEPHEN B. DOTY (2007), *Tissue Mechanics*. New

York: Springer.

ALAN M. TURING (1952), 'The Chemical Basis of Morphogenesis' in *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London* (Series B, Biological Sciences), vol. 237, no. 641, pp. 37–72.

- 118 CHRISTIANUS: So you *plan* for it. It's *in* you.
- 119 KATHERINE: OK, OK. I *do* worry about death, since it's the end of my life. But I *don't* believe in any afterlife. So why *plan* for it?
- 120 CHRISTIANUS: So the question for you is whether there *is* afterlife for the individual soul, at all?
- 121 KATHERINE: It's not a *question*. I just don't *believe* it. Unless you *prove* it.
- 122 CHRISTIANUS: But I cannot *prove* to you on a piece of paper that you are an immortal soul and that you have an afterlife. If *that's* what you're asking.
- 123 KATHERINE: Why *not*?
- 124 CHRISTIANUS: I don't *have* a piece of paper.
- 125 KATHERINE: Come *on!*
- 126 CHRISTIANUS: All right. But even if I *had* it, I still couldn't do it.
- 127 KATHERINE: Why?
- 128 CHRISTIANUS: Because whatever I scribbled on it, you might say either 'I don't understand it', or 'I don't agree', or 'I don't have time'.
- 129 KATHERINE: Why would I do *that*?
- 130 CHRISTIANUS: Because you might not understand it, or agree, or have the time. Or

you might simply do it because your
mind freaks out.

131 KATHERINE: But surely, if I am *very* interested
in the topic, I *wouldn't* say any of those
things.

132 CHRISTIANUS: But you're *not* very interested.

133 KATHERINE: Perhaps not. But I am a *little* in-
terested.

134 CHRISTIANUS: That doesn't count for much.
Anyone can say that.

SCENE XIV.

A Moribund Mortality Proof

1 KATHERINE: Chris, why can't you just quickly grab a piece of paper and *prove* that I am an immortal soul with an afterlife? I mean, if it *is* a fact, as you claim, it shouldn't be *that* hard. So why not just *get on with it*, and *prove* it?

2 CHRISTIANUS: Ah! You want to play the 'Proof Game'?

3 KATHERINE: Well, not *really*. But let's do it *anyway*. So we can put that *behind* us, and do *other*, more *enjoyable* things.

4 CHRISTIANUS: Right. But the problem is just that *immortality* proofs are very, very tricky. And time-consuming. And boring. And I'm also a little tired. So why don't we do something *easier*?

5 KATHERINE: What?

6 CHRISTIANUS: Do you have a piece of paper? And a pen?

7 KATHERINE: Sure.

8 CHRISTIANUS: Now, I want *you* to *prove* on that piece of paper that *you* are *mortal*.

9 KATHERINE: Are you kidding?

10 CHRISTIANUS: No. You can scribble *anything*
you like on that piece of paper to prove
to the reader, whoever he or she may be,
that you are mortal.

11 KATHERINE: Anything?

12 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. Whatever scientific or non-
scientific sentences, algorithms, phrases,
words, symbols, or representations you
can think of. And you can even draw
pictures and use music notation if you
like. So how would you then go about
proving, on that very piece of paper, that
you are mortal?

13 KATHERINE: Can I use a ‘direct proof’? With
a conclusion, and a couple of premises to
back it up? As I sometimes do in court?

14 CHRISTIANUS: Sure. As long as you can make
it *work*.

15 KATHERINE: So where do we start?

16 CHRISTIANUS: Well, first of all, let’s get your
conclusion up and running. What is it?

17 KATHERINE: How about ‘I am mortal’?

18 CHRISTIANUS: Well, Miss Miami, you’re on
the right track. But there is a problem.

19 KATHERINE: *What?*

20 CHRISTIANUS: Well, when *I* read that sen-
tence, I don’t think of *you*; rather, I think
of *me*. So you have to change it. Remem-

ber, what I asked you to do was to prove to *any* reader, that *you* are mortal. So the task is then *not* to prove that *the reader* is mortal — unless the reader is you yourself, of course. So you have to figure out a way to identify yourself, in *all* cases.

21 KATHERINE: So then I simply write ‘Katherine is mortal’.

22 CHRISTIANUS: It’s better. But *you* are not the *only* Katherine in the world, are you? One of my friends, for example, has a battery-operated *toy cat* called Katherine.

23 KATHERINE: Well, what if I identify myself as ‘that Katherine who was born in Miami thirty-four years ago’? And if *that* isn’t enough, I could also fill in some more details: the exact hospital, my mother’s name, the exact date, etc.

24 CHRISTIANUS: But why would I *believe* you? You can’t just *say* that you were born that date; that’s no *proof*. Then you could just *say* that you are mortal, and we wouldn’t have to bother with this whole thing. No, you have to *prove* it.

25 KATHERINE: But I can show you my birth certificate and my passport!

26 CHRISTIANUS: Birth certificates and passports are easy to buy on the black market, so I need not accept that those are yours.

And even if they *were* authentic, they also have the further defect that they are *not* on this white piece of paper. Remember, your proof must keep itself on *this* white paper here.

27 KATHERINE: Then what if I refer to myself as ‘that Katherine who is right now sitting next to Christianus in a café in London?’

28 CHRISTIANUS: But that would only be applicable another thirty minutes or so. How can it be a *real* proof if it is only applicable for another thirty minutes? I didn’t ask you to provide a proof that is valid *only* while your coffee is still warm, did I?

29 KATHERINE: No.

30 CHRISTIANUS: And there is of course also the identity problem. People’s bodies, including yours and mine, are always in a flux, since old cells are going and new cells are coming every second of the day. So how are you to *uniquely* identify yourself? Who, or what, *is* Katherine? Which cells are *you*, and which are *not* you? How many body parts can you have replaced and still be you?

31 KATHERINE: I am not sure.

32 CHRISTIANUS: Well, you can think about that until next time. Right now, we have *bigger* fish to fry.

- 33 KATHERINE: We do?
- 34 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. We need to haul in a pair of palatable premises. So we can cook ourselves a nice conclusion. Any suggestions?
- 35 KATHERINE: What about 'Katherine is a human being'?
- 36 CHRISTIANUS: OK, that's *one*. Do you have *another*?
- 37 KATHERINE: 'All human beings are mortal'.
- 38 CHRISTIANUS: Good. So then we conclude *what*?
- 39 KATHERINE: 'Katherine is mortal'.
- 40 CHRISTIANUS: Not bad. It's a deductively valid argument, at least according to the modern materialist way of doing logic.
- 41 KATHERINE: Thank you. I am glad I could do *something* right.
- 42 CHRISTIANUS: But the proposition 'All human beings are mortal' is of course problematic. *Validity* doesn't 'guarantee' *soundness*.
- 43 KATHERINE: It *does* ring a bell, but . . .
- 44 CHRISTIANUS: Well, *validity* does not 'guarantee' that your premises are *true*. It only

xiv:40, materialist . . . logic: When Christianus speaks of 'materialist logic' one probably should understand

this to be a reference to the kind of modernized Aristotelian philosophical logic that is taught at modern

‘guarantees’ that *if* your premises are true, *then* your conclusion is true. So you must also show that your premises really *are* true.

45 KATHERINE: So how do I prove that, say, ‘Katherine is a human being’ is true?

46 CHRISTIANUS: It’s not so easy. So to save time, let’s just quickly *accept* the idea that you *are* a human being. For now.

47 KATHERINE: Thank you! You are *most* generous!

48 CHRISTIANUS: Well, I *did* have my coffee and cream now!

49 KATHERINE: And some scones!

50 CHRISTIANUS: Yes, they were *really* good!

51 KATHERINE: I agree. So what’s next?

52 CHRISTIANUS: We need to revisit your problematic premise ‘All human beings are mortal’.

53 KATHERINE: What’s wrong with it?

54 CHRISTIANUS: Well, first of all we need to understand what ‘is mortal’ *means*. So if I claimed that it means, roughly, ‘must die’, would you then object?

universities, whether of an ‘informal’ (arguments expressed using natural languages) or ‘formal’ (arguments ex-

pressed using logical symbols) character.

55 KATHERINE: No.

56 CHRISTIANUS: Good. And just to confirm: you
are not dead yet, are you?

57 KATHERINE: No. I am alive and *bored* in Lon-
don, England.

58 CHRISTIANUS: Ha ha! Yes, right! But then we
have a problem.

59 KATHERINE: Why? Because I'm *bored*?

60 CHRISTIANUS: Ha ha! Yes! And because you're
alive.

61 KATHERINE: I don't follow.

62 CHRISTIANUS: Well, according to *your* non-
sense nothingness scenario, you can only
be really *alive* and *bored* when you are
in a *physical* body, not otherwise. Right,
Miss Nothing Hill?

63 KATHERINE: Of course.

64 CHRISTIANUS: So, according to your not-so-
nothingnessless speculation, you cannot
be *dead* yet.

65 KATHERINE: Right.

66 CHRISTIANUS: So it follows that your proposi-
tion 'All human beings are mortal' is not
proven.

67 KATHERINE: How so?

68 CHRISTIANUS: Only if *all* human beings really
are mortal will that proposition really be

true.

69 KATHERINE: Sure. So?

70 CHRISTIANUS: But all human beings have not died yet. Including you and me and a few billion more. So we have to wait and see. Until we have scientifically *verified* that all humans actually *do* die in an orderly fashion, the proposition 'All human beings are mortal' is just an unproven assumption.

71 KATHERINE: But surely all human beings have *hitherto* died?

72 CHRISTIANUS: How do you *know* that? *For sure?* Have you personally witnessed the individual lives of *everyone* in the history of mankind and seen that they all died?

73 KATHERINE: No.

74 CHRISTIANUS: Or have you found some secret public records with authentic and comprehensive lists of all human beings that ever lived on this planet, that verify that they are all dead by now?

75 KATHERINE: No.

76 CHRISTIANUS: And is the fact that most modern Western countries have extensive birth records for their citizens a *guarantee* that there are no *unregistered* illegal immigrants roaming about in the bushes, whose ages and whereabouts are *not*

tracked?

77 KATHERINE: No.

78 CHRISTIANUS: So there is no *proof* that they all die. In other words, the fact that *some*, or even *most*, human beings die is no *proof* that *some other* beings, born in another time and place and superficially *looking like* human beings, *also* will die. After all, perhaps some miraculous Darwinism has evolved some of us into immortals by now?

79 KATHERINE: Aren't you a little unfair?

80 CHRISTIANUS: Unfair?

81 KATHERINE: Yes. To Darwin and his followers.

82 CHRISTIANUS: Would it have been better if I said 'non-miraculous'?

83 KATHERINE: No.

84 CHRISTIANUS: Katherine: *Our* discussion is about *rigid proofs*. It's *not* about any pseudo-scientific Darwinian speculations.

85 KATHERINE: Are you serious?

86 CHRISTIANUS: Absolutely. I am trying to make a very strong point. What *you* originally asked for was *proof*, nothing else. Proof is not just obtained by arguing positively or passionately for something, or being 'well informed' and having a thousand loosely linked arguments in your pocket.

Really *proving* something is to establish a conclusion in a very strict and rigid manner. So what is required for a proof is *not* just some sloppy statistics, or some casual ‘common sense’ argument, or some ‘general trends’, or some ill-chosen analogy, or some cheap rhetoric or theatrics; it’s something *much* more demanding.

87 KATHERINE: OK.

88 CHRISTIANUS: So when I said that I wanted *proof* that *you* are mortal on this piece of paper, I *knew* that it would be practically impossible for you to produce it. And so far you *haven’t* proved it. But maybe you want another stab at it?

89 KATHERINE: No. I think it might be too difficult.

90 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. But *why* do you think it’s too difficult?

91 KATHERINE: There are so many things.

92 CHRISTIANUS: Yes, there are. But one difficulty is, of course, related to the conclusion itself: for in order to really *prove* that *you* are mortal, you first have to die *yourself*.

93 KATHERINE: Yes, I see what you’re driving at: it’s my *personal* dying that constitutes the ultimate proof that I am mortal.

94 CHRISTIANUS: Exactly. But that’s not an unsolvable problem on its own: after all, it

is quite possible — both in principle and in practice — to execute such a demonstration: you can either kill *yourself*, or you can ask *someone else* to do it for you.

95 KATHERINE: Yes. But I don't want to die *like that*.

96 CHRISTIANUS: Sure, I can understand that. So your *life* is actually more important to you than the *proof* is?

97 KATHERINE: *Absolutely*. Proofs are just little *plays*; but my own life is real and precious.

98 CHRISTIANUS: Yes, that's how many people feel.

99 KATHERINE: So *now* what?

100 CHRISTIANUS: One option is that we *first* decide to skip these boring proofs, and *then* order some more coffee and some of those *fantastic* home-baked blueberry muffins.

101 KATHERINE: And the *other*?

102 CHRISTIANUS: That we *first* order, and *then* decide to skip all talk about these boring proofs. That way we will get our coffee and muffins *quicker*.

103 KATHERINE: Sounds even better!

104 CHRISTIANUS: So let's order!

SCENE XV.

The Okefenokee Man-Monster

1 KATHERINE: Ahhhh! These blueberry muffins
are *sensational!* I can't *believe* how good
they are!

2 CHRISTIANUS: I know. That's why I come here
a lot.

3 KATHERINE: I would too. It's a no-brainer.

4 CHRISTIANUS: Yes.

5 KATHERINE: But I have a question. And it's
not about any proofs.

6 CHRISTIANUS: I hope not. Only a *madman*
would spend more than ten minutes on
those!

7 KATHERINE: So what about that Okefenokee
Monster story you mentioned at the piz-
za place? I need some *light* entertainment
now.

8 CHRISTIANUS: Ah, yes! Oki! He's low-key! And
organically home-grown in Florida, just
like you and your orange juice.

9 KATHERINE: Sounds good!

10 CHRISTIANUS: Which means it's time for the
body-bomb again. Remember?

11 KATHERINE: Unfortunately, yes.

- 12 CHRISTIANUS: And what about my response
to your death-and-nothingness scenario?
How to better 'handle' the body-bomb?
- 13 KATHERINE: Sorry. I don't remember all the
details.
- 14 CHRISTIANUS: Hmm. Well, it was based on
the idea that we are non-material spirit
souls *using* our material bodies as in-
struments. And when our bodies die we
simply continue our business elsewhere,
without losing our 'core' individuality,
perception, or ability to *experience* things
and *do* things.
- 15 KATHERINE: That *does* ring a bell.
- 16 CHRISTIANUS: And then I said that this was
a *better* theory than yours. For not only
may it help us *minimize* our death anx-
ieties in *this* life; it may also help us ex-
perience *much more* satisfaction in *future*
lives.
- 17 KATHERINE: But what does this have to do
with Oki?

xv:10, the body-bomb: The 'body-bomb' is a condition that all human beings are subject too. See SCENE XI ('The Body-Bomb') in *KQQ* (Klintberg 2008a, pp. 65–71; ref. *supra*, note 'you're late' at 1:1).

xv:14, bodies as instruments: The idea is presumably that the spirit soul is the

real living entity, and that he or she (i.e., the spirit soul) only temporarily, here in this (material) world, has entered into a (material) body, and *uses* it to act. This situation may be compared to the one in which twenty-first century commuting men and women enter into the body of a subway train,

18 CHRISTIANUS: Well, John is a friend of mine
who is a professional stage actor. And he
usually plays the Okefenokee Monster
in the late afternoons at the local theatre
here, before a crowd of *very* enthusiastic
six-year-olds and their slightly less en-
thusiastic parents.

19 KATHERINE: So it's a play for kids?

20 CHRISTIANUS: No. But most grown-ups sim-
ply prefer to *view* it like that. So they *don't*
have to bother trying to *understand* it.

21 KATHERINE: Right.

22 CHRISTIANUS: But it's not easy playing Oki.

23 KATHERINE: How come?

24 CHRISTIANUS: For in order to *enter into* that
swampy Floridian personality and give
a truly *credible* performance, John must
always put on that same heavy, smelly,
sweaty costume before he goes on stage.

25 KATHERINE: Oh my God!

26 CHRISTIANUS: And it may even be *someone*
else's sweat!

bus, or car for the purpose of reaching a particular destination, after which they exit it — an experience that, in virtue of the repeated, prolonged time they spend in that vehicle, sometimes conditions them to think of that transportation instrument as 'theirs', even though they may not (ever) legally own it (e.g.,

'Here comes my bus!').

For more on (material) bodies as instruments, see SCENE XII ('The Cartesian Theatre') and SCENE XIII ('Radha's Microscope') in *KQQ* (Klinterberg 2008a, pp. 72–82; ref. *supra*, note 'you're *late*' at 1:1).

27 KATHERINE: Ueah!

28 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. But he still manages to do
it every time, even though the costume is
so incredibly inconvenient to wear. And
the kids *love* it, of course!

29 KATHERINE: And?

30 CHRISTIANUS: And when the play is over, John
steps out of that dreadful, heavy, smelly
suit, leaves the theatre, and returns to his
real life.

31 KATHERINE: In other words, John dresses and
undresses. So what?

32 CHRISTIANUS: First of all, John does *not* think
that he *is* the monster; he knows that he
just *plays* that role some afternoons. It's
his *temporary job* to enter into that Oki
outfit. Until he gets something *better*.

33 KATHERINE: So he *plays* the monster, but
meanwhile experiences some demanding
working conditions. Doesn't sound very
shocking!

34 CHRISTIANUS: Maybe *you* don't think so; but I
can assure you that *the kids* are *screaming*
with fear whenever he goes on stage!

35 KATHERINE: I am *sure* they are. When are kids
not screaming? Do you have a conclusion?

36 CHRISTIANUS: Yes, of course. John does *not*
spend his days *worrying* about that he

later in the evening will finally *step out* of his warm and uncomfortable monster costume. For he doesn't consider it *a loss* to toss it away, but a true blessing.

37 KATHERINE: I would too.

38 CHRISTIANUS: Similarly, turning to our own lives, if we just view our own bodies as costumes, with our real selves inside, we will be in a *much* better satisfaction-position than in your unsatisfying, soul-less scenario.

39 KATHERINE: Why?

40 CHRISTIANUS: Well, even if we *know* that our body-bombs are ticking and that our bodies eventually *will* have to go, we have little reason *to worry* about their departure.

41 KATHERINE: We do?

42 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. If our bodies are nothing but *costumes*, then departing from them will not cause us to *lose* our true individual selves *or* our abilities to experience and do things; on the contrary, their departure will *reveal* our real spiritual super-natures. Thus, when our current performances are over, we should, just like John, simply be very happy to step out of our smelly costumes, so that we can return to our *real life* somewhere else.

43 KATHERINE: But what if the body-bomb explodes and John is *in* the costume at that very time?

44 CHRISTIANUS: In a typical play, is the actor *really* killed on stage when his character *seemingly* gets a dagger in his chest?

45 KATHERINE: No.

46 CHRISTIANUS: So then it's just part of the play.

47 KATHERINE: Which means?

48 CHRISTIANUS: When your own body-bomb goes off, *you* the actor, *you* the observer, *you* the spirit soul, *you* the self, do not die.

49 KATHERINE: You keep *saying* that, but I don't buy it. I mean, if someone gets a *dagger* in the chest, and the dagger is a *fake* one with some kind of push-sensitive and self-contracting blade, then it would be *believable* to think that the actor inside the costume is not hurt. But how could he be alive in the case of an *explosion*?

50 CHRISTIANUS: Yes, explosions are always difficult to fake really well. As Hollywood knows, it's hard to make them believable, *without* also hurting the actors or the crew at the same time, especially if it's done without any computer graphics. But as Hollywood *also* knows, 'difficult' doesn't mean 'impossible'; just look at ILM.

51 KATHERINE: ILM?

52 CHRISTIANUS: Industrial Light and Magic —
one of the first special-effects companies.
So we just have to use our imagination a
little. There are so many possibilities.

53 KATHERINE: OK. Shoot.

54 CHRISTIANUS: Let's go back to the final swamp
scene. This is where the handsome David
mistakenly stabs the ugly but curiously
kind Okefenokee Monster to death with a
shiny dagger, whereupon Oki falls, seem-
ingly thoroughly and irreversibly dead.

55 KATHERINE: What does *that* have to do with
any explosions?

56 CHRISTIANUS: Please be patient. I am coming
to that.

57 KATHERINE: OK.

58 CHRISTIANUS: Now, let's rewrite that scene so
that Oki is *not* killed by a dagger, but by
a powerful explosion instead, to really
shake the audience up and produce an
ending they will never forget.

59 KATHERINE: But should we really do that in
front of all the kids?

60 CHRISTIANUS: Absolutely! The sooner, the
better! It's part of their real, live 'pre-
pare-yourself-for-death-NOW' educa-
tion. They need to see some serious

alternatives to all those wishy-washy performances they experience watching their favourite, establishment-controlled TV shows. It's good for them to see more live explosions and deaths, so that they will start inquiring about what it means in terms of their own life. There's no time to lose. Kids die every day.

61 KATHERINE: But don't you think their parents will object?

62 CHRISTIANUS: I think we can handle an objection or two, if they should feel so inclined. And scandals are always good for the play economy, in any case.

63 KATHERINE: All right.

64 CHRISTIANUS: So how should we proceed with our explosive plot? Any ideas?

65 KATHERINE: What do *you* have?

66 CHRISTIANUS: Would it be all right if the explosion cut off the monster's head in a more or less *clean* way, so that it just dropped to the ground near his left foot, with the blood *slowly* pouring out along his left side? Or would you rather that his head exploded more like some New Year's Eve

xv:73, super-kapha: In Ayurveda, persons having a *kapha* bodily constitution normally are 'blessed with a strong, healthy, well-developed body'

but 'generally have a slow digestion and metabolism' (Lad 1998, p. 25).

For more information about the *kapha* bodily constitution in ayurvedic

crackers, followed by some high-pressure fountain of blood coming up from his aorta region? What do you think?

67 KATHERINE: I *hate* blood!

68 CHRISTIANUS: But it keeps you alive. How can you *hate* it?

69 KATHERINE: I get sick.

70 CHRISTIANUS: Well, you have to get over it. And the blood I am talking about is not real anyway. Think of it as ketchup, if you like. It doesn't matter. It's a theatre production. So, what say you?

71 KATHERINE: OK, then. I think the second scenario might be more *striking* from a dramatic standpoint; but it's *much* messier: it will be blood *absolutely everywhere*, including on the audience. Also, sometimes *too* much blood, gushing out too quickly, is *less* believable. So I would vote for scenario one: I think it's shocking enough for the audience to see Oki's head pop off in clean way, with the blood pouring *slowly* down Oki's left side.

72 CHRISTIANUS: I think so too.

73 KATHERINE: And it also fits much better

medicine, see also note 'mostly *kapha*' at 1:51 in *KQQ* (Klintberg 2008a, pp. 6–7; ref. *supra*, note 'you're *late*' at 1:1) and note '*kapha* constitution' at 111:39

in *KQQ* (Klintberg 2008a, p. 18).

VASANT D. LAD (1998), *The Complete Book of Ayurvedic Home Remedies*. New York: Three Rivers Press.

with Oki's super-*kapha* temperament: he *thinks* slowly, *talks* slowly, and *walks* slowly; so why wouldn't he also *bleed* slowly?

74 CHRISTIANUS: *Brilliant* analysis! Then it's settled. Scenario *one!*

75 KATHERINE: Yes.

76 CHRISTIANUS: And while we're at it, do we need to add any *other* flying parts? Maybe his right arm could fall off too, so that there would be some blood also on his *right-hand* side? Wouldn't that be better, aesthetically speaking? I always hear that having the right *colour balance* is so important.

77 KATHERINE: Well, I am not an art director or production designer. But I just feel that we already have enough explosions and blood.

78 CHRISTIANUS: All right, you decide. But how shall we prepare the plot so that Oki's head will end up on his *left* side? Must we then not arrange an explosion on his *right* side? But if we do *that*, will not all his blood also end up on his *right-hand* side, instead of on his left, as we planned before?

79 KATHERINE: Yes, that's a worry. But maybe we can live with that?

80 CHRISTIANUS: Sure. It's not bad.

81 KATHERINE: No, it's not.

82 CHRISTIANUS: So maybe we can have the bomb hidden in a necklace, or something? Maybe Cassandra, who is an ex Vegas lion tamer, and perhaps even previously involved with Roy and his tiger, now has given the necklace as a gift to Oki to let him think that she cares about him? But secretly, of course, Cassandra just prepares to assassinate him.

83 KATHERINE: Ah! It's devilishly devious! But where did David the daggerman go? Is he expunged from the final scene?

84 CHRISTIANUS: Well, I can't really use David's skill-set in the last scene; after all, he's a daggerist, not an explosionist! So I need to let *Cassandra* do the *really* dirty work. She's *much* more witchy, cunning and scheming than the handsome, courageous David *ever* could be.

85 KATHERINE: You are certainly right! Character really *is* everything. As you always say.

86 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. And, just to be sure: you are *still* having a hard time accepting that the actor still may be alive after such a staged explosion?

87 KATHERINE: Yes.

88 CHRISTIANUS: All right. Before John leaves the

dressing room, Maria the makeup artist always applies some special matte black paint on his face, being *especially* careful not to forget his eyelids. A few moments later, after the paint has dried, he puts on a black fire-safe dress, including a hood, similar to the ones that professional racing drivers use when they race on Daytona. And then he jumps into the Oki costume itself, prepared to go.

89 KATHERINE: So what happens on stage, then? Is he really ready for a decapitation?

90 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. When Cassandra detonates Oki's necklace bomb with her remote control unit hidden in her cigarette case, the necklace really *does* explode as it should. But it is only a *very* small explosion.

91 KATHERINE: So how could *that* make any impression on the audience?

92 CHRISTIANUS: Since John's wireless mike is close by, it easily picks up the sound and amplifies it to a much bigger *boom* than it really was. Simultaneously, the Oki costume is rigged in such a way that the Oki head, which has a hinge on its lower *left* side, flips up from the right, over John's head, and down on his left side, still hanging on the hinge, upside down. Then John just pushes a switch inside his

suit to manually release the Oki head, making it fall to the floor.

93 KATHERINE: So then the Oki head goes where it should. But what about the blood on the right hand side?

94 CHRISTIANUS: Well, the explosion also triggered the blood bags inside Oki's costume. So the blood is flowing very nicely along his right-hand side.

95 KATHERINE: But what about *John's* head? Is it still there?

96 CHRISTIANUS: Of course. And his *face* too. But it's very dark, since he has both the black hood and the black face paint on. Also, the lighting technician doesn't have a spot on Oki when it explodes; it's on Cassandra.

97 KATHERINE: What else?

98 CHRISTIANUS: Well, it's important to understand that the last scene is set in a very dark environment. Maybe it's a coal mine, or something. So John's head is not visible as a silhouette either.

99 KATHERINE: And?

100 CHRISTIANUS: You must also remember that John will be instructed to close his eyes as soon as the bomb goes off; and because of his black-painted eyelids, his eyes will, from where the audience sits,

almost magically appear to disappear.

101 KATHERINE: I'm sorry, but I'm not convinced.

102 CHRISTIANUS: Why not?

103 KATHERINE: Well, the apparent disappearance of John's eyes was *almost* believable. But I didn't like the explosion part. I thought it sounded unrealistic that John's face was so close to Oki's necklace. I don't think he could have survived that explosion without any injury, even *with* that hood and everything.

104 CHRISTIANUS: Maybe you are right. But what if he had a Kevlar body-armour under the Oki outfit? Wouldn't that cover it?

105 KATHERINE: Perhaps. But there's still another detail that I am not completely satisfied with.

106 CHRISTIANUS: Which one?

107 KATHERINE: Well, even if the spotlight isn't *directly* on John's face, it will still be possible for those sitting in the front rows to see it. So I would very much like to have *no* face there at all, not even a black-painted one. How can we do that?

108 CHRISTIANUS: It's easy. We'll just have to call Andrew!

109 KATHERINE: What's his specialty?

- 110 CHRISTIANUS: He comes when I call him.
- 111 KATHERINE: Great. But what does he *do*?
- 112 CHRISTIANUS: He always puts on a good show.
You'll see.
- 113 KATHERINE: I will?
- 114 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. When the script is done.
And when we are ready to show it to
you.
- 115 KATHERINE: So you're not ready?
- 116 CHRISTIANUS: I *am* ready. To *leave*. I am very,
very tired.
- 117 KATHERINE: Sure. But what about just a few
minutes summing up?
- 118 CHRISTIANUS: All right. Just a few minutes,
then. But let's go outside. I need some
fresh air!
- 119 KATHERINE: Me too.
- 120 CHRISTIANUS: After you!

SCENE XVI.

Some Conclusive Costume Talk

1 CHRISTIANUS: Ah, *there* it is! The ‘Monster
Cookies’ sign! How did I *miss* it?

2 KATHERINE: Maybe because you were so *late*?

3 CHRISTIANUS: Maybe.

4 KATHERINE: OK. So what can we conclude?

5 CHRISTIANUS: Well, one thing is this. The fact
that the Oki *costume* has been found to
lie lifeless in the dressing room one morn-
ing is no proof that *Oki* will not return
on stage in the late afternoon. For if *John*
can’t make it, his stand-in James usually
always *can*.

6 KATHERINE: Anything else?

7 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. The fact that the Oki *cos-
tume* has been found to lie lifeless in the
dressing room one morning is also no
proof that John does not *live*; for John is
just not *in* the costume at that particular
time.

8 KATHERINE: But he *could* be dead.

9 CHRISTIANUS: Sure, he *could* be. But it seems
unnatural to assume that he is dead *just*
from the fact that he is not in the Oki
costume *in the morning time*.

10 KATHERINE: Why?

11 CHRISTIANUS: Because John is one of the lead actors; and he comes and goes every day. But he *never* comes before lunch. So it's nothing *abnormal* or *unnatural* about the fact that the Oki costume can be found to lie lifeless in the dressing room in the *morning time*; it *always* does! John just likes to sleep in.

12 KATHERINE: So what is the 'moral' of this analogy, if there *is* one? Should I think, whenever I see a dead body, that the dead body is actually just a costume?

13 CHRISTIANUS: Yes, at least if you want to do it the *satisfactionist* way. And there's more.

14 KATHERINE: More?

15 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. It's not just when you see a *dead* body that you should think 'costume'; you should think 'costume' when you see *any* body — lifeless *or* animated.

16 KATHERINE: Your theory is a little hard to digest; it sounds very unscientific.

17 CHRISTIANUS: *Of course* it's unscientific; it's built on a *play!* Why would scientists be interested in talking about such things?

18 KATHERINE: Don't ask *me!*

19 CHRISTIANUS: You have to try to understand things without being *attached* to mate-

rialist theories. You have to see things in such a way that you can enable your *personal* satisfaction. In other words, if you're not *satisfied* with *other* people's theories and world-views, then just throw them out!

20 KATHERINE: So if I am not satisfied with *your* theory, why should I adopt it?

21 CHRISTIANUS: I am not talking about the *mind's* satisfaction; I am talking about the *spirit soul's* satisfaction. The *self*.

22 KATHERINE: What are you saying?

23 CHRISTIANUS: I am saying that the greatest enemy to *real* satisfaction and to self-realization is your own mind. It always wants to argue. So you have to put it in place, so that you can start your satisfaction journey.

24 KATHERINE: How?

25 CHRISTIANUS: We just did it, right? The Mortality Proof. Where we both clearly saw that you could not *prove* that you are a mortal *before* you are dead.

xvi:34, No, I'm not: Katherine here not only seems to struggle against the idea of being ostrich-like, but also against the idea of going to the London Zoo — an attitude that Christianus *also* could have identified as being remarkably similar to the behaviour of certain ostriches.

For after that popular ostrich at the Regent's Park Zoological Gardens was 'loved to death' in 1873 and a dissection of it showed that it had 'met its end by twenty-one penny pieces which it could not digest, although it was an ostrich' (Walford 1878, p. 286), there was a sud-

26 KATHERINE: Well . . .

27 CHRISTIANUS: And then, using your cold-hearted *nothingness* scenario, we saw that you could not do it *after* you are dead, either.

28 KATHERINE: Cold-hearted?

29 CHRISTIANUS: So the conclusion is that your *nothingness* scenario is *useless*.

30 KATHERINE: Not to me.

31 CHRISTIANUS: That's only because you don't want to *see* the truth. You're one of those ostriches at the Zoo.

32 KATHERINE: No, I'm not.

33 CHRISTIANUS: Or *on the way* to the Zoo, then.

34 KATHERINE: *No*, I'm not.

35 CHRISTIANUS: Of course you are. You don't want to jeopardize your girlish little dreams about a cute little life, as a cute little wife of a cute little knight, whose fearless fight on a moonlit night made all your freight go out of sight.

den shortage of ostriches. So when the Prince of Wales returned to England from his India adventures in the spring of 1876, he brought with him 'three large ostriches' (Wheeler 1876, p. 363; ref. *supra*, note 'Monday' at 111:105), all of which seemingly ended up at the Zo-

ological Society's Gardens (*ILN* 1876h, p. 367; *ILN* 1876i, p. 518).

But those ostriches had not been very co-operative to get there. Just getting them on board the *Serapis* proved to be difficult, when that ship had anchored off Aden to take in two hundred tons of

- 36 KATHERINE: How poetic.
- 37 CHRISTIANUS: Thank you. So here's the deal.
If you adopt *my* scenario, you *can* verify
that you once *were* a mortal. For when
you leave your body at the time of death,
you *can* see, with your spiritual senses
and consciousness, your dead, cold, life-
less body lying there, whether on the op-
erating table, or under a 24-foot truck in
the middle of the road.
- 38 KATHERINE: Don't *talk* like that!
- 39 CHRISTIANUS: Why not? Does it go badly with
your chic Gucci bag? Or your colourful
haute couture Chanel dress?
- 40 KATHERINE: I *love* my handbag and my dress.
Unlike *your* outfit, *mine* has style.
- 41 CHRISTIANUS: I just have a *different* one.
- 42 KATHERINE: There is no doubt about *that!*
- 43 CHRISTIANUS: In any case, my *scenario* is *much*
more attractive than yours.

coal on Sunday, 19 March 1876 (Wheeler 1876, p. 363). As seen in the front-page illustration in the *Illustrated London News* called 'The Royal Visit to India: The Voyage Home – Getting Ostriches on Board at Aden' (*ILN* 1876g, p. 337), *four* sailors were needed to carry *one* hard-struggling ostrich up the ladder to the ship with 'considerable difficulty' (Wheeler 1876, p. 363); and there is no indication that

the other two were any less 'huge' or 'struggling' (*ILN* 1876g, p. 354).

ILLUSTRATED LONDON NEWS (1876g), Saturday, 8 April 1876, vol. 68, no. 1915.

ILLUSTRATED LONDON NEWS (1876h), Saturday, 15 April 1876, vol. 68, no. 1916.

ILLUSTRATED LONDON NEWS (1876i), Saturday, 27 May 1876, vol. 68, no. 1922.

EDWARD WALFORD (1878), *Old and New London. A Narrative of Its History, Its*

- 44 KATHERINE: Why? It's not *the least* romantic or colourful.
- 45 CHRISTIANUS: Yours isn't either. In *your* scenario, *you* cannot *ever* verify *anything* about your own mortality, neither before death nor after. But in *my* scenario, I can *directly* verify, with my own spiritual consciousness, as soon as I am dead, that I once *was* a mortal.
- 46 KATHERINE: So what does that *prove*?
- 47 CHRISTIANUS: It doesn't prove anything *conclusively*, on its own, of course, just as *any* argument doesn't prove anything conclusively on its own — other than, perhaps, that it was possible to *formulate* that argument. So it strongly *indicates*, in conjunction with *other* pieces of information, that my scenario is more *real* than yours, since one can actually *know more* about oneself and one's body.
- 48 KATHERINE: But what if I am blind? What if I

People, and its Places, vol. 6: *The Western and Northern Suburbs*. Illustrated with numerous engravings from the most authentic sources. London, Paris & New York: Cassell Petter & Galpin.

xvi:47, scenario . . . more real: Christianus's point is apparently about 'reality' and the *possibility* of knowledge. He seems to suggest that the degree of 'realness' of a

scenario is related to the (presumably gradualistic) level of knowledge (or potential knowledge) that one may have of objects in that scenario. So, for example, if an individual potentially can have *more* knowledge of the body from a spiritual 'body-and-soul' scenario than from a purely material 'body-but-no-soul' scenario, then, potentially, the spiritual scenario would be more 'real' than the purely material one.

can't *see*?

49 CHRISTIANUS: Why would you be blind *after*
death? Why would John be blind *after* he
takes off his Okefenokee monster suit?
Who would be foolish enough to hire a
blind actor?

50 KATHERINE: No, no. I mean blind *here*, on
earth. Now. In *this* life.

51 CHRISTIANUS: How do you mean?

52 KATHERINE: If I were blind since birth, and
the sky were blue, I would never be able
to prove, with my own perception, that
the sky *is* blue. Why, then, would I *there-*
fore have to conclude that the sky is *not*
blue?

53 CHRISTIANUS: You wouldn't.

54 KATHERINE: I *wouldn't*?

55 CHRISTIANUS: Well, since you *are* a little *neti-*
neti philosopher, maybe you *would*. But
I wouldn't, that's for sure.

56 KATHERINE: Why not?

57 CHRISTIANUS: All people are not blind, are
they?

58 KATHERINE: No, they aren't.

59 CHRISTIANUS: So some people — in fact *most*
people — *will* be able to confirm by their
own, direct perception that the sky *is*
blue. If it really *is* blue, that is.

60 KATHERINE: OK?

61 CHRISTIANUS: So the proposition 'the sky is blue' *can* be verified in a very direct manner by those who are *not* blind.

62 KATHERINE: But?

63 CHRISTIANUS: But, in your nothingness scenario, the proposition 'I am mortal' can *never* be directly verified *by anyone*. So that scenario is extremely unsatisfying, from an aesthetic point of view.

64 KATHERINE: So you're saying?

65 CHRISTIANUS: You must *abandon* your nothingness scenario.

66 KATHERINE: I don't *want* to.

67 CHRISTIANUS: Sure. But do you have a choice?

68 KATHERINE: How do you mean?

69 CHRISTIANUS: Well, if you want to be unreasonable, you can. Is *that* your brilliant plan?

70 KATHERINE: No.

71 CHRISTIANUS: Or *unintelligent*?

72 KATHERINE: Of course not.

73 CHRISTIANUS: Or *unhappy*, then?

74 KATHERINE: No. But can't we meet tomorrow to talk more about this?

75 CHRISTIANUS: No, I have Wendy.

76 KATHERINE: Oh, right. What about Sunday?

77 CHRISTIANUS: Sorry. Sunday is Sandy-day.

78 KATHERINE: Sandy?

79 CHRISTIANUS: Yes. She's a *really* nice girl. Very
co-operative. And sexy.

80 KATHERINE: So when *do* you have time? Mon-
day? Tuesday?

81 CHRISTIANUS: No, probably not until the end
of the week.

82 KATHERINE: What about Thursday, then?

83 CHRISTIANUS: Maybe. Email me on Wednes-
day, and we'll see. OK?

84 KATHERINE: OK.

85 CHRISTIANUS: But I have to run now.

86 KATHERINE: Sure. Bye!

87 CHRISTIANUS: Bye.

ISSN 1654-6296 (print) · ISSN 1654-6318 (online)

<http://www.philosophicalplays.com>