
The “Real” Rules of Dixonary



The last official revision of the rules of Dixonary was published on CompuServe by Anders R. Sterner on 4 January 1990, 6 months to the day after the game began. This rulebook is both an unofficial revision of those rules and a compilation of the accumulated precedent by which the game is currently played.

Copyright © 1990 by Anders R. Sterner and others.
Copyright © 2005 by Paul Keating.

The game itself is to be found at
<http://groups.google.com/group/Dixonary>

You can find the latest version of this document at
<http://www.dixonary.net/game-rules-and-advice/rules>
You can find the 1990 rules at the same location.

Document Revision 360.



Introduction

These rules describe the game as it is played in 2015, as opposed to the way it was played in 1989, which is what you will find in the official rules that were last published in 1990. In the intervening twenty-five years a body of precedent has been built up which players are expected—somehow—to know. Much of this precedent is old; most of it refines on the rules; some of it downright contradicts them.

To a new arrival, Dixonary players seem like a band of scofflaws, applying the rules they like and ignoring the ones they don't, and generally making things up as they go along. But appearances can be deceptive, and the rules are in fact quite rigid. They just haven't been written down lately. Except, and entirely unofficially, here.

This is hard on new players. These rules are for them, especially when they have to deal for the first time, and conscientiously read the 1990 rules, only to discover they have been playing a rather different game.

Despite these rules' being unofficial, you will not get into trouble if you play as if they *were* official. At the end of each rule is the number of the corresponding 1990 rule; or ∞ if there isn't one: in which case, the rule may cite the round that gives the earliest precedent known to me, like this: ∞ (1825).

A preamble set the 1990 rules the goal of sparing the newcomer embarrassment. But strictly following some of the 1990 rules now may provoke a sharp rebuke. And so these "real" rules take up that worthy goal.

Interspersed between the actual rules you will find italicized *comments*, which report precedent, with every effort to be impartial. A disagreement with the 1990 rules is marked ×. Round numbers appear where possible, but old precedent for accepted practice, though I may clearly remember it, has sometimes proved hard to confirm from the redacted message store.

On first reading, *skip the comments*. You really only need to read them if you need help interpreting the rule.

The modifications presented here to the 1990 rules are as follows. These rules strictly follow the current order of play. There are minor verbal alterations to take account of precedent. Wordiness has been simplified; drastically so in the scoring rules. New rules are provided for situations the 1990 rules do not cover, such as withdrawn words, interrupted rounds and dealer points. Redundant rules have been docked. Whimsy, opinion, mathematical error, and remarks that disagree with current practice, have been demoted to comments, or removed altogether. Explicit references to obsolete software have been recast.

Despite the modifications (which, to my regret, made renumbering the rules unavoidable) the rules laid out here are **procedurally identical** to the corresponding 1990 rules, as far as they go: at least, that is my earnest



intention. Please read both again, and any comments, before concluding otherwise.



Start of Round and Choice of Word

1. Da Winnah of the last round is the dealer of, and cannot play in, the current round. 1

(a) The dealer begins the round by selecting from a trustworthy source a word the players are not likely to know (“The Word”), and posting it publicly as a group message. 1(a)

Communication delays (608), dealer error (2505), or plain carelessness (2477), may result in two players each considering that the obligation to deal has fallen to them. The first player to successfully publish The Word is the dealer of the new round, even if the scoring rules and the timestamps of competing announcements would impose dealership on the other (1668 & 1768). ×

The source is usually a dictionary, but encyclopædias (1544) and magazine articles discussing recent coinages (1524) have also been used.

Players expect that the source will be an English-language source†. It may cite words borrowed from other languages: such words are always allowed, even if they would be italicized in running English text (2523).

Some players regard phrontistery.info (1829) and wiktionary.org (1756) as untrustworthy. You can ward off criticism by finding corroboration elsewhere.

Be on your guard against proposing a “word” that is in reality not an attested word at all, but a copyright trap (554). These are to be found in respectable dictionaries (1813), and so do not in themselves render the source unreliable (2002).

Words with multiple meanings cause trouble because players may know one definition but not others, and the trouble is compounded if the dealer does not post all of the definitions given in the source. Experienced dealers recommend that both kinds of trouble are best avoided (649).

(b) If Da Winnah fails to announce The Word within 24 hours, the obligation to deal falls to a substitute selected by the reapplication of Rules 9(b)–9(c) to the remaining players in the previous round. 1(c)

Players may announce beforehand that there will be a specified delay in dealing the new round should they win. This is not regarded as failure to announce the new word (2549).

† During a brief experiment (1120–1166), the game admitted words taken from dictionaries of other languages. Three Dutch words were played before the experiment was formally ended.



A few players think that 24 hours is too short (1668), but it is generally accepted that flexible interpretation of this rule would render it useless.

When a substitute is selected in this way, it is considered sporting for Da Winnah to volunteer to deal in the substitute's place in a later round (1657). ×

(c) When posting The Word, the dealer specifies an email address to which definitions should be sent, and a deadline for submitting them (for *deadline* see Rule 13). 3(a)

(d) A player may point out that The Word has been played in a previous round (311), or the dealer may receive an unacceptably large number of DQs (for *DQ* see Rule 5) (111). In this case, the dealer withdraws The Word and announces a substitute word (whereafter "The Word"), under the same round number as the withdrawn word; and may set a new deadline. ☒

Most dealers will proceed with a word if there are only one or two DQs, and few will proceed if there are five or more (755). The proportion of DQs counts more than absolute numbers: if the first two submitters DQ, or even two out of the first four or five, then a dealer may choose to start over without waiting for more (2527).

It is not unknown for there to be a series of substitutes in a round (443).

When a substitute word is posted, most dealers treat a definition already received as applying to the substitute word, unless its author provides another. But some dealers consider the round to have started afresh and do not reuse definitions unless asked (1869). So it is best to be explicit about which line you are taking. ×

(e) If a dealer is prevented from completing a round, the players may declare a redeal, and a new dealer then: either volunteers; or is selected by the reapplication of Rules 9(b)–9(c) to the remaining players in the previous round. The new dealer announces The Word afresh, under the same round number as the interrupted deal. ☒ (1938 & 1944)

Submitting Definitions

2. Players then send the dealer their fictitious definitions of The Word privately by email. 3

(a) As a courtesy to the dealer, players should include the round number, or the word, or both, in the subject line of the email. 3(c)

In the 1990 rules this is a recommendation ("should"), but it is now generally regarded as obligatory, not optional. Dealers routinely set up message filters



to handle game messages, and ignoring this rule may cause a filter to bypass the message. Dealers have been known to regard this as the player's fault.

Rule 1(c) further implies that the dealer is not at fault for missing a def that a player sends to an address other than the one specified.

Players sometimes post their fake definitions in public, by accident. The term for this is *dixon* (noun and intransitive verb; usu. cap.), named for a player who did it frequently in the early months of the game: so often, in fact, that when the game was renamed as a result of (groundless) fears of trademark infringement, *Dixonary* was the name chosen. So the name owes nothing to *Becky Sharp*, as literary-minded players have sometimes imagined.

Players also post humorous definitions in public that are not intended to be taken seriously: they are fake fake definitions. These are called *NADS* (not a *Dixon*). Some players put *NAD* prominently in the posting; others think this spoils the joke, and that the headers of the message should be enough to alert a dealer whose sense of humour is not tickled by the fake fake.

(b) A player who knows the definition of The Word may still offer a fictitious definition, but it must not resemble the dictionary definition (for knowing the definition see Rule 5). 3(d)

Posting the Definitions

3. As soon as may be after the submission deadline, the dealer assembles all the fictitious definitions received, along with the one from the chosen trustworthy source ("the dictionary definition"). 4

The 1990 rules do not actually say that the dictionary definition is to be taken from the source where the dealer found The Word, but most players expect that it will be (1544) .

(a) A dealer who is confronted with two definitions very close to one another has discretion to combine them. 4(c)

Players may object to their definitions being combined unless it is clearly unavoidable, so dealers are in general reluctant to do it.

Some players (619) *assume that this rule does not apply to the dictionary definition, and so may choose to treat a pair of similar definitions as a hint that one of them is the dictionary definition. That is not the dealer's problem* (1380). *The passive construction ("is confronted") explicitly puts the dictionary definition on an equal footing with the others, and so the plain meaning of the rule accords no special status to the dictionary definition—and neither do other players* (649). ×



If the dictionary definition is short, and a similar fake definition is long, then combining the two may entail submerging the dictionary definition in the fake one. In this case, it is best not to combine them, because a player who detects fakery in the long combination, and rejects it on that account, will then be left with no dictionary definition to vote for. × (2494)

Some players (1639) think that a dealer does not have discretion if two definitions are very close, and is obliged to combine them. The plain meaning of the rule (“has discretion”) disagrees with this view. ×

The 1990 rules do not address the possibility of two definitions agreeing word for word. In this rare case the dealer must combine them (1915) because the alternative would be two identical definitions in the list. ✕

Distinguishing among the last three cases may not always be straightforward.

See also the second comment to Rule 8(b)–8(c).

(b) Except where the dictionary definition is combined with a submitted one, the dealer should refrain from changing the way it is worded. 4(b)

Some players (1842) regard everything after the headword in a dictionary entry as the definition. That is not how lexicographers see it. For them, it is a dictionary article, which may contain one or several definitions; but also an etymology, citations, various kinds of label, and so forth. None of these other elements is, strictly speaking, part of the definition. The lexicographers’ acceptance of definition must be decisive in this game, since we are all playing at being lexicographer.

Dealers often present a dictionary article rather than just a bald definition. Rule 3(b) leaves the dealer a free hand with nondefinition parts of the source dictionary article. Dealers routinely reorder, abbreviate or suppress labels, cross-references, citations and etymologies. Abbreviating an etymology needs skill if the result is not to look fictitious (566). If in doubt, omit an over-long etymology rather than shorten it.

(c) The dealer may edit submitted definitions only sufficiently to achieve general similarity of form. 4(a)

Players may also present dictionary articles rather than just bald definitions, from various motives, ranging from verisimilitude to comic effect. Beware of spoiling the effect in the interests of uniformity.

Dealers rarely go much beyond regularizing initial capitals, final points, and typographical treatment of labels and etymologies. Some dealers are reluctant to do even that.



Correcting an obvious typo is allowed (1752); but if in any doubt, confirm with the player, if there is time, or leave it alone. ×

It is courteous to gently polish, unasked, a submission from a player whose first language is not English; even if there is no time to check with the player. In practice, such players (and they are understandably few) generally give blanket approval for this beforehand.

(d) The dealer posts a message that repeats The Word, lists the assembled definitions, and sets a voting deadline (for *deadline* see Rule 13).

4, 4(d)

Voting and DQing

4. Players, whether or not they have submitted a definition, then vote for two definitions. 5, 5(b), 10(b), 10(c)

The 1990 rules say that players are to vote for definitions they think to be the true one, but in fact players vote as they please: neither random (500) nor tactical (783) voting is considered to be against the rules. ×

The 1990 rules permit players, at one point, to cast one vote rather than two, but discourage them, at another point, from doing so. In fact, other than beginners (186, 714, 1134) players almost invariably cast two votes. There are rare instances of seasoned players deliberately casting one vote (558), but the precedent for this is very old, and current players may regard it as unpersuasive, despite what the 1990 rules have to say. 5, 10(b), ×

(a) Votes are cast publicly by reply to the message posting the definitions. The dealer has discretion to ignore any vote not cast in that manner. 5(a)

Some players think that blind votes (that is, votes cast before the definitions are posted, by a player who will be absent) should not be allowed, because it embroils the dealer in a (very minor) conflict of interest. This rule permits them to enforce that view when they deal. It does not permit them to ignore votes cast by a proxy after the definitions appear. The passive construction (“votes are cast”) explicitly avoids requiring the voter to be the sender of the message.

(b) Players may offer commentary, honest or misleading or both, explaining the “reasoning” by which they arrived at their votes, without regard to the effect such commentary may have upon any particular submission. 5(c)

Most players consider that this rule does not protect informed remarks based on specific domain knowledge or language skills (215). For example, if you are a musician, you should avoid criticizing a musical definition; if you



studied Old English at college, you should avoid criticizing an Old English etymology; and so on. Some players go further and regard any commentary, however innocent, as unfair play: in other words, they wish this rule did not exist. In deference to this view, general current practice is to refrain from commentary altogether.

Remarks made after the voting deadline, but before the results are posted (1147), count as commentary: see the comments to Rule 13.

5. Disqualification from Voting

(a) If at any time before you vote you come, by any means, to know the definition of The Word, you are disqualified from voting (“DQ”†) and from offering commentary. 6

Knowing the definition means that the word is a part of your passive vocabulary: you can without notice and out of context offer a reasonably close synonym or definition for the word, in at least one sense. Being able to make an educated guess at a definition based on etymological cues (“guessing the roots”) is not the same (6) as knowing the definition (though not all players (976) would agree with this statement). Recognizing the universe of discourse to which a word belongs is not the same as knowing the definition (790). Speaking the language from which a borrowing comes need not constitute knowing the definition. Recognizing the definition in the posted list is generally held to be the same as knowing the definition (but only if you are right, of course).

(b) If you have submitted a definition, you should advise the dealer privately by email that you are a DQ. 2(d), 6

Rule 5(b) is a recommendation (“should”): it does not oblige you to DQ. If you are unsure about whether you know the definition, simply neglecting to vote is legal, and may be the best course of action.†† 2(d), 6, ×

In the same vein, it is inadvisable for a dealer to enter into private discussions with players about whether their DQs are correct or justified.

If your setup makes it easy to inadvertently post a message in public that you meant to be private, then, as a precaution against publishing a spoiler, make it a rule to refrain from explaining why you are a DQ (661).

A few players consider it wrong to DQ in public (1626), no matter how discreetly, because a public DQ from a player whose interests are widely known could provide a hint to the word’s meaning.

† Also pronounced *Dairy Queen* (2423).

†† There is an extended discussion of this issue in the paper *Do you have a high DQ?* which you can download from the location where you found these “real” rules.



End of Round and Scoring

6. The dealer ends the round on the earlier to occur of: 8(a)

(a) the arrival of the deadline for voting, or 8(a)(1)

(b) all those submitting definitions, and not disqualified, having voted (or as soon thereafter as the dealer chooses). 8(a)(2)

This early-closing rule is uncontroversial, but is so seldom invoked that players have been known to conclude—wrongly—that it is a dead letter (1629).

Overwhelming precedent also allows the dealer to delay the effective end of the round. See the closing comments to Rule 13. x

7. If a player accidentally reveals the dictionary definition (or narrows the possibilities substantially) while voting is in progress, the dealer may—

(a) declare a redeal and proceed as for rule 1(d), if only a few players have voted; or x (661)

(b) end the round early and score it on the basis of the votes cast before the error, if half of the submitters have voted. x (2000)

8. Scoring follows: 8(b)

(a) For each vote an uncombined definition receives, the dealer awards one point to its author. 8(b)(1)

(b) For each vote a combined definition receives, the dealer awards one point to each contributing author. 4(c)(1), 4(c)(2)

(c) The dealer awards two points to each player who votes for the dictionary definition, or a combined definition that incorporates it. 8(b)(1), 4(c)(2)

Provided always that the author of a definition, or a contributor to a combined definition, never receives points for voting for it.

8(b)(1), 4(c)(1), 4(c)(2)

The 1990 rules for scoring combined definitions are cumbrous and disorganized. Some players think them vague (1631); *a few even think they yield an interpretation different from the one given above. But this interpretation has the unanimous support of longstanding players.*

A player whose definition has been combined with the dictionary definition receives no points beyond what is provided for in Rule 8(b). This may have



the effect of a penalty. A few players think that this is sufficient reason for the dealer never to combine a submission with the dictionary definition (1635); despite Rule 3(a) which plainly permits it. ×

On rare occasions, the dealer accidentally omits the dictionary definition from the published list (2579). In this case, after suitable self-abnegation, the dealer scores the round as though nobody had voted for the dictionary definition.

(d) If a player has been disadvantaged by some error on the dealer's part (such as losing a submitted definition, or posting it in such a way that it is clear that it is fake), the dealer has discretion to award dealer points to that player as compensation. † ×

It is conventional to award two dealer points. There is some precedent for awarding one point (763), and no precedent for awarding more than two. Awarding two dealer points for a lost definition to a player whose cumulative average is more than about 2.2†† has the effect of a penalty.

Dealer points are to compensate a player for some avoidable administrative error that harmed that player's score. Exercise of dealer's discretion (for example, combining definitions) does not qualify, even if the dealer, on reflection, regrets having done so.

Some players think that any problem beyond a player's control, such as an email unaccountably lost or delayed, does qualify, though according to recent precedent (2515), only for one point, not two.

Declaration of Da Winnah and Start of New Round

9. Announcement of Results.

(a) The dealer posts all definitions, their authors, those who voted for them, and the resulting scores. 8(c)

If it appears from an unexplained delay that the dealer has been prevented from announcing the results, the players and the Scorekeeper cooperate to score the round in the dealer's stead (2638).

(b) The player who scores the highest is Da Winnah. 9(a)

† There is an extended discussion of this rule in the paper *Dealer points considered harmful*. You can download it from the location where you found these "real" rules.

†† The exact value generally lies between 2.18 and 2.25; it is given by $2 + \frac{4}{n-1}$ where n is the number of players in the round, including the dealer.



(c) If there is a tie for the highest score, the dealer selects Da Winnah using the tie-breaking procedure in Rule 10. 9

(d) The dealer notifies Da Winnah of the result privately by email, to avoid delays in starting the next round. ⌘ (1825)

(e) A new round begins. 8(e)

(f) There is a cumulative 4-round rolling score, as well as an overall cumulative score reaching all the way back to Round 1. 8(b)(2)

See the comment to Rule 10(b).

(g) The Scorekeeper posts the rolling and cumulative scores as soon after the end of the round as may be. 8(d)

On rare occasions, a dealer diverts attention away from the dictionary definition so successfully that no-one votes for it. This is called a D0 (“dee-zero”, not “d’oh!”), from the way the rolling scores report shows it (670), and is cause for warm congratulation (but no points). Near-misses are notated D1 (one correct guess), D2 (two correct guesses) and so on.

Votes that are posted in time, but that arrive (owing to network delays) too late to be counted in the dealer’s announcement of results, may be taken up in the rolling scores (at the scorekeeper’s discretion), but do not affect the determination of a new dealer (1744). ×

Where one player has an unassailable lead over the others, it is courteous for the dealer to give that player an early warning that the obligation to deal is imminent.

10. The dealer decides ties by ranking the tied players, applying the rules below in order until one player outranks the rest:

(a) A player who has a “natural score”, that is, one achieved without earning points for guessing correctly, ranks higher. 9(a)

(b) A player who has a higher 4-round rolling score (not including the results of the round being resolved) ranks higher. 9(b)

The 1990 rules instruct the dealer to rank players according to their 5-round rolling scores, including the results of the round being resolved. The dealer will arrive at an identical result using their 4-round rolling scores, not including the results of the round being resolved, since their scores in the current round are equal (otherwise there would be no tie to decide) and so can’t affect their relative positions.



Using 4-round rolling scores has the advantage that they are available to you. The scorekeeper will obviously publish rolling scores that include the current round only after you have announced the results.

The 1990 rules' call for a rolling score that is not available at the time of announcing results has long been a source of confusion (233). In the 1990s a dealer would often simply report that there was a tie and wait for the scorekeeper to decide it (614), rather than follow the correct procedure, which was: take the most recent 5-round rolling scores report and subtract out the oldest round.

For this reason, the Scorekeeper reports both 4-round and 5-round rolling scores at the end of each round. This relieves you of having to compute the 4-round scores manually.

Requiring the 5-round rolling scores to include the current round's results was clearly an oversight. The sole purpose of the rolling score is to resolve ties in the current round, and including the current round's tied scores in it does not serve that purpose.

(c) A player who has a higher cumulative score since Round 1 ranks higher. 9(c)

(d) A player whose submitted definition has a later timestamp ranks higher. 9(d)

The 1990 rules say that "dealing has the effect of a penalty: in the best of all possible worlds you would consistently finish second in each round." The clear intent of this memorably-phrased rule was to burden the highest-scoring player with the scoring disadvantage of the next deal; the presumption being that dealing has a negative effect on your average score, since you score zero in the round you deal. But longstanding practice (1575) has been to omit the rounds you deal from the computation of your average score, and so any penalty is purely procedural, amounting to no more than the inconvenience of dealing a round. The tie-resolution rules are of course necessary, and easy to apply; but are also essentially arbitrary: they have no score-based justification, nor need one. 9, ×

General Rules

11. Players may join and leave the game at will. 10

This does not apply to the dealer, of course, who must play a round out to the end. The 1990 rules discourage players from leaving a round before voting, but that is unnecessary, because the scoring system is sufficient disincentive. The 1990 rules encourage players to join a round after definitions have been posted. That carries an even greater scoring disincentive.

5(b), 10(b), 10(c), ×



12. When a round is in progress, if any situation arises which is not disposed of by these Rules, the dealer has authority to resolve the question in such manner as seems to him or her equitable. 2

Most players will expect the dealer to follow established precedent in arriving at a decision (1544), despite the plain meaning of the rule, which gives the dealer carte blanche to ignore precedent. ×

This rule does not mean that straightforward errors on the dealer's part, whether of arithmetic, or attribution of votes, or application of the scoring rules, are allowed to stand.

(a) After completion of the round, the dealer shall describe the situation, and his or her ruling on it, and open the matter for discussion. 2(a)

(b) Whether the dealer's ruling or some other is finally adopted by the Rules, the dealer's ruling is law of the case for that specific round. 2(b)

In practice, the rules have never been modified as provided for here. Had they been, you would not be reading this document. ×

13. Deadlines are to be no less than 32 nor more than 48 hours from the time they are posted, and must specify a time zone (for example, EDT). 3(b), 4(d), (612, 1626, 2007), ×

The 1990 rules say "no less than 24 nor more than 36 hours." This is unequivocal, but precedent, especially since 2005 (1626), has modified it. ×

In the mid-90s, deadlines were generally close to 24 hours, except at weekends: there used to be an unwritten rule, now long irrelevant, that slowed or stopped the clock over weekends, to suit players who had online access only at work.

Email messages may encounter delays of a sort that were not possible with realtime CompuServe forum messages. Such delays make 24-hour deadlines less workable than they once were.

A 24-hour deadline that ends between 01h00 and 09h00 US Eastern Time is effectively 18 hours for the majority of players. In the early years of the game, nearly all the players lived in North America, and would have had no occasion to set such a deadline. That is no longer true.

For these reasons, many players now consider a 24-hour deadline unacceptably short (1626). ×

Dealers have always felt free to extend the deadline beyond the 1990 rules' 36-hour limit to take account of other demands on their time, or the likely availability of players. Deadlines of 48 hours or more on US (612) and non-US



(2007) *holiday weekends have never evoked protest, but without such excuse, deadlines longer than 48 hours have done so* (1726). ×

The reworded rule attempts to capture the apparent current consensus that a deadline should not be shorter than 32 hours, for any reason; and also not much longer than 48 hours, without good reason. A 36-hour deadline is uncontroversial and remains within the letter of the 1990 rules.

Irrespective of the length of the deadline, definitions or votes that arrive after the deadline, but before the dealer starts to tabulate them, are invariably accepted (620). ×

The Need for Unofficial “Real” Rules

You may reasonably ask why there is a body of precedent that substantially modifies the rules, and yet is officially codified nowhere. There are two answers, each containing at least a grain of truth.

One answer says it is simple conservatism, that refuses to acknowledge that the game has changed all that much, or, even if it has, that the rules need to change to match. This amounts to keeping the written rules unchanged and requiring players simply to *remember* any new ones, for example, Rules 9(d) (1824) and 13 (1626). This comfortable approach means that new players cannot find out how to play the game properly (and especially how to deal a round) just by reading the written rules, and so it implies that new players are unwelcome. Some players have on occasion said this in almost so many words (1872)—though those same players would doubtless be mortified or angry to be so interpreted.

A second answer says that (unusually, for a constitution) the 1990 rules make no provision for their own amendment. A preamble to the rules, not reproduced here, reserved to the drafters (as *Rules Momma* and *Rules Poppa*) the sole right to change the rules. But in the first fifteen years of play, they never did; and apart from very occasional courtesy visits, they now no longer play the game. Formally, then, for the players to have the power to change the rules, the original drafters would first have to insert an enabling amendment. But that is an unlikely prospect. To get around the problem, and in defiance of the preamble’s express ban on democratic interference, the players nominated substitutes to the posts of *Rules Momma* and *Rules Poppa* in December 2005 (1668), so the game is no longer in a constitutional impasse.

But however constitutionally satisfactory, this hasn’t changed anything in practice. Players have an understandable distaste for a “constitutional



convention” about rule revisions (1630), and so, by corollary, they are happy to accept rule autocrats. But rule autocrats who simply maintain the status quo, as ours have done for a quarter of a century, take us back to the first answer: the game hasn’t changed, or if it has, we officially pretend otherwise.

*Paul Keating
The Hague
Prinsjesdag 2015*

This page intentionally left blank.