

To properly compare fruit, one must first be able to analyse chairs. Or at least, the way we look at chairs.

Why is it that, when faced with an old Chesterfield and a Jacobsen Egg Chair, we assign them both to the same category of “chair”? Surely, this gross appropriation of chairness cheapens the identity in some way. Even if we get more specific, and say that one falls into “classic” and the other into “modern”, this is either too specific or too general. What of Ottomans? Or Roman triclinia? They are both traditional chairs, which are nothing like the Chesterfield. They must feel rather slighted—oppressed even—by this arbitrary division. It seems that however many small divisions or large dichotomies we assign for these chairs, some are bound to be either improperly excluded or included, according to their own sense of identity. Yet they are all used for the same function; they all have the same Final cause, if different Material causes. This means that, though each may have its own unique form contained in its substance, each is still only an earthly representation of the Ideal of “chairness” contained in the Æther. The infinite variety among the chairs belies their similarity, but we must always keep this in mind when contemplating causes.

It is the same way with fruit. Scientifically, we assign apples to the species *M. domestica*, and oranges to *C. sinensis*, but if both serve the same reproductive function, and serve them equally as well (I assume they do, as neither tree seems to hold a particular reproductive advantage over the other as of yet), then can we not say that they are both of the same Final cause? I say we must, since neither is a perfect representation of fruitiness and yet neither can properly be compared by any other cause but the Final. Therefore, looking at the substances will lead us nowhere, and we must turn to the abstract.

“Apple” can, in most languages, refer to the fruit or the tree, or even the wood. In fact, the apple holds a place of significance in many cultures and mythologies. Nothing especially outstanding. “Orange”, on the other hand, is a tree, a fruit, a wood, *and* a colour. (Not counting the Princedom.) We even call the fruit “orange” because people thought it was just an orange apple. A much more interesting etymology than your standard Germanic root. But oranges do not by any means have to be orange; we have blood oranges, which make *sanguinella* (basically just blood wine) and the best San Pellegrino. Apples just have juice and applesauce, and some pies those can really be made with anything. It is also commonly accepted that, outside of some half-exceptions, “orange” is a unique phoneme and has no perfect rhyme, whereas “apple” is cheaply thrown around and easy to rhyme. So, linguistically, there is no competition, and, as I have shown before, comparing words is ultimately the only effective way to compare the incomparable.