



Logicomix: En tegnet fortælling om jagten på sandhed

Apostolos Doxiadis

[Download now](#)

[Read Online ➔](#)

Logicomix: En tegnet fortælling om jagten på sandhed

Apostolos Doxiadis

Logicomix: En tegnet fortælling om jagten på sandhed Apostolos Doxiadis

An innovative, dramatic graphic novel about the treacherous pursuit of the foundations of mathematics. This graphic novel recounts the spiritual odyssey of philosopher Bertrand Russell. In his agonized search for absolute truth, he crosses paths with thinkers like Gottlob Frege, David Hilbert & Kurt Gödel, & finds a passionate student in Ludwig Wittgenstein. But his most ambitious goal—to establish unshakable logical foundations of mathematics—continues to loom before him. Thru love & hate, peace & war, he persists in the mission threatening to claim both his career & happiness, finally driving him to the brink of insanity. This story is at the same time a historical novel & an accessible explication of some of the biggest ideas of mathematics & modern philosophy. With rich characterizations & atmospheric artwork, it spins the pursuit of such ideas into a satisfying tale.

Probing, layered, the book throws light on Russell's inner struggles while setting them in the context of the timeless questions he tried to answer. At its heart, *Logicomix* is a story about the conflict between ideal rationality & the flawed fabric of reality.

Logicomix: En tegnet fortælling om jagten på sandhed Details

Date : Published 2012 by politisk revy (first published September 29th 2009)

ISBN :

Author : Apostolos Doxiadis

Format : Paperback 350 pages

Genre : Sequential Art, Graphic Novels, Comics, Philosophy, Nonfiction, History, Biography, Science



[Download Logicomix: En tegnet fortælling om jagten på sandhed ...pdf](#)



[Read Online Logicomix: En tegnet fortælling om jagten på sandhe ...pdf](#)

Download and Read Free Online Logicomix: En tegnet fortælling om jagten på sandhed Apostolos Doxiadis

From Reader Review Logicomix: En tegnet fortælling om jagten på sandhed for online ebook

Foad says

? ?????????????? ?????????????...
??? ?? ??? ??? ?? ?? ????????????? ?? ???????

Eirini Proikaki says

?να κ?μικ που μπλ?κει την ιστορ?α,τα μαθηματικ?,την λογικ? σκ?ψη,τη φιλοσοφ?α και τις αρχα?ες τραγωδ?ες.Πολ? καλ? δουλει? με εξαιρετικ? εικονογρ?φηση.Ειδικ? τα καρ? με φ?ντο την Ακρ?πολη ? αρχα?α θ?ατρα ?ταν απλ? καταπληκτικ?!Ομολογ? οτι δεν κατ?λαβα ?λες τις θεωρ?ες και τους συλλογισμο?ς που δι?βασα αλλ? βρ?κα το βιβλ?ο πολυ ενδιαφ?ρον,γραμμ?νο με χιο?μορ και δεν βαρ?θηκα ο?τε μια στιγμ?.

Warwick says

‘Organic life, we are told, has developed gradually from the protozoan to the philosopher, and this

development, we are assured, is indubitably an advance. Unfortunately it is the philosopher, not the protozoan, who gives us this assurance.'

—Bertrand Russell

'Logic! Good gracious! What rubbish! How can I tell what I think till I see what I say?'

—EM Forster

Logicomix has the admirable idea of presenting us, in comic form, with the story of the search for the logical underpinnings of mathematics in the early twentieth century, told mostly through the life of Bertrand Russell.

Usually, when this story comes up at all, it seems to be told by way of a prelude to the birth of computing (in, for instance, Neal Stephenson's *Cryptonomicon*, which rushes past Russell to get to Turing), so it was nice here to see it placed front and centre. And on the whole, the details of these often quite abstruse theoretical investigations are very well explained here, embedded as they are in the context of the main players' personal lives and professional rivalries.

The set of all sets that do not contain themselves: Russell suddenly realises "Russell's paradox"

I really love Bertrand Russell for the way that his professional logicalism did not impede his towering moral authority – he embodied a pacifistic, anti-authoritarian activism that was awakened during the First World War and that lasted until the end of his life, when he was still being dragged away from protests by police in his eighties. This moral sensibility takes a backseat to the quest for logic in the book, though it's definitely there – a framing story concerns Russell's feelings about pacifism in the 1939 war, and within the main story the authors are careful to show the effects of the first war on all the major characters.

Wittgenstein has an existential epiphany in the trenches

I have to admit, with my ideal image of Russell in mind, it was painful for me to read about the way he behaved towards his first wife and his children, about which I knew nothing before I read this. The authors – as they themselves explain – are very concerned to make sure that this is a story about these mathematicians' and philosophers' private lives as well as their professional investigations. Though I have to admit, the drama in the forbidden relationships and family secrets never seemed quite as engaging to me as the actual nerdy stuff about logic.

Gödel drops the bombshell of his incompleteness theorem

I had lingering doubts as I read this of whether it was really suited to the comic form: somehow, it never really felt like it was playing to the strengths of the medium. I was also not convinced by the choice to include several metanarrational interludes in which the authors and illustrators talk about how best to tell the story; this seemed, on the whole, more of a distraction than anything else, although a final section set during a present-day production of the *Oresteia* is a tour-de-force.

The comic's authors walk around Athens

There's lots to get out of this book and I'd definitely recommend it, but in the end it's one of those pieces that

I admired more for its concept than its execution. Illogical perhaps – but that, as the book demonstrates, is to be expected.

Hesam says

Riku Sayuj says

This wildly ambitious graphic novel is a fictional (auto?)biography of Bertrand Russell and traces his journey from doubt to certainty and back again.

It is littered with the lofty ideas of the many giants of mathematics and philosophy throughout, but is never daunting in its subject matter or too overreaching in its objectives. A list of the co-stars might be enough to induce you to stop reading this review, so I restrain myself from indulging.

The self-referential presentation, which shows the creators struggling with the same questions, helps the readers get into the real spirit of the 'Quest' and enjoy the ride and its uncertainties instead of agonizing over the answers that are guaranteed to never come in any case.

The comic sags a bit once the obsession with the theme of 'logicians and madness' threatens to run away with it and obscure the real story. But, the precisely mad and inanely confident Side-Kick to our Super Hero (read Russell) comes traipsing into the story with perfect timing and livens up the story and thickens the plot into a right stew. With Wittgenstein thus in the mix, Russell gets comfy in being true to his character (destiny?) and takes us to the logical conclusion of the pursuit of Truth - to Philosophy.

Fittingly enough, the story concludes with the legendary closing scene of Oresteia, which perhaps makes the whole experience more profound than it really deserved to be, but then that is the fun of great ideas - you never know when they are only pretending!

Buck says

It's marvellous that something like *Logicomix* exists: a graphic novel that seeks to put the Vienna Circle on the pop-culture map deserves a special Pulitzer for chutzpah (read those last three words aloud and you'd swear you were speaking *Hochdeutsch*). But I sensed an uncomfortable tension here between the genuine profundity of the ideas being explored and the inescapably hammy conventions of comic-book narrative. No doubt there's a special, tiny place in my heart for hamminess, just as there's a miniature compartment in my brain for profundity, but mash them up and my uncomplicated soul gets all squirmy. Which, incidentally, explains why Billy Corgan's poetry has never brought me the spiritual sustenance it obviously has to millions of others.

Although it's only a small part of the story told in *Logicomix*, I'm fascinated by the unlikely bromance between Bertrand Russell and Ludwig Wittgenstein. This is sort of unconscionable, but for the sake of brevity I'm going to translate their relationship into buddy-comedy terms: basically, Russell played the skirt-chasing Seth Rogen character to Wittgenstein's high-strung, undersexed Paul Rudd. Of course, their differences ran a lot deeper than that. During the First World War, Russell's pacifism landed him in prison, while Wittgenstein took the opposite route, volunteering for active duty on the eastern front and ending up a war hero (yes, brainy, unstable, rich-boy Wittgenstein. War hero. I shit you not. And in justifying his decision to enlist, he'd said that, before becoming a great philosopher, "he should become a human being." Hard not to love the guy for that.)

I couldn't philosophize my way out of a paper bag, but as I understand it (partially thanks to *Logicomix*), Russell and Wittgenstein didn't exactly see eye to eye on the great metaphysical issues of the day, either. If this means anything to you, Russell was a straight-edge foundationalist, whereas Wittgenstein was a total, punk-rock anti-foundationalist. So what happened is, Bertie spent a good decade of his career building this lovely epistemological sand castle, and then one day his buddy Ludwig comes along and nonchalantly kicks the shit out of it. And so Russell was like, "Dude." But no harm done. Russell got over it and maybe even secretly admired Wittgenstein all the more for it.

The lesson here is: don't be friends with someone who's much smarter than you unless you're big-hearted enough to accept it. It's a lesson I refuse to learn, but maybe you can profit from the example.

Stokespower says

kind of disappointing; don't think it set out to do what it aims to do (and what it aims to do is frequently stated) in bringing the story of the search for rigorous logic to life through the lives of the main protagonist(s). essentially it's a potted biography of bertrand russell, but so shortened as to be fairly meaningless. it's covering and explanation of logical theories is equally skimpy and vague. there's some neat comic tricks (asides to the reader, references to 'filming live'), a framing device of the comic creators discussing the comic's direction (which takes on more relevance in the context of russell's paradox) and a story within the story of one of the comic creators rehearsing a production of Oresteia, but ultimately it all falls short.

whats really annoying is the great reviews printed on the back cover. i think any comic that isn't superheroes automatically gets credit as being intelligent and genre breaking. its not. and it cost me 25quid. thats the danger in buying comics...

David says

I never imagined reading a graphic novel--but here is a graphic novel that I highly recommend. As explained in the back of the book, this is not, strictly speaking, a biography. It is a novel, largely based on facts. Some of the meetings never took place in person, but all of the meetings are based, at the very least, on interactions through correspondence.

The book is highly readable, and enjoyable. It features interesting interactions between the authors and illustrators of the book, intermixed with the biography of the book's protagonist, Bertrand Russell. Very well done!

Zaphirenia says

Ξεκ?νησα το Logicomix με την ιδ?α ?τι θα διαβ?σω κ?τι πολ? ευχ?ριστο και ευκολοδι?βαστο που θα ρε?σει ε?κολα μετ? το τερ?στιο (απ? κ?θε ?ποψη, να μην τα ξαναλ?με) 2666 του Μπολ?νιο. ?πεσα μ?σα ως προς το πρ?το σκ?λος (της ευχαρ?στησης) αλλ? ?ξω ως προς το θ?μα της ευκολ?ας. Φυσικ?, επειδ? ε?ναι εξαιρετικ? καλογραμμ?νο και ?χει πολ? καλα?σθητο σχ?διο κυλ?ει αρκετ? γρ?γορα. Ωστ?σο, δεν ε?ναι απλ?, τουλ?χιστον ε?ν σε ενδιαφ?ρει να κατανο?σεις αυτ? που λ?ει π?ρα απ? το να περ?σεις την ?ρα σου. Μου π?ρε αρκετ?ς μ?ρες να το ολοκληρ?σω (για το μ?γεθ?ς του) και πολλ? σημε?α τα δι?βασα περισσ?τερες φορ?ς μ?χρι να αισθανθ? ?τι ?χω κατανο?σει τι δι?βασα. Γιατ? εντ?ξει, ας μην κορο?δευ?μαστε, τα μαθηματικ? δεν ε?ναι το δυνατ? μου σημε?ο, π?σο μ?λλον η θεωρητικ? θεμελ?ωσ? τους στη λογικ?.

Κεντρικ?ς ?ξονας του ?ργου, λοιπ?ν, ε?ναι η λογικ? στην αναζ?τηση των θεμελ?ων των μαθηματικ?v. Και το κεντρικ? πρ?σωπο στην αναζ?τηση αυτ? ε?ναι ο αγαπημ?νος Bertrand Russell, ο οπο?ος αφηγε?ται π?ς τη β?ωσε εκε?νος μ?σα απ? το ?ργο του αλλ? και μ?σα απ? τη γενικ?τερη εμπειρ?α του στο χ?ρο της Λογικ?ς. ?μφαση δ?νεται επ?σης στο δ?πολο λογικ?-τρ?λα: γιατ? τ?σοι πολλο? μελετητ?ς της λογικ?ς τρελα?νονται; Μ?πως η δ?ση της λογικ?ς ε?ναι τ?σο μεγ?λη που τους οδηγε? στην παραφροσ?νη; Και τελικ?, ε?ναι τα μαθηματικ? η σταθερ? πηγ? γν?σης της αντικειμενικ?ς αλ?θειας και της στ?ρεης γν?σης ?πως μας μαθα?νουν στο σχολε?ο; Η απ?ντηση ε?ναι τρομακτικ?: μ?λλον ?χι. Και τ?τε τι; Δεν ξ?ρω.

Πολ? ωρα?ο βιβλ?ο. Πραγματικ? απολαυστικ?. B.R.A.CE. 2018 ?να graphic novel ? κ?μικ

Μπ?νους το πολ? ενδιαφ?ρον παρ?ρτημα στο τ?λος με υλικ? για τα πρ?σωπα, τις ιδ?ες και τις μεθ?δους που αναφ?ρονται στο βιβλ?ο καθ?ς και η βιβλιογραφ?α, β?σει της οπο?ας ο αναγν?στης μπορε? να αναζητ?σει και ?λλες σχετικ?ς πηγ?ς για αυτ? τα πολ? ενδιαφ?ροντα ζητ?ματα.

Anna says

Στα χν?ρια του κ?σμου της σοφ?ας για την ιστορ?α της φιλοσοφ?ας, αυτ? το graphic novel αφορ? την ιστορ?α της Λογικ?ς, εν?ς κλ?δου που προ?ρχεται απ? τα μαθηματικ? αλλ? ?χει ιδια?τερα στοιχε?α φιλοσοφ?ας μ?σα του (για να γ?νω και λ?γο προκλητικ? στους φιλολογικο?ς κ?κλους: ?λη η φιλοσοφ?α προ?ρχεται απ? την επιστ?μη, απλ? ?σοι δεν σκαμπ?ζουν απ? μαθηματικ?, τα αφαιρο?ν και κρατ?νε το περιτ?λιγμα, το οπο?ο επ?σης ε?ναι σπουδα?ο!!!! Τι ?γινε; Π?σα comments μ?ζεψα;)

Σε κ?θε περ?πτωση π?ντως, το συγκεκριμ?νο βιβλ?ο ε?ναι μια εξαιρετικ? προσπ?θεια του Απ?στολου Δοξι?δη και του Χρ?στου Παπαδημητρ?ου να παρουσι?σουν την ιστορ?α της Λογικ?ς, με το σκ?τσο να ε?ναι επ?σης εξαιρετικ?. Μια δουλει? για την οπο?α οι δημιουργο? της πρ?πει να ε?ναι περ?φανοι, παρ?μοιο του ?ργου του Ντεν? Γκετζ και του Θεωρ?ματος του Παπαγ?λου, επ?σης για τα μαθηματικ?. Διαβ?ζεται ?νετα σαν ιστορ?α προσ?πων και για τους μη γν?στες των μαθηματικ?v, εν? νομ?ζω ?τι μ?νο οι απ?φοιτοι του Μαθηματικο? Τμ?ματος (? ?σοι ?χουν σπουδ?σει Λογικ?) θα το κατανο?σουν 100%

Hadrian says

A self-referential biographical history of mathematics and logic in the later 19th and early 20th century, with narrative interludes on ancient Greek tragedy. Framed around the life of Bertrand Russell, several contemporary thinkers (Frege, Wittgenstein, Gödel, Schlink, Wallace, von Neumann). Manages to describe incredibly complex concepts in understandable language, and only a few relatively minor errors.

I'd like to see more, if that was possible. One for each of the other thinkers, especially Wittgenstein or Gödel.

Richard Derus says

THIS IS NOT MY PERSONAL OPINION

IT IS THAT OF MY CLOSE FRIEND JOE

I suspect someone more familiar with the players and their theories would get even more out of this, but I definitely feel more kindly and receptive toward these eggheads, having seen through this their human sides and their passionate struggles to reach truth. Their integrity requires ruefully accepting it time and again when the newest genius tears down the fortress of truth each thought he had built. The constant questioning of principles and fervent desire to locate truth has been associated with "madness", and that comes up in this, too. The drawing is engaging and witty. The story concludes, satisfactorily in an unexpected way, with a performance of the Orestia. Kudos to the author for coming up with such a well-executed and thought-expanding book.

Thomas says

Βαθμολογία: ★★★

Το κ?μικ αυτ? με βρ?κε εντελ?ς εκτ?ς των νερ?ν μου, καθ?ς η φιλοσοφ?α δε μου αρ?σει καθ?λου και οι γν?σεις μου στα μαθηματικ? ε?ναι περιορισμ?νες. Εντο?τοις, σε κ?ποια σημε?α κουρ?στηκα και βαρ?θηκα και σ?γουρα διαφων? με ?σους λ?νε ?τι ε?ναι ευκολοδ?βαστο. Μου ?ρεσε πολ? το σχ?διο και ο τρ?πος που ενσωμ?τωσαν οι δημιουργο? τους εαυτο?ς τους μες στην ιστορ?α και χα?ρομαι που ?να ελληνικ? κ?μικ ?κανε τ?τοια επιτυχ?α.

Chris says

I have a question for you. It's a simple-sounding question, but hard to answer, so I really want you to put a good amount of thought into it before you do. Okay? Yes, I'm still in Teacher-mode, but that's not important right now. My question is this:

What is truth?

It's one of those unanswerable questions that has bugged us ever since we started being able to ask unanswerable questions. Along with "Why is there evil in the world?" and "Do we have free will or are our lives pre-determined from the beginning?" or "What's the deal with that Justin Bieber kid? I mean really?" this question is one that people either ignore or obsess over.

Didn't think I could do a pop-culture reference like that, did you? Shows how much you know....

This graphic novel is about one man's pursuit of this question, and the ways in which it nearly destroyed his life. The man was Bertrand Russell, and we follow his life from his childhood to late adulthood as he searches for an unshakable foundation to mathematics and logic, and thus an absolute truth that he could rely on.

As a child, Russell lived with the question of why things are the way they are, and got no good answers from his domineering grandmother. It wasn't until his introduction to geometry and the wonder of mathematical proofs that he could finally say there was something about which he could be absolutely sure in the universe. Mathematics, he thought, would be the answer to everything. Pure, unsullied and utterly, utterly reliable.

But there was a flaw in math - the Axioms. Mathematics in the 19th century was a direct descendant of Euclid's work, and rested on a series of axioms in order to function. An axiom, then, is something that is assumed to be true so that you can go on to prove other things. For example, if you have a line, and a point not on that line, there can be only one line drawn through that point that is parallel to the first. Why is this true? Well... it just *is*. If you have to prove that, then you have to prove a thousand other things first, and you never end up being able to prove the thing you were trying to prove in the first place. It was like, he thought, the cosmological model of the world on the back of a turtle. Which stood on another turtle. Which stood on another, and another - turtles, all the way down.

That didn't satisfy young Russell, and he went off in search of the floor upon which the last turtle stood, as it were - new mathematics that would be able to define the foundations of math, and thereby give a concrete

understanding of the universe. Along the way, his desire to apply the certainty of math to human thought and interaction led him to the discipline of logic, a strange chimera of mathematics and philosophy. By becoming a logician, he thought he might finally be able to pin down some absolute truths about not only abstract math but human nature itself.

Of course, he failed. Spectacularly. Broken marriages, broken friendships, ill health - his obsession with an absolute truth to the universe nearly destroyed everything he had. Fortunately for him, Russell pulled back from the abyss before it could swallow him whole, and became one of the early 20th century's greatest philosophers in the process. His failure to find an ultimate foundation for logic and math was not entirely without fruit - thanks to work by Russell and others, these disciplines were pushed forward in ways that made our modern lives possible. New ways of understanding the universe, from the unfathomable depths of infinity to the simplicity of $1+1=2$, everything was open to examination in those days. Because of men like Bertrand Russell, humanity advanced in great leaps and bounds.

In the end, it's a compelling book. I read and re-read it, convinced each time that there was something else I had missed. I was very often right. Doxiadis and Papadimitriou have put together a compelling tale of a man often overlooked by the general public, and they did so in a medium that's close to my heart - the graphic novel. The art, done by Alecos Papadatos and Annie Di Donna, is wonderful. It has a simplicity that belies the complexity of its topic, and shows an excellent sense of storytelling. Hats off to the two of them, without a doubt.

This book, it should be noted, is not a primer on logic. If you're looking to know how logic works, or you want to know a bit more about higher mathematics and how to do them, then you'd best look for another book. As the authors tell us right in the beginning, this book is a story, a great tragedy that owes its inspiration to the ancient productions of the Greeks. It's the story of a man who pitted himself against the universe and lost, but who did so in such a way that he - and the world - came out better for it. The book ends with a scene from *The Oresteia*, a classic Greek drama about another man who found himself in a no-win situation with no absolutes to rest upon. Much like Orestes, when faced with two choices that could lead to his destruction, the only way forward for Russell was to compromise and to move forward. By doing so, he not only became a happier man, but became involved with humanity again, as a philosopher, a teacher, and an anti-war activist.

In the end, this book is about the compromises we all have to make as human beings. The world may be a logical place, but we are not. There is a limit to our logical understanding of ourselves, and sooner or later we have to accept that and deal with people as people, rather than as problems to be solved and equations to be balanced. Bertrand Russell's quest, as interpreted by this novel, is an example of how far we can push the need to know exactly that's at the bottom of it all. The fact that the foundations of our world appear to be unprovable and unknowable is, ultimately, unimportant. What is important is that we are here, now, and we need to make sense of our own lives.

Melika Khoshnezhad says

????????? ??? ?????? ??????? ???? ? ?????????? ?????? ?????? ?? ? ???????? ?? ?????? ??? ?????? ?????????????? ????
?????? ? ???? ?? ???? ???? ???? ?? ??? ??????? ?? ??? ?????? ?????? ??? ?????? ??? ?????? ??? ?????? ?????? .????? ?
?????????? ???? ?????? ?? ?????? ?????? ??? ? ?? ???? ??? ?????? ??? ?????? ??? ?????? . ??? ? ??????? ?? ??? ??????
?? ?? ??????????? ??????? ???? ?????? ???? ?? ???? ?????????? ?? ??? ?????? ??? ?????? ??? ?????? ???.

Keith says

EDIT: The occasional vitriolic response post on this review has me revisiting it from time to time, and each time it makes me a little more uncomfortable. Not because I disagree with the basic sentiment here. I originally set out to say this book is a boring, pretentious piece of shit that use the comics medium rather cynically in order to market itself, without really demonstrating much understanding of what makes the comic medium really interesting and useful for storytelling.

Of course, what I actually wrote wasn't anything like that -- but this version is funnier and meaner, and I sort of still think that an obnoxiously ignorant response says what I want to say about *Logicomix* far better than the slightly more reasoned paragraph above.

So I'm still 100% in support of the review below -- except for the fact that in my original fervor, I also ended up being kind of sexist. I think that this undercurrent is part of what makes the review somewhat loathsome, and why it still gets so much hate six years after I wrote it. While the review is designed to poke the *Logicomix* audience with a sharp stick in their collective self-righteousness, there's no merit in my viewpoint if its wound up in sounding like a misogynist jerk.

I've changed a single word here to another word which hopefully makes the same point without being such a pig about it. But I'm leaving the comments section afterward as-is, if for no other reason than it's easier to read.

No one asked me to make these edits, but I have had readers of this review tell me I have the intelligence of an adolescent, that they are going to burn my house down, and that I should kill myself. This may or may not be the internet's way of saying 'Hey, make some edits.' I don't know.

But I DO know that *Logicomix* is a terrible book written by cash-grabbing nerds for terrible, boring people who have the right to fair and equal treatment regardless of their gender and sexual orientation.

Thank you. The original post follows.

Okay, I'm all for the widening modern-day definition of the graphic novel, but in the event that you find yourself writing a 352 page comic, there's one thing you should definitely ask yourself early on, and that is, 'Did I remember the ninjas?'

And if you didn't remember the ninjas, then there should be an excellent reason for it, i.e. dinosaurs, robots, or ~~boobs~~ schtupping. And while there are many more things other than dinosaurs, robots or ~~boobs~~ shtupping you can replace ninjas with in a 352 page graphic novel, math is not one of them.

If you have a 352 page graphic novel in which you forgot the ninjas but remembered the math, and put in MORE math besides, and then made your book's selling point the fact that there's a ton of math in it, and you suddenly have a critically acclaimed best-seller on your hands --

-- Well, right there you've got a situation in which a hell of a lot of people missed the whole goddamn point.

On behalf of the comic book community, Mr. Doxiadis -- maybe it'd be best if the next time you tried to expand the medium you just wrote a term paper or something instead.

Jon Stout says

Logicomix An Epic Search for Truth, came as a complete surprise to me. Given to me by a good friend for Christmas, this graphic novel first struck me as a psychodrama about an obsessive-compulsive personality, not at all resembling myself. But when I started to read it I realized that it was a history of early 20th century philosophy and foundations of mathematics, featuring cartoon characterizations of people I have studied at some length, such as Bertrand Russell, Ludwig Wittgenstein, Gottlob Frege, Kurt Godel, Alan Turing and a dozen others. The first two of these are arguably the greatest philosophers of the 20th century.

The only exposure I had had to graphic novels was through my daughter, who is an illustrator and has done her own comix. I had from time to time leafed through her collection, and we had seen Persepolis. But to see the form stretched around a subject about which I had been very serious was astonishing to me. The story functioned on so many levels that it was dizzying.

On the highest, theoretical level the story was about the philosophical task of establishing mathematics on a firm logical foundation, so that it would become an ironclad vehicle for the pursuit of knowledge. This effort proved to have theoretical difficulties, which in turn led to the “anti-foundational” (pragmatic, relativistic) trend of philosophy in the second half of the 20th century. This intellectual history was portrayed by the activities of cartoon figures in dramatic situations. I had to strain to consider if they were getting it right, but I think they did a creditable job.

The second level, the psychological interplay of (cartoon) personalities, was even better. Although dramatic action was obviously condensed, there was a very gossipy portrayal of the lives and foibles of the great philosophers and mathematicians. Cartoons lend themselves to melodrama, and the philosophers themselves had more than enough melodrama in their lives.

On a third level of art, the cartoon artistry was beautiful. There were portrayals of very dramatic scenes and locations, such as a walk around the Parthenon in Athens, or the battlefields of war torn Europe, or the life of the British aristocracy, or laid-back Berkeley, California. The book ended with a climactic scene from the Oresteia Trilogy of Aeschylus, which was imposing and appropriate. As I write this I wonder how I can be talking about cartoons as though they were panoramic epics, but it worked.

There were other levels as well, including connections to music, literature, languages, poetry, politics, history, and lots of other things. But at heart, the book was a great adventure of ideas, which I bought into completely. I think there is something fundamentally philosophical about portraying life with well-defined lines and shapes of uniform color. Everything is simplified and dramatized and so... graphic. It made me want to write the graphic novel of my life, or better yet, to live it.

Fatemeh says

?? ??? ????? 4.5 ?? ??? ?? ?? ???.

Kowsar says

Vasilis Kalandaridis says

Για λ?τρεις των μαθηματικ?v και ?χι μ?νο.Καταπληκτικ? βιβλιο,υπ?ροχη δουλει?,σε β?ζει σε σκ?ψεις πολλ?ς.Θα διαβ?σω σ?γουρα κι ?λλο βιβλιο του Δοξ?δη.