

**World Philosophy Day 2022:  
The Human of the Future  
(Based on the materials of the symposium  
“The Human of the Future,”  
November 16-18, 2022, UNESCO, Paris)**

**Kseniia Fedorova**

Odesa Mechnikov National University (Odesa, Ukraine);

University of Luxembourg (Luxembourg, Luxembourg)

E-mail: kseniia.fedorova@uni.lu

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6875-4704>

Fedorova, Kseniia (2023) World Philosophy Day 2022: The Human of the Future (Based on the materials of the symposium “The Human of the Future,” November 16-18, 2022, UNESCO, Paris). *Philosophy and Cosmology*, Volume 30, 33-41. <https://doi.org/10.29202/phil-cosm/30/3>

*The paper is devoted to reviewing the materials of “The Human of the Future” symposium, which took place at UNESCO Headquarters from 16 to 18 November on the occasion of the World Philosophy Day. In a hyper-technological world, the very concept of humanity undergoes constant evolution. In view of the scale of modern challenges, within the framework of the event, it was suggested to reflect upon the concept of “the human of the future” from the point of view of their own evolution and historical development, as well as from the viewpoint of the world upheavals causing human to overflow and surpass their own historical formation. The purpose of the article is to determine contemporary philosophical and anthropological tendencies in the development of Humanities and Social studies and to examine the status of a philosophical approach as relevant to the digital world for understanding the “human”. The theoretical basis is represented by the materials of the speeches of contemporary philosophers, anthropologists and researchers within the framework of “The Human of the Future” symposium and focused on the search for alternative anthropocentrism ways of understanding human and technology. Conclusions. The future is presented as a challenge faced with a number of serious crises in the context of information overload and unstoppable speed of data flows circulation. Studying the process of multiplying technological updates and human transformations leads to the idea of reconstructing the nature of philosophical research. Two philosophical and anthropological trends are presented: the expansion of the understanding of “human” through the introduction of technological objects and the biogeophysical dimension into its interpretation, as well as the process of ontologization of digital technologies. There is specified a range of current issues in the Social Sciences and Humanities research: communication between species, life definition, ambiguous relationship of people with technology, with increasingly blurred boundaries between technology and biology.*

*Keywords: philosophy and society, human, philosophical and anthropological tendency, technologization, digital technologies, philosophy and war in Ukraine*

Received: 25 November 2022 / Accepted: 28 December 2022 / Published: 5 February 2023

© Fedorova, Kseniia, 2023

---

## Introduction

In the contemporary world, the concept of humanity is in constant transformation and forces researchers to think about the search for new forms of human experience. Countless digital interventions in the production of human experience, the speed of fluidity of contemporary world, the rapid growth of technological updates and global social transformations raise new questions about the essential forms and manifestations of human. Today's challenges make it possible to look differently at the basic problem for philosophy, what it means to be human and to consider who comes after the subject of humanism. Thus, in the last two decades, scientific research discourse has been actively saturated with questions about the possibilities and consequences of the use of modern technologies, in particular, about the idea of convergence of the biological and technological dimensions of humanity. In such circumstances, the transhumanist vision flourished, which gave humanity hope and fear at the same time, raising a number of questions. They include potential benefits and risks of transhumanism, which involve a radical transformation, overcoming the human nature by technological means, with the replacement for a radically different being (in the form of a robot, cyborg, or even a computer program); human / post-human evolution; hybridization of human and machine; ethics of physical, cognitive and moral improvement; concepts of equality, social justice, defense and security in the post-human world. Pretending to maximally realize the possibilities of human development, to embody new trends in the scientific and technological world at the expense of establishing the primacy of technology over human, transhumanism bears the stamp of the limitations of anthropological vision with the impossibility of presenting a full-fledged method of the anthropological constitution. Today, during such critical changes, human still needs to consider not only and not so much technological, but personal scenarios and strategies.

### The return of Human: (non)anthropocentric optics

World Philosophy Day is celebrated every year on the third Thursday of November. The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) launched this event to encourage civil society to engage in public debate on the pressing challenges of today. As the initiators of the Day of Philosophy, the European institution honors it by holding philosophical debates, conferences, seminars and cultural events with the participation of philosophers and scientists from various fields of natural and social sciences around current socio-cultural issues. UNESCO aims to raise public awareness of philosophy and significant role not only in understanding the contemporary problematic agenda, but also in demonstrating connection between the future and the past. Therefore, it is not for nothing that the theme of the World Philosophy Day in 2022 was "*The Human of the Future.*" Together with the National Studio of Contemporary Art Le Fresnoy, UNESCO's Social Sciences and Humanities Sector organized a symposium and exhibition held in Paris from 16 to 18 November. The three-day event covered a number of issues: ethical and epistemological dilemmas of the contemporary world, the interaction of living beings with technological objects, ecological challenges of the Anthropocene era, the situation of post-colonialism, gender issues and the potential of outer space as the place for human existence. The symposium program was designed to create an interdisciplinary dialogue and, in addition to philosophy, it included natural sciences, anthropology, and art.

Accumulating the ideas presented within the framework of the symposium, it is possible to identify *two contemporary philosophical and anthropological trends*, phenomena in the

digital world; concepts that are subsequently explained and become essential factors in social reality. The complexity and heterogeneity of the digital age is determined by a certain level of anthropological reflection and forces philosophers and anthropologists to revise their research strategies. Post-nonclassical methodologies are beginning to be actively used, since the multidimensionality of human is not covered by one type of rationality. Thus, at the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, actor-network theory, new materialism, and speculative realism are developing. The principled openness to objects targets these developments at the search for new (non)anthropocentric optics, an orientation that continues to grow. This trend is connected with several strategies and programs that offer consideration of human integrity with the world: as an after-effect of the geological environment, the Anthropocene era; in relationship with technological objects, which are subject to their own genesis of their development.

As part of the section *“Life, cosmos and deep time”*, a French philosopher, paleoanthropologist, and professor at the École des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales (EHESS) Claudine Cohen outlined the figure of the human of the future by referring to the past and to the biological origin of humanity. It was suggested to refer to the original biological characteristics of human in the context of the concept of anthropogenesis of a French paleoanthropologist, historian of technology and art Andre Leroi-Gourhan (Leroi-Gourhan, 1964). The Leroi-Gourhan model of anthropogenesis or hominization represents the gradual formation of the Homo Sapiens species as a chain of successive liberations: a hand is liberated from participation in the body movement and grows into a gesture and a tool, and at the same time, the mouth, liberated from holding the prey, acquires the ability to speak and reveals a face around itself that captures the moment of the skull transformation. During the “liberation” or “exteriorization,” brain and inorganically organized matter (technique) develop equally rapidly. Technique acts as a factor in the biological dimension of humanity and is established in the structure of the human race. Since this non-anthropocentric conception contradicts the classical view of human as a reflective animal, it seriously calls into question the radical opposition between human and animal. The body vertical position and the evolution of movements played a decisive role in the process of hominization. The very fact of upright walking makes it possible to talk about the formation of a biological species, while evolutionary processes take place both at the biological and cultural levels of development. A feature of the human species is the constant use of tools. However, it would be a mistake to recognize this property as specific only to humans, because it is characteristic of animals as well. In fact, a characteristic feature of humanity is the ability to separate the tools of labor from their bodies, while the tools of animals remain fused with their bodies.

The challenge of modernity is to talk about different scenarios of hominization and to define the gaps and boundaries of the “human.” Only by expanding the understanding of the human with the help of introducing the world of multiplicity of biological and non-biological species into its interpretation, is it possible to find a human. Human falls out of the approved natural order and is constituted thanks to technological objects. The evolution of humanity is presented in a non-linear way as countless attempts to build relationships and connections between different types of living and non-living things, thanks to which human becomes inextricably linked with technology. Technological objects and tools, along with animals, plants, cells, with the planet and outer space, are transformed into a political arena. Non-human entities play an important role. They are considered and reinterpreted as “conceptual characters.” Their primary function is to challenge the distinction between nature and culture while at the same time asserting anthropocentric exceptionalism.

At the end of her speech, Claudine Cohen outlined three scenarios for the future of human, while rhetorically stating several potential consequences in each. The first is based on the interaction of digital technologies and humanity. Rapid technological development has led to the confusion of humanity, so the search for a new subject perspective is realized through the reconstruction of the status of digital technologies, assessment of the consequences of technological processes, and hybridization of human and technology. Will human be able to “liberate” themselves thanks to technology, like the hand was once liberated, or are we facing a return to the stage of alienation? The second way is adaptation, as an opportunity to shape everything that is human, to imitate the achievements of the Anthropocene era (caused by driving and harmful actions of human in relation to nature, as well as the post-effects of anthropogenic actions). Is such an adaptation possible at all, or will human face the total devastation of the environment caused by themselves? Finally, the third direction involves cultural extinction or nutritional exchange. The consequences of this path depend on the humanity’s ability to preserve specific cultural codes but not to lead to cultural unification. What awaits the human of the future – a rich and sustainable cultural exchange or a simplification of cultures?

The section “*The Anthropology to come*” was started by a British anthropologist, professor of social anthropology at the University of Aberdeen, Tim Ingold, with an apt look into the past, which causes the “*return of the human*”. Scientific and biotechnological developments of the last two centuries have caused an urgent need to redefine the concept of “human”, and have led to discussions on modern academic platforms around the figure of “post-human.” A contemporary trend of the development of post-Human as a convergent phenomenon of post-humanism and post-anthropocentrism, which involves criticism of the universal ideal of the thinking human, on the one hand, and rejection of the species dominance, on the other, has exhausted itself. In this post-human convergence, Tim Ingold calls for abandoning the label “post-human” because it leaves no room for human in the future. Instead, it is suggested to transform the word “human” itself by adding a procedural character to it, and using the verb “humaning.” Such an anthropocentric view shifts human to the center, which becomes a prerequisite for the transition from progress to the society sustainable development. At the same time, the researcher does not proceed from the position of classical anthropocentric optics, which contrasts only with the object left for the redemption of epistemology. He defines a human as a “humanifying animal.” Next, he adds a description to this position: one should not exclude the biogeophysical dimension, which requires a shift to a whole complex of things, consisting of the Earth with all beings and non-beings, including human. The Earth is not meant only for the human species, so wholeness is foregrounded, a human / non-human continuum that refuses to single out the aspects of human existence in the fullness of its essential characteristics. At the same time, it is not about a versatile understanding of human, but rather about the potential opportunities that are inherent in them and need to be understood.

Finally, Tim Ingold mentioned that the future of humanity depends on the ability to push aside science and technology and give way to anthropology. It is anthropological research with its desire to learn from others, and not only about them, that can offer a better perspective than post-science. The speculative ambitions of anthropology are constantly compromised and subordinated to the academic model of knowledge production, according to which the data obtained from practical participation are processed into empirical material for further interpretation. In this fatal step, anthropology not only collapses into ethnography, but also inverts the relationship between knowledge and existence. Contrary to this false

identification of ethnography and anthropology, the latter is not associated with a retrospective commitment to descriptive fidelity. It presents itself as a space for an open and critical study of the conditions and possibilities of human life, behind which the future lies.

## **Ontologization of digital technologies**

The process of digitalization took its form within the framework of information technology research in various disciplinary areas at the end of the last century, and by the mid-2000s, there was hardly any field of knowledge left that did not involve a preliminary understanding of digital. Moreover, a “new” and established nature of digitalization has unwittingly linked this process to a much broader and older metadiscourse of modernism: from science fiction to various versions of technoliberalism. Ultimately, digital became a discursive catchall for novelty. As a result of continuous technological progress, “newness” is indeed a cause of concern today. A rapid nature of technology renewal leads to the transformation of a “new” temporal dimension: from calculation in years to that in seconds. There is an orientation to microtime, which defines digital culture only at the level of machines and technological processes, as well as to the expansion and recursion of time, which creates a feeling of being in time of a different order. In these conditions, a second trend has been born: instead of the functionalist view on technology, the ontological optics is suggested. Yuk Hui, a philosopher and professor at the University of Hong Kong and Goldsmiths College in London, the initiator of the Philosophy and Technology Research Network, dedicated his speech entitled “*The obsolescence of the human and the becoming of technology*” as part of the section “*The question of technology*.”

The philosopher began his speech with two facts about human. First, human is a mortal being with limited capabilities, in particular, memory. Secondly, following Ernst Cassirer, Yuk Hui recognizes human not so much as a rational animal but as a symbolic animal. Humans have always lived in a hybrid environment surrounded by artificial and natural objects. In fact, “artificial” and “natural” do not exist separately, and artificial objects are not simply tools for conquering the nature; instead, they constitute a dynamic system giving rise to human experience and existence. And that is why the artificial is constantly moving towards greater concretization, and needs constant reflection on a peculiar historical state. Today, the power of thinking is distributed among many species and is often implemented by technologically mediated systems of knowledge production, managed networks and computational processes. Technological objects challenged a clear division between living and non-living things: technological mediation comes to the fore. Yuk Hui suggests turning to Andre Leroi-Gourhan’s concept of anthropogenesis (Leroi-Gourhan, 1964), which was already discussed in the context of Claudine Cohen’s speech. Hui equates the process of anthropogenesis with technogenesis. A usual understanding of technology as an external extension of human is complicated: technical objects do not complete the evolutionary process of humanity, they are woven into this process. Technology is in the form of a “purely zoological fact”, and transition from the zoological stage to the sociological stage is connected with the liberation of technology from connections with the organism, with the acquisition of their own form of existence. That is, the central question is formed not around the process of human formation, but rather around the formation of technology. Next comes the question of predicting the future of technology by human, because otherwise, the problem of the human of the future arrival becomes irrelevant.

In this connection, the “agonizing points” of the Anthropocene era are formed, which are worth more attention than the concern about the capture of humanity by machines:

technological rationality, the path to universality as society's constant monitoring and the suppression of irrational human impulses; economic competition, which determines the development of technologies in terms of profit, efficiency, and an increase in human potential; and military expansion aimed at increasing the speed of technological development and the scale of destruction. These three forms of technology development lead to the impossibility of discussions about "the human of the future", because it will be determined by a certain type of technology, and this type will be caused by one of the directions of technology development, so the future of humanity is characterized as "*pure human becoming*." It reveals the difference between "the future", which is predictable, programmed, planned, and "l'avenir", which refers to the one who comes, whose arrival is completely unexpected. The real task of modernity consists in the democratization of technologies, in other words, in demand for "*technodiversity*". This phenomenon can be revealed through the imperative of diversification of technologies with the help of diverse cultural resources: the multiplicity of technologies is revealed through the multiplicity of nature, which anthropologists are actively talking about today. Thanks to different cultures, it is possible to find resources for finding different technological forms and ways of influencing technological diversity. For its establishment, a constant search for alternatives to the currently dominant technologies through the epistemological dimension (various forms of knowledge, in particular, various forms of modeling techno-knowledge to create technologies) is also important.

After the philosopher Yuk Hui, the floor went to a technology anthropologist, curator and professor at the *Haute École d'art et de design in Geneva (HEAD)* Nicolas Nova, who is active in the field of digital culture. His research focuses on observing and documenting digital media practices and environmental change. Using ethnographic approaches, Nicolas explores everyday culture and uses design methods such as Design Fiction to study the effects of social or technological change. Inspired by medieval bestiaries and observations of the consequences of the technogenic era, Nicolas Nova in collaboration with the Parisian research group DISNOVATION.ORG., which works at the intersection of contemporary art and digital technology research, launched the "A Bestiary of the Anthropocene" (Nova, 2021). This is a controversial project that later turned into a book challenging the dominant ideology of technological innovation and stimulating the emergence of alternative narratives. "A Bestiary of the Anthropocene" presents a collection of hybrid beings of our time, emerging at the same moment when the biosphere and the technosphere merge into one new hybrid body. Presenting the concept of the project as part of the "The Human of the Future" symposium, Nicolas Nova addresses both the issue of technological objects and technogenic artificial environment. Advances in science and technology have also spawned an array of hybrid bodies from humanoid robots to rock-shaped Bluetooth speakers and cultured meat; not to mention prosthetics of animals, genetically modified creatures and industrial production of trees. These phenomena are spreading exponentially and are the symptoms of rapid transformation of the "post-natural" era. Such upheavals require a revision of a set of bestiaries of the Anthropocene era to be able to navigate in the artificial fabric of today.

To assess the ability to exist in a hybrid environment, the question about researching the natural-technical continuum arises. It is suggested to think about the internal accessories of an ordinary smartphone: when anatomizing the device, a picture opens with a whole series of components-elements. Mineral lithium, gold, copper, tin, cobalt, plastic form the internal organs of the smartphone. Plastic, living for years, has already entered the food chain. A smartphone can hardly be called a living organism, but it definitely makes you think about the division between artificial and natural and forces you to recognize the existence of a

certain continuum. This operational chain becomes a way of analyzing humanity: from meta, from dirt and minerals to the creation of tools, things, and objects. So, it is interesting how it is possible to move from natural resources, things that are in their natural state in the environment, to the production of objects. At this stage, a connection is formed between technology and our environment, thanks to which the environment itself is transformed.

It becomes a difficult task to use the past technological vocabulary to describe and analyze modern processes, in particular, such words as “technique”, “technology”, “technological objects”, because the very positions of the technosphere are changing, the most important of which is the formation of an exceptionally developing system by technologies. There is a fantastic example of a “fake tree” in Cape Verde. Nearly a third of Britain’s mobile masts struggle to pick up signals due to the trees that operators have had to plant next to them to hide the “ugly” elements. The trees were planted in the 1990s, and as their trunks have grown and branches filled in, they are now wreaking havoc on telephone lines. Therefore, there was created a palm tree, a disguised cell phone tower, a completely man-made structure, which at the same time continues its life cycle at night. It is interesting, because it is a fake tree, but a real antenna; a way to remind us that technological things only work because there is a system around us.

The technology issue is that of environment transformation, and if we talk about human nature, we should rather think about coexistence with technological objects than about technological determinism. The realization of coexistence lies in what Yuk Hui has described as “technodeterminism.” It was also added by Nicolas Nova with the process of democratizing the design of technologies for use: the development of technologies taking into account biogeophysical dimension, social and environmental justice, which is complicated because economic and military relations are asymmetrical. The possibility of the “human of the future” existence depends on the ability of humanity to create new devices without destroying the environment and preserving the logic of the development of technical objects, their own existence.

### UNESCO symposium beyond the crisis

To complete the review of “The Human of the Future” symposium, it is suggested to reflect upon the message of the UNESCO Director Audrey Azoulay on the occasion of the World Philosophy Day. Since time immemorial, philosophy has responded to the pressing problems of society and contributed to intercultural communication and creation of new intellectual conditions for changing communities. At the same time, the task of philosophers required avant-gardism in response to modern life challenges and demonstration of deep reflection. It is no coincidence that Audrey Azoulay noted in her speech that “*philosophy is therefore essential when it comes to defining the ethical principles that should guide humanity*” (Azoulay, 2022: 1). In order to build a better world, it is necessary to realize the importance of applying a philosophical approach, namely the need to question the flaws of the world “*beyond the tumult of crises*” (Azoulay, 2022: 1). In addition, as the politician notes, the discussion on this topic should be *open*. Open to all types of knowledge, especially to other human sciences, which will make it possible to understand the world in all its complexity and be able to transform reflection into action. It is also open to all societies, because philosophy is not isolated from the world; it is a practice of exploring the world, where everyone should be able to master their tools “*to reinvent a common world*”. Therefore, UNESCO calls for a moment to take a step back and think collectively about *the future of humanity* (Azoulay, 2022: 1).

Following the proposed path, we will try to consider these theses through the lens of contemporary Ukrainian philosophical community. To maintain an intercultural status of the event, researchers from different countries of the world were invited as part of the symposium: from France, Great Britain, Italy and Switzerland to China, Colombia, Australia and India. Ukrainian representatives were not included into this international gathering, besides, not a word was heard about the Russian invasion of Ukraine. UNESCO's moral and institutional energy, which for years has demonstrated attempts to build a strong world based on dialogue and mutual understanding, has been exhausted in the face of pressing societal challenges. On the main platform of intellectual and moral solidarity of humanity, not a single speech touched on the global social crisis unfolding in the heart of Europe right now. Is the position of distancing and abstracting from crisis upheavals correct? It seems that philosophical reflections upon "the human of the future" may not be timely in the midst of war. However, does not the crisis become a moment of total reassessment and change of the current order of things? Perhaps it is the state of crisis that makes it possible to cut off the unnecessary, separate the painful, break the current and create a new one. And this is the time for philosophical reflections. Philosophy needs to apply its toolkit to reflect upon the moral, social and ecological catastrophe of today and plunge into the diversity of human, creating new vectors for reflection. It really plays an important role in determining the path of society's development, but only when approaching the crisis peaks of society and when thinking about urgent ethical problems of today with subsequent public discussions. Under such a condition and with a general trajectory towards an understanding of the human phenomenon, with the active participation of philosophers, in inseparability with other Humanities and Social disciplines and sciences, it is possible to ask questions about "the human of the future".

Through the general vision of the symposium, a systemic review of the current situation of the Anthropocene, when people and nature are dynamically interweaved, shone through. In these circumstances, humanity has become the main driving force in shaping the future of the earth system as a whole; and the scale and pace of the human dimension has caused climate change and rapid biodiversity loss. Collective actions of people challenge the biosphere basis of the flourishing development of civilizations and make these natural and social shocks part of the world dynamics. The reality we are witnessing today is an ever-increasing turbulence in the entire system, which requires transformative changes in the direction of sustainable development. Reflecting upon the communication of humans with non-humans, the discussion agenda of "The Human of the Future" symposium, in reality, did not cover the true meaning of the idea of sustainable development. The Anthropocene global challenges require learning with and from people, not just making them the subjects of analysis. The application of the principles of openness, cooperation and universal accessibility is the guarantee of the idea of sustainability of the future. However, is it possible to talk about the openness of the discussion and the stability of the international dialogue, when the Ukrainian voice was not heard within the framework of the event of the organization that sets international standards and implements cooperation programs promoting the free exchange of ideas and knowledge? The organization, which has been developing educational tools for years, promotes the openness of education around the world, conscientiously preserves cultural heritage and protects freedom of expression as a necessary condition for democracy and the society development. These questions remain open. However, "*reinventing a common world*" and delineating the future beyond the Anthropocene era depends on the ability of the society and its institutions to fundamentally

unite around Ukraine, plunge into the stormy crisis and make it a common cause for the struggle of “the *human of the future*”, turning it into a source of energy for the new sustainable future.

## Conclusions

Aimed at the creation of various systems of representations of the world's current state and the future from a multicultural and multidisciplinary perspective, “The Human of the Future” symposium became a platform for discussions of contemporary philosophical politics. The search for a new subject perspective is realized by reconstructing the status of digital technologies, which leads to the actualization of the work of the anthropological apparatus. Moods of technological determinism and radical reduction, amputation, rejection of many aspects and dimensions of human existence are replaced with discussions about “human becoming” in the principled openness to the objects of the material world in its integrity with the world. The current human anthropolandscape consists of a biogeophysical dimension in interaction with technological objects, thanks to which biological nature is not replaced with a technological substrate, but is constituted thanks to digital technologies. Modern research strategies focus on considering a specific dynamic and hybrid existence in its formation, which expands our perception of reality by including anthropological factors of existence in it. Together with the proposal of various options for answers to the question “what happens to a person on the way to becoming a human”, the possibility of implementing the presented philosophical and anthropological trends in the field of the modern system of Humanities thought acts as an attempt to systematize the philosophical understanding of being and becoming human in the post-human world.

In such an anthropological situation, philosophical knowledge about human is fragmented. However, philosophy is invited to immerse itself into the diversity of human and apply its tools to reflect upon moral, social and environmental problems of today, creating new vectors for reflection. The modern character of philosophy is ensured by its inseparability with Humanities and Social disciplines and sciences, and opens up the perspective of understanding human in their changeability and dynamism. It remains humanity's duty, both philosophical and ethical, to reflect upon this unedited contemporary manifestation of the “human” while immersing itself in social crisis upheavals. New philosophical, ethical, and political questions require engagement, openness and the capacity for dialogue, which can offer a different perspective on the distance between our present and the tumult of changes taking place within.

## References

- Azoulay, A. (2022) *Symposium and Exhibition “The Human of the future “L’humain qui vient”*. UNESCO Social and Human Sciences Sector/ Le Fresnoy – Studio national des arts contemporains. Available online: [https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000383675\\_eng](https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000383675_eng)
- Leroi-Gourhan, A. (1964) *Le geste et la parole. Tome I: Technique et langage*. Paris: Albin Michel.
- Nova, N. (2021) *A Bestiary of the Anthropocene: Hybrid Plants, Animals, Minerals, Fungi, and Other Specimens*. The Netherlands: Onomatopée.