

MAY, 2003

IN RECENTLY CIRCULATED COPIES OF MY 'MEMOIRS', I MADE SOME PASSING REFERENCE TO AN OCCASION WHEN ONE OF MY BOTTLES OF PREMIUM WINE WAS USED TO MARINADE AN OTHERWISE BLAND DISH OF RABBIT.

NOW, UNDER THREAT OF IMMEDIATE RETRIBUTION BY THE LAW FOR LABEL, (QUITE APART FROM A VERBAL DRESSING DOWN BY AN EXPERT IN THAT FIELD - I.E. VERBAL DRESSINGS DOWN), I AM OBLIGED, LIKE GALILEO, TO PUBLISH A 'CLARIFICATION', A 'CORRECTION', A 'RETRACTION', OF MY PREVIOUS OBSERVATIONS.

IT WOULD SEEM, (ACCORDING TO CATHERINE, WHO CLAIMS A MEMORY NOT AFFECTED BY AGE, STRONG DRINK, OR OTHER VICIES OF MINE), THAT: -

1. THE BOTTLE OF CHALAMBAR WHICH SHE USED TO MARINADE THE RABBIT WAS NOT MY LAST BOTTLE, BUT WAS, IN FACT, MY SECOND-LAST BOTTLE.

SHE AVERS THAT I WAS ABOUT TO OPEN MY LAST BOTTLE, TO DRINK WITH THE RABBIT DELICACY, UNTIL SHE POINTED OUT THAT THERE WAS ALREADY A BOTTLE (OR THE CONTENTS THEREOF) OF '67 CHALAMBAR ALREADY IN WITH THE RABBIT! AT LEAST, THAT WHICH HAD NOT EVAPORATED. SO, THE LAST BOTTLE WAS PUT BACK IN THE CUPBOARD.

AFTER PROMPTING, I DO HAVE A VAGUE RECOLLECTION OF THAT, SO WILL ACCEPT CATHY'S VERSION.

2. SHE, HERSELF, DID NOT "RUMMAGE IN THE WINE CUPBOARD" TO FIND THE CHALAMBAR.

APPARENTLY HER BROTHER GREGORY, A BROTHER OF A BOY AGED ABOUT 13 AT THE TIME, WAS DEPUTED TO DO THE JOB AND HE, WITH COMMENDABLE TASTE IN WINES FOR SUCH AN ACOLYTE, CHOSE ONE OF THE BEST TO ENHANCE THE RABBIT. THE FACT THAT THE CHEF DID NOT REJECT IT FOR ANY REASON IS PROBABLY OF NO CONSEQUENCE, TO PARAPHRASE GALILEO - "NEVERTHELESS, IT WAS A GOOD STORY".

Brian.