

Some problems if the Pancreator/Outsider is the Holy Trinity

The Urth list — 6 messages, 4 voices, 10 Jun 2002

<https://urth.darkrealm.vip/thread/urth/3303>

Exported from an unofficial mirror of a public mailing list. Copyright in each message remains with the person who wrote it. Email addresses are obscured as `user at host`, the form the original archive published. This file was rebuilt from parsed fields rather than retained headers, so it is faithful in content but not byte-exact.

Andrew Reeves — 10 Jun 2002, 20:08

James Jordan wrote:

.... remember that Urth is a universe-cycle before ours. These events predate the promise to Noah by about 50 billion years maybe. We don't know that such a promise had been given to any Urnoah in Urth history. Nor, returning to the first point, do we have to assume that God managed BriaH precisely the same way He manages our cycle.

I've come across this stated in the archives before; is the source an extra-textual Wolfe interview or the like? The reason I ask is because it seems odd that in a whole different cycle of creation you'd still get the Apollo moon landing whose picture is recognizable as such. And as someone else mentioned, how would Severian's box with BOTNS make it through the singularity?

That aside, what's going on with that window into the 20th c. in the botanical gardens?

Andrew

Roy C. Lackey — 11 Jun 2002, 05:58 · follows Andrew Reeves

From: James Jordan

At 03:08 PM 6/10/2002 -0500, you wrote:

James Jordan wrote:

.... remember that Urth is a universe-cycle before ours. These events predate the promise to Noah by about 50 billion years maybe. We don't know that such a promise had been given to any Urnoah in Urth history. Nor, returning to the first point, do we have to assume that God managed BriaH precisely the same way He manages our cycle.

I've come across this stated in the archives before; is the source an extra-textual Wolfe interview or the like?

Yes.

The reason I ask is because it seems odd that in a whole different cycle of creation you'd still get the Apollo moon landing whose picture is recognizable as such. And as someone else mentioned, how would Severian's box with BOTNS make it through the singularity?

Well, the fact that it does somehow pass through the singularity, on board the Ship perhaps, or in the Yesod Library, is the intra-textual indicator that these events are in our past. That's always the problem with

Wolfe: which of the tiny hints are important and which of the hints are not hints at all?

In addition to the objections raised by others, there are all those stories in the Brown Book, clearly recognizable to students of Classical mythology as founded on Earth's mythology. It also contains a direct quote from Genesis, and another from Marlowe's FAUSTUS. No. No. No. Urth is in our Earth's far future.

Facts aside, as well as theological difficulties, the notion of Severian, turning water into wine, being baptized, dying and being resurrected, a world savior, etc., in a previous iteration of creation, makes him the prototype for Jesus. Kind of cheapens the whole Holy Spectacle, doesn't it? Putting the cart before the horse.

Not to mention it plays hell with Nick Gevers' idea of placing 5HC in the SUN universe. A separate creation with an Earth, complete with Ireland, Scotland, Wales, and New York City, DAVID COPPERFIELD, and Catholic saints (all mentioned in the text), stretches credulity past all endurance.

-Roy

James Wynn — 11 Jun 2002, 14:54 · follows Roy C. Lackey

I seem to recall an expansion theory in which the universe eternally expands, collapses, and expands again in an unending cycle of big bangs and big gnabs. According to this theory, each universe will would be precisely (or *almost* precisely) like the ones preceding it because it started the same way. I understand this theory is now out-of-favor with recent evidence that the universe cannot ultimately collapse. But it wouldn't have been at the time of writing.

This could reconcile Wolfe's claim with the familiar references in the story.

But in my heart of hearts I believe Wolfe concocted this explanation to rescue himself from having to constantly justify theologically everything in the BOTNS. I DO recall that he denied Severian is Christ. He said he was a "Christ figure", but that's merely a literary term.

-Crush

-----Original Message-----

From: James Jordan [mailto:jbJordan4 at cox.net]

Sent: Tuesday, June 11, 2002 9:55 AM

To: urth at urth.net

Subject: Re: (urth) Some problems if the Pancreator/Outsider is theHoly Trinity

JJ: This universe that you sought in Briah are part of it. Is that our universe? Or is that a universe that resurrected saints have set up in the world to come as part of the cities that they made?

GW: No. I thought of it as a long past universe. Something that we are repeating rather than something that we are.

<http://www.op.net/~pduggan/gwjbj3.html>

That was my source.

Nutria (JJ)

--

James Wynn — 12 Jun 2002, 13:56 · follows James Wynn

I really would NOT place a lot of weight on this particular statement of Wolfe's in the quoted interview. It's just too difficult to reconcile the other clues. I think there is no doubt when Wolfe was writing this FUTURISTIC novel he imagined it in the future. I think the following statement is more explanatory: "I was toying with those ideas, I think, rather than trying to make sense of them. Is our resurrection going to be in another universal cycle? Well, yes, maybe it is. I don't know. We don't know what is really meant by the world coming to an end, and God rolling up the sky like a carpet and all that. It is all picturesque language. Figurative language to try to give a general idea to an audience that would not be capable of understanding the actuality. And I am not sure we are more capable of understanding that actuality than they were. It is like the Genesis story. I don't believe in a literal apple and I don't believe that literally biting into the fruit had this effect but if you have to explain to a bunch of primitives how men differ from animals and where men went wrong in differing from animals, this is a pretty good way to do it." "Toying" is an important word here. Based on the Wolfe answer I'm quoting here, I'd say trying to make tBotNS fit with Christian theology in every way (or most ways) is like trying to create a perpetual motion machine or trying to rectify general relativity with quantum mechanics: It seems so logical and straightforward, but then....

-- Crush

Matthew said:

But no, placing tBotNS in a distant past distresses me. It's too complex.

James Jordan wrote:

JJ: This universe that you sought in Briah are part of it. Is that our universe? Or is that a universe that resurrected saints have set up in the world to come as part of the cities that they made?

GW: No. I thought of it as a long past universe. Something that we are repeating rather than something that we are.

Andy Robertson — 12 Jun 2002, 15:28 · follows James Wynn

It is logical and straightforward. It is called Quantum Electrodynamics.

hartshorn

----- Original Message -----

From: "James Wynn" <crushtv at HotPOP.com>

"Toying" is an important word here. Based on the Wolfe answer I'm quoting here, I'd say trying to make tBotNS fit with Christian theology in every way (or most ways) is like trying to create a perpetual motion machine or trying to rectify general relativity with quantum mechanics: It seems so logical and straightforward, but then....

James Wynn — 12 Jun 2002, 15:23 · follows Andy Robertson

I think it's funny that someone would call quantum electrodynamics "straightforward".

Clearly there should be a novel about wherever you work. ;-)

- Crush

-----Original Message-----

From: Andy Robertson [mailto:andywrobertson at clara.co.uk]

Sent: Wednesday, June 12, 2002 10:29 AM

To: urth at urth.net

Subject: Re: (urth) Some problems if the Pancreator/Outsider is theHoly Trinity

It is logical and straightforward. It is called Quantum Electrodynamics.

hartshorn

----- Original Message -----

From: "James Wynn" <crushtv at HotPOP.com>

"Toying" is an important word here. Based on the Wolfe answer I'm quoting here, I'd say trying to make tBotNS fit with Christian theology in every way

(or most ways) is like trying to create a perpetual motion machine or trying

to rectify general relativity with quantum mechanics: It seems so logical and straightforward, but then....

--