

Some problems if the Pancreator/Outsider is theHoly

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

<https://urth.darkrealm.vip/thread/urth/3305>

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.

James Jordan — 10 Jun 2002, 21:02

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?

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

Protestant missionaries of the Theoanthropos. Well, like the Apollo picture, somehow this earlier BangganB of the cosmos is much like ours, but not quite the same. I do think we have an incarnation of the 2nd person of God in this earlier cosmos, the aforementioned Theoanthropos, the original Conciliator of which Severian is an application, but as Dan'I mentioned, from some Roman Catholic perspectives the atonement of the Son is "eternal" so it could "happen" in time more than once. If this was not in Wolfe's mind, then I doubt if we are supposed to press the problem of a repeated crucifixion.

But then, if we allow Wolfe the "liberty" to have a previous incarnation and atonement-of-infinite-worth in the BriaH cosmos, then how are we to "know" that Severian's manuscript is from a previous cosmos and has made it into ours? Which "hint" do we take as simply a liberty we grant the author, and which "hint" we take as internal to the argument of the narrative? After all, maybe Wolfe just "somehow" got Severian's book from the future and "somehow" (golden spectacles?) was able to translate it, and we are not supposed to ponder further? Or, maybe it fell back to him through the corridors of time, instead of proceeding forward to him from the previous BanggnaB. Is there another "hint" that resolves the question? This is the problem and frustration when reading Wolfe!

JBJordan Nutria

Jeff Wilson — 11 Jun 2002, 02:36 · follows James Jordan

From: James Jordan <jbjordan4 at cox.net>

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 Briaiah 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.

Did he explain why he has completely reversed his statements in the appendix of Shadow?

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?

Where is this "fact" documented?

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

Protestant missionaries of the Theanthropos. Well, like the Apollo picture, somehow this earlier BangganB of the cosmos is much like ours, but not quite the same. I do think we have an incarnation of the 2nd person of God in this earlier cosmos, the aforementioned Theanthropos, the original Conciliator of which Severian is an application, but as Dan'l mentioned, from some Roman Catholic perspectives the atonement of the Son is "eternal" so it could "happen" in time more than once. If this was not in Wolfe's mind, then I doubt if we are supposed to press the problem of a repeated crucifixion.

Why can't this just be regarded as allegorical? The crucifixion would not be repeated so much as represented, it avoids all problems with time-binding statements and promises attributed to G-d, doesn't make a liar out of the translator, and doesn't require the Book to travel half a universe backward, get translated, then come 1 1/2 forward to be published.

Jeff Wilson

How Am I Posting? 1-800-555-6789

"If your SecOp can see you, so can the enemy." -Cpt Law

--

matthew.malthouse — 11 Jun 2002, 07:14 · follows Jeff Wilson

On 11/06/2002 06:58:32 Roy C. Lackey wrote:

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.

I agree. The internal evidence of tBotNS is only consistant with it being set in the very far future.

I'd be curious to know if the external statements were delivered ex-cathedra or if they were accompanied by any explanation or rational that gives reason for the change. I have to suspect pure mischief.

Matthew

Adam Stephanides — 11 Jun 2002, 14:01 · follows matthew.malthouse

on 6/10/02 4:02 PM, James Jordan at jbjordan4 at cox.net 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.

Textual and theological difficulties aside, I really don't like this idea. I won't say it ruins the books for me, but it does detract substantially from their sense of wonder and the uncanny. It's as if had declared that THE DYING EARTH was really the Dying some-other-planet-that-happens-to-be-called-Earth.

Since, afaik, there's no indication in the original BotNS that the books are taking place in a previous universe, I'm tempted to speculate (and hope) that this was an idea Wolfe thought of after writing the original books.

--Adam

James Jordan — 11 Jun 2002, 14:55 · follows Adam Stephanides

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)

Jeff Wilson — 12 Jun 2002, 01:28 · follows James Jordan

From: James Jordan [mailto:jbjordan4 at cox.net]

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.

Well yes, =Yesod= is a previous universe, an extension of one, or at the very least, a place settled by refugees from one according to Mantiss.

Jeff Wilson

How Am I Posting? 1-800-555-6789

"If your SecOp can see you, so can the enemy." -Cpt Law

--

matthew.malthouse — 12 Jun 2002, 07:37 · follows Jeff Wilson

On 11/06/2002 15:55:18 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.

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

That was my source.

Thanks.

But that does seem like mischief because the explanation of the origin of the manuscript is in the book, so we have to add a further wrap around it to account for the book arriving in our hands.

On a metaphysical level I also cavil somewhat - the similarities of the books ancient past with our world are too similar. Either it's not just cyclic but the repetition is near identical or we have to interpolate additional holes through which things like the moon picture have been moved.

For sheer fun I quite like the idea of Ultan's library being part of L space. Just as the shelves reach might the archive of the House Absolute so too one might hope to turn an unexpected corner and come across a russet furred Librarian subjecting a minor grimoire to some remedial

book-binding.

But no, placing tBotNS in a distant past distresses me. It's too complex.
Not that we expect anything but complexity from Wolfe; but this is purposely complex and purposelessness is not a lupine characteristic.

Matthew

Adam Stephanides — 12 Jun 2002, 15:49 · follows matthew.malthouse

on 6/12/02 10:28 AM, Andy Robertson at andyvrobertson at clara.co.uk wrote:
It is logical and straightforward. It is called Quantum Electrodynamics.

No, QED combines special relativity and quantum mechanics. The problem of reconciling general relativity with quantum mechanics is still unsolved.

--Adam

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....

Michael Straight — 12 Jun 2002, 16:15 · follows Adam Stephanides

On Mon, 10 Jun 2002, James Jordan wrote:
Or, maybe it fell back to him through the corridors of time, instead of proceeding forward to him from the previous BanggnaB.

If you're going to count the intros/appendix where Wolfe talks about translating Severian's manuscript, Wolfe directly refers to all the stuff of Severian's time being in the future, or "futuraity."

I guess Wolfe could have been mistaken...

-Rostrum

Dan'l Danehy-Oakes — 12 Jun 2002, 16:18 · follows Michael Straight

Rostrum saith:

If you're going to count the intros/appendix where Wolfe talks about translating Severian's manuscript, Wolfe directly refers to all the stuff of Severian's time being in the future, or "futuraity."

Yes. But on the other hand, he also writes of having been allowed to tour and photograph the "surviving" buildings of that distant future period. Which seems to put the distant future into the distant past and make the whole thing cyclic after all, dunnit?

--Dan'l