

Travelling North aka miscellaneous thoughts on Wolfe

The Urth list — 162 messages, 17 voices, 04 Jun 2010

<https://urth.darkrealm.vip/thread/urth/5621>

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.

Tim O'Donnell — 04 Jun 2010, 08:32

From: Jerry Friedman <jerry_friedman at yahoo.com>

But I see two possibilities in addition to Mr. Wolfe's starting with the idea that Urth was in our future and retconning it into a past universe.

One is the >apparently Brunian possibility that different universes and iterations will have overwhelming similarities for reasons we don't understand (unless Josh does). >In that case many or all of the universes have the names "Robert" and "Marie" at some point ("Marie" coming from "Miriam" even though there was no Mary >Mother of Jesus). Even the saints' names could be names of exemplary people who were equivalent to the saints of our world.

I always thought Wolfe answered questions about the nature of Christ in Severian's universe obliquely but definitively in BOTNS. Time is not linear and future events influence past events. The legend of Baldanders and his doctor ripple through time to inspire our own Dr Frankenstein. A stone dropped in a pond sends ripples in all directions and I believe the analogy holds here; time is not linear and immutable but elastic and intertwined. As things such as Christianity exist in our universe and have such a strong influence they can (and in my opinion do) send ripples of influence to Severian - wherever he is placed.

Jeff Wilson — 04 Jun 2010, 08:45 · in reply to Tim O'Donnell

On 6/4/2010 3:32 AM, Tim O'Donnell wrote:

linear and future events influence past events. The legend of Baldanders and his doctor ripple through time to inspire our own Dr Frankenstein. A stone dropped in a pond sends ripples in all directions and I believe the analogy holds here; time is not linear and immutable but elastic and intertwined. As things such as Christianity exist in our universe and have such a strong influence they can (and in my opinion do) send ripples of influence to Severian - wherever he is placed.

What makes the ripples from the Frankenstein stone stand out from all the rest?

Jeff Wilson - jwilson at io.com
IEEE Student Chapter Blog at
< <http://ieeetamut.org> >

brunians at brunians.org — 04 Jun 2010, 09:36 · in reply to Jeff Wilson

Talos remarks upon it when it occurs.

He is an educated homunculus.

.

On 6/4/2010 3:32 AM, Tim O'Donnell wrote:

linear and future events influence past events. The legend of Baldanders and his doctor ripple through time to inspire our own Dr Frankenstein. A stone dropped in a pond sends ripples in all directions and I believe the analogy holds here; time is not linear and immutable but elastic and intertwined. As things such as Christianity exist in our universe and have such a strong influence they can (and in my opinion do) send ripples of influence to Severian - wherever he is placed.

What makes the ripples from the Frankenstein stone stand out from all the rest?

--

Jeff Wilson - jwilson at io.com
IEEE Student Chapter Blog at
< <http://ieeetamut.org> >

Jeff Wilson — 04 Jun 2010, 10:23 · in reply to brunians at brunians.org

On 6/4/2010 4:36 AM, brunians at brunians.org wrote:
Talos remarks upon it when it occurs.

He is an educated homunculus.

How does Talos pick those ripples out from the ripples from all the other events in all of time, space, and dimension?

Jeff Wilson - jwilson at io.com
IEEE Student Chapter Blog at
< <http://ieeetamut.org> >

brunians at brunians.org — 04 Jun 2010, 10:32 · in reply to Jeff Wilson

He is present at the echoing event.

Since he is educated, he understands how the World works.

Since he is educated, he has read / is familiar with Frankenstein.

.

On 6/4/2010 4:36 AM, brunians at brunians.org wrote:
Talos remarks upon it when it occurs.

He is an educated homunculus.

How does Talos pick those ripples out from the ripples from all the other events in all of time, space, and dimension?

--

Jeff Wilson - jwilson at io.com
IEEE Student Chapter Blog at
< <http://ieeetamut.org> >

Jeff Wilson — 04 Jun 2010, 10:56 · in reply to brunians at brunians.org

On 6/4/2010 5:32 AM, brunians at brunians.org wrote:
He is present at the echoing event.

Since he is educated, he understands how the World works.

Where did he get this education in the secret nature of reality?

Since he is educated, he has read / is familiar with Frankenstein.

How did Mary Shelly pick them out?

Jeff Wilson - jwilson at io.com
IEEE Student Chapter Blog at
< <http://ieeetamut.org> >

John Watkins — 04 Jun 2010, 11:56 · in reply to Jeff Wilson

Lots of drugs? Too much time spent with Byron?

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 6:56 AM, Jeff Wilson <jwilson at io.com> wrote:

On 6/4/2010 5:32 AM, brunians at brunians.org wrote:

He is present at the echoing event.

Since he is educated, he understands how the World works.

Where did he get this education in the secret nature of reality?

Since he is educated, he has read / is familiar with Frankenstein.

How did Mary Shelly pick them out?

--

Jeff Wilson - jwilson at io.com
IEEE Student Chapter Blog at
< <http://ieeetamut.org> >

brunians at brunians.org — 04 Jun 2010, 12:02 · in reply to John Watkins

It is not documented.

Apparently, Baldanders wished to have an educated physician.

So, by whatever means, he educated him or had him educated.

.

Lots of drugs? Too much time spent with Byron?

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 6:56 AM, Jeff Wilson <jwilson at io.com> wrote:

On 6/4/2010 5:32 AM, brunians at brunians.org wrote:

He is present at the echoing event.

Since he is educated, he understands how the World works.

Where did he get this education in the secret nature of reality?

Since he is educated, he has read / is familiar with Frankenstein.

How did Mary Shelly pick them out?

--

Jeff Wilson - jwilson at io.com
IEEE Student Chapter Blog at
< <http://ieeetamut.org> >

Tony Ellis — 04 Jun 2010, 12:31 · follows brunians at brunians.org

Jeff Wilson wrote:

How did Mary Shelly pick them out?

I'm not sure if that was a rhetorical question or not, but anyway:

Mary Shelley, famously, was inspired to write Frankenstein by a *dream* she had. At a villa on Lake (hint hint) Geneva. Dr Talos isn't saying events in his time influence events in ours, he's saying they influence our dreams.

What makes the ripples from the Frankenstein stone stand out from all the rest?

They don't, necessarily. Maybe we're all having dreams inspired by Urthian events, all the time. It's just that in this case the dream was recorded and that record - somewhat miraculously - survived long enough for one of its instigators to identify it.

brunians at brunians.org — 04 Jun 2010, 13:19 · in reply to Tony Ellis

Dreams don't take place in linear time.

.

Jeff Wilson wrote:

How did Mary Shelly pick them out?

I'm not sure if that was a rhetorical question or not, but anyway:

Mary Shelley, famously, was inspired to write Frankenstein by a *dream* she had. At a villa on Lake (hint hint) Geneva. Dr Talos isn't saying events in his time influence events in ours, he's saying they influence our dreams.

What makes the ripples from the Frankenstein stone stand out from all the rest?

They don't, necessarily. Maybe we're all having dreams inspired by Urthian events, all the time. It's just that in this case the dream was recorded and that record - somewhat miraculously - survived long enough for one of its instigators to identify it.

Jeff Wilson — 04 Jun 2010, 14:32 · in reply to brunians at brunians.org

On 6/4/2010 8:19 AM, brunians at brunians.org wrote:

Dreams don't take place in linear time.

That makes it even less likely - how does a person's sleeping mind select an images of an event from among all the events, ever? Imagine a radio that picks up not only every station in the world, but every program every station has ever played.

When Clarke used the idea in CHILDHOOD'S END, it made bit more sense: the occupation of the Earth by aliens was a singular event in human history, and signaled the approaching end of human history.

Jeff Wilson - jwilson at io.com
IEEE Student Chapter Blog at
< <http://ieeetamut.org> >

brunians at brunians.org — 04 Jun 2010, 14:51 · in reply to Jeff Wilson

I am talking about something Real, which I have experienced.

.

On 6/4/2010 8:19 AM, brunians at brunians.org wrote:

Dreams don't take place in linear time.

That makes it even less likely - how does a person's sleeping mind select an images of an event from among all the events, ever? Imagine a radio that picks up not only every station in the world, but every program every station has ever played.

When Clarke used the idea in CHILDHOOD'S END, it made bit more sense: the occupation of the Earth by aliens was a singular event in human history, and signaled the approaching end of human history.

--

Jeff Wilson - jwilson at io.com
IEEE Student Chapter Blog at
< <http://ieeetamut.org> >

Lee Berman — 04 Jun 2010, 14:53 · follows brunians at brunians.org

I like the idea of the presence of Baldanders/Talos rippling through time and space to affect the dreams of Mary Shelley on Lake Geneva (or vice versa).

Still there are other Earthly artifacts on Urth which seem to demand a more substantial connection, most notably in the Jungle Hut. I think the Jungle Hut actually exists on Earth not Urth, and that Severian has passed through a portal from one world/universe to the other to get there. I think Borski identified a historical pair of missionaries who perhaps form the basis for Robert and Marie. And I suspect the master of portals on Urth, Father Inire, is found in that hut. We get most of our glimpses of the mysterious Padre in cowed or masked form but I think in the Hut we get an all too explicit view of him as buck naked Isangoma.

Jeff Wilson — 04 Jun 2010, 15:18 · in reply to Lee Berman

On 6/4/2010 9:53 AM, Lee Berman wrote:

I like the idea of the presence of Baldanders/Talos rippling through time and space to affect the dreams of Mary Shelley on Lake Geneva (or vice versa).

Still there are other Earthly artifacts on Urth which seem to demand a more substantial connection, most notably in the Jungle Hut. I think

the Jungle Hut actually exists on Earth not Urth, and that Severian has passed through a portal from one world/universe to the other to get there. I think Borski identified a historical pair of missionaries who perhaps form the basis for Robert and Marie. And I suspect the master of portals on Urth, Father Inire, is found in that hut. We get most of our glimpses of the mysterious Padre in cowled or masked form but I think in the Hut we get an all too explicit view of him as buck naked Isangoma.

That's my other concern with the "Urth preceeds Earth" theory: it seems like an awful lot of hand-wringing is done over the fate of Urth when it's a simple matter to stroll in the Gardens and see how things turned out.

Personally, I think Wolfe borrowed from the "All Our Yesterdays" episode of Star Trek where the Sarpeidons escape the end of their world by emigrating to historical eras. It doesn't hurt that Mr Atoz, the time librarian, was played by Ian ("eon"?) Wolfe.

Jeff Wilson - jwilson at io.com
IEEE Student Chapter Blog at
< <http://ieeetamut.org> >

James Wynn — 04 Jun 2010, 15:26 · in reply to brunians at brunians.org

He is present at the echoing event.

Since he is educated, he understands how the World works.

Since he is educated, he has read / is familiar wit

Green has an interesting explanation of how this works in There Are Doors. The various dimensions of There Are Doors with some worlds "closer" to each other than others are (like strings on a guitar), is indistinguishable from tBotNS's succession of universes, at least from Green and Sev's POV.

Lee Berman — 04 Jun 2010, 17:25 · follows James Wynn

That's my other concern with the "Urth preceeds Earth" theory: it seems like an awful lot of hand-wringing is done over the fate of Urth when it's a simple matter to stroll in the Gardens and see how things turned out.

That's not really the interpretation I am presenting. Urth becomes Ushas not Earth. Urth is part of an entire universe, named Briah, which Big Bangs into existence, runs its course then collapses and Grand Gnabs itself into a single mass and out of existence. This single mass then Big Bangs itself into a creation of the next universe which is called Yesod.

Yesod, in the course of its existence, has a planet called Earth which is cognate to but not directly evolved from Urth or Ushas. Instead of Urth's Commonwealth and Severian, Earth has South America and Jesus. I think Earth resides in Yesod Universe because they both have an arch-angel named Tzadkiel. Briah does not have a Tzadkiel (though it might have a Zak).

Also, I don't think just anyone can stroll up to the Jungle Hut and take a peek. The twisting path surely leads different people to different destinations. The labyrinthine path to the Jungle Hut resembles the path to the Atrium of Time and the path to the Last House. I think Severian is privileged in his access to these portals.

I think it is noteworthy that Agia (and first time readers) find the conversation in the Jungle Hut to be a lot of pointless nonsense, but Severian and some multiple-time readers find the

conversation and its Biblical references to be fascinating and perhaps fraught with meaning. (True also of Dr. Talos' play).

James Wynn — 04 Jun 2010, 17:36 · in reply to Lee Berman

Doesn't Wolfe undermine the idea that Urth's universe has no Jesus in "The Book of the Long Sun"? Lemur told Silk that Scylla founded the Chapter as a "parody of the state religion of her own whorl". I suppose it is possible to claim that that "state religion" was not Catholicism, but I don't know why anyone would bother.

Dan'l Danehy-Oakes — 04 Jun 2010, 17:37 · in reply to James Wynn

I'm not sure how trustworthy a source Lemur is...

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 10:36 AM, James Wynn <crushtv at gmail.com> wrote:
Doesn't Wolfe undermine the idea that Urth's universe has no Jesus in "The Book of the Long Sun"? Lemur told Silk that Scylla founded the Chapter as a "parody of the state religion of her own whorl". I suppose it is possible to claim that that "state religion" was not Catholicism, but I don't know why anyone would bother.

Urth Mailing List

James Wynn — 04 Jun 2010, 17:38 · in reply to Dan'l Danehy-Oakes

True for just about any character in a Wolfe story.

I'm not sure how trustworthy a source Lemur is...

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 10:36 AM, James Wynn<crushtv at gmail.com> wrote:
Doesn't Wolfe undermine the idea that Urth's universe has no Jesus in "The Book of the Long Sun"? Lemur told Silk that Scylla founded the Chapter as a "parody of the state religion of her own whorl". I suppose it is possible to claim that that "state religion" was not Catholicism, but I don't know why anyone would bother.

James Wynn — 04 Jun 2010, 19:04 · in reply to James Wynn

On the other hand, it is possible for a "Catholic Church" to have been established in the Commonwealth without a Jesus (complete with crosses) merely in correspondence to the vibrations of our Universe, just as in Green's dimension (There Are Doors) grooms wear black at weddings only because they do it in Lara's dimension.

In that case, the Chapter is a parody of an echo. But somehow I find that less satisfying.

J.

True for just about any character in a Wolfe story.

I'm not sure how trustworthy a source Lemur is...

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 10:36 AM, James Wynn<crushtv at gmail.com> wrote:
Doesn't Wolfe undermine the idea that Urth's universe has no Jesus in "The Book of the Long Sun"? Lemur told Silk that Scylla founded the Chapter as a

"parody of the state religion of her own whorl". I suppose it is possible to claim that that "state religion" was not Catholicism, but I don't know why anyone would bother.

John Watkins — 04 Jun 2010, 19:10 · in reply to James Wynn

How Catholic is the Chapter, really?

Naturally there are elements in the liturgy and priestly celibacy. But the Catholic liturgy did not spring forth fully formed either, and priestly celibacy is not a uniquely Christian practice either (many Buddhist groups, um...Vestal Virgins...have to be others as well).

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 3:04 PM, James Wynn <crushtv at gmail.com> wrote:
On the other hand, it is possible for a "Catholic Church" to have been established in the Commonwealth without a Jesus (complete with crosses) merely in correspondence to the vibrations of our Universe, just as in Green's dimension (There Are Doors) grooms wear black at weddings only because they do it in Lara's dimension.

In that case, the Chapter is a parody of an echo. But somehow I find that less satisfying.

J.

True for just about any character in a Wolfe story.

I'm not sure how trustworthy a source Lemur is...

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 10:36 AM, James Wynn<crushtv at gmail.com> wrote:

Doesn't Wolfe undermine the idea that Urth's universe has no Jesus in "The Book of the Long Sun"? Lemur told Silk that Scylla founded the Chapter as a "parody of the state religion of her own whorl". I suppose it is possible to claim that that "state religion" was not Catholicism, but I don't know why anyone would bother.

brunians at brunians.org — 04 Jun 2010, 19:10 · in reply to James Wynn

I wonder if the iterative Worlds and the parallel Worlds can be identified.

I think maybe yes.

They can be next to each other in more than one dimension.

.

On the other hand, it is possible for a "Catholic Church" to have been established in the Commonwealth without a Jesus (complete with crosses) merely in correspondence to the vibrations of our Universe, just as in

Green's dimension (There Are Doors) grooms wear black at weddings only because they do it in Lara's dimension.

In that case, the Chapter is a parody of an echo. But somehow I find that less satisfying.

J.

True for just about any character in a Wolfe story.

I'm not sure how trustworthy a source Lemur is...

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 10:36 AM, James Wynn<crushtv at gmail.com> wrote:

Doesn't Wolfe undermine the idea that Urth's universe has no Jesus in "The Book of the Long Sun"? Lemur told Silk that Scylla founded the Chapter as a "parody of the state religion of her own whorl". I suppose it is possible to claim that that "state religion" was not Catholicism, but I don't know why anyone would bother.

brunians at brunians.org — 04 Jun 2010, 19:11 · in reply to John Watkins

Priests are celibate for reasons which have nothing to do with religion per se.

.

How Catholic is the Chapter, really?

Naturally there are elements in the liturgy and priestly celibacy. But the Catholic liturgy did not spring forth fully formed either, and priestly celibacy is not a uniquely Christian practice either (many Buddhist groups, um...Vestal Virgins...have to be others as well).

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 3:04 PM, James Wynn <crushtv at gmail.com> wrote:

On the other hand, it is possible for a "Catholic Church" to have been established in the Commonwealth without a Jesus (complete with crosses) merely in correspondence to the vibrations of our Universe, just as in Green's dimension (There Are Doors) grooms wear black at weddings only because they do it in Lara's dimension.

In that case, the Chapter is a parody of an echo. But somehow I find that less satisfying.

J.

True for just about any character in a Wolfe story.

I'm not sure how trustworthy a source Lemur is...

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 10:36 AM, James Wynn<crushtv at gmail.com> wrote:

Doesn't Wolfe undermine the idea that Urth's universe has no Jesus in "The Book of the Long Sun"? Lemur told Silk that Scylla founded the Chapter as a "parody of the state religion of her own whorl". I suppose it is possible to claim that that "state religion" was not Catholicism, but I don't know why anyone would bother.

John Watkins — 04 Jun 2010, 19:14 · in reply to brunians at brunians.org

I disagree with that, actually.

I recognize that, oh, historically, there were various secular causes for priestly celibacy. But there's a pretty well-established human impulse to recognize things associated with the transcendent or divine by "setting them apart," and requiring that the intermediaries between God and man give up some form of "normal" human life is a perfectly natural way for that impulse to be satisfied.

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 3:11 PM, <brunians at brunians.org> wrote:
Priests are celibate for reasons which have nothing to do with religion per se.

.

How Catholic is the Chapter, really?

Naturally there are elements in the liturgy and priestly celibacy. But the

Catholic liturgy did not spring forth fully formed either, and priestly celibacy is not a uniquely Christian practice either (many Buddhist groups, um...Vestal Virgins...have to be others as well).

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 3:04 PM, James Wynn <crushtv at gmail.com> wrote:

On the other hand, it is possible for a "Catholic Church" to have been established in the Commonwealth without a Jesus (complete with crosses) merely in correspondence to the vibrations of our Universe, just as in Green's dimension (There Are Doors) grooms wear black at weddings only because they do it in Lara's dimension.

In that case, the Chapter is a parody of an echo. But somehow I find that less satisfying.

J.

True for just about any character in a Wolfe story.

I'm not sure how trustworthy a source Lemur is...

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 10:36 AM, James Wynn<crushtv at gmail.com> wrote:

Doesn't Wolfe undermine the idea that Urth's universe has no Jesus in "The Book of the Long Sun"? Lemur told Silk that Scylla founded the Chapter as a "parody of the state religion of her own whorl". I suppose it is possible to claim that that "state religion" was not Catholicism, but I don't know why anyone would bother.

brunians at brunians.org — 04 Jun 2010, 19:20 · in reply to John Watkins

It is biologically based.

If a man does not have orgasms, he becomes capable to perform certain spiritual acts which he cannot otherwise perform, or not as well.

.

I disagree with that, actually.

I recognize that, oh, historically, there were various secular causes for priestly celibacy. But there's a pretty well-established human impulse to recognize things associated with the transcendent or divine by "setting them apart," and requiring that the intermediaries between God and man give up some form of "normal" human life is a perfectly natural way for that impulse to be satisfied.

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 3:11 PM, <brunians at brunians.org> wrote:

Priests are celibate for reasons which have nothing to do with religion per se.

.

How Catholic is the Chapter, really?

Naturally there are elements in the liturgy and priestly celibacy.

But the Catholic liturgy did not spring forth fully formed either, and priestly celibacy is not a uniquely Christian practice either (many Buddhist groups, um...Vestal Virgins...have to be others as well).

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 3:04 PM, James Wynn <crushtv at gmail.com> wrote:

On the other hand, it is possible for a "Catholic Church" to have been established in the Commonwealth without a Jesus (complete with crosses) merely in correspondence to the vibrations of our Universe, just as in Green's dimension (There Are Doors) grooms wear black at weddings

only
because they do it in Lara's dimension.

In that case, the Chapter is a parody of an echo. But somehow I find that less satisfying.

J.

True for just about any character in a Wolfe story.

I'm not sure how trustworthy a source Lemur is...

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 10:36 AM, James Wynn<crushtv at gmail.com> wrote:

Doesn't Wolfe undermine the idea that Urth's universe has no Jesus in "The Book of the Long Sun"? Lemur told Silk that Scylla founded the Chapter as a "parody of the state religion of her own whorl". I suppose it is possible to claim that that "state religion" was not Catholicism, but I don't know why anyone would bother.

James Wynn — 04 Jun 2010, 19:21 · in reply to John Watkins

You could just as well ask "How Catholic is the Catholic Church?" Obviously there are parallels with other religions in this or that aspect. It's the whole package that is at issue. I can't imagine that any reader has said, "Oh! You think the Chapter seems like a twisted version of Catholic Church? I hadn't thought of that."

How Catholic is the Chapter, really?

Naturally there are elements in the liturgy and priestly celibacy. But the Catholic liturgy did not spring forth fully formed either, and priestly celibacy is not a uniquely Christian practice either (many Buddhist groups, um...Vestal Virgins...have to be others as well).
On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 3:04 PM, James Wynn <crushtv at gmail.com <mailto:crushtv at gmail.com>> wrote:

On the other hand, it is possible for a "Catholic Church" to have been established in the Commonwealth without a Jesus (complete with crosses) merely in correspondence to the vibrations of our Universe, just as in Green's dimension (There Are Doors) grooms wear black at weddings only because they do it in Lara's dimension.

In that case, the Chapter is a parody of an echo. But somehow I find that less satisfying.

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 10:36 AM, James Wynn<crushtv at gmail.com <mailto:crushtv at gmail.com>> wrote:

Doesn't Wolfe undermine the idea that Urth's universe has no Jesus in "The Book of the Long Sun"? Lemur told Silk that Scylla founded the Chapter as a "parody of the state religion of her own whorl". I suppose it is possible to claim that that "state religion" was not Catholicism, but I don't know why anyone would bother.

John Watkins — 04 Jun 2010, 19:21 · in reply to brunians at brunians.org

I'm never sure what planet you're from.

For the record, Nietzsche shared your view that there was some biological benefit to preserving the seed. He too was a bit of a nutter.

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 3:20 PM, <brunians at brunians.org> wrote:
It is biologically based.

If a man does not have orgasms, he becomes capable to perform certain spiritual acts which he cannot otherwise perform, or not as well.

.

I disagree with that, actually.

I recognize that, oh, historically, there were various secular causes for priestly celibacy. But there's a pretty well-established human impulse to recognize things associated with the transcendent or divine by "setting them apart," and requiring that the intermediaries between God and man give up some form of "normal" human life is a perfectly natural way for that impulse to be satisfied.

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 3:11 PM, <brunians at brunians.org> wrote:
Priests are celibate for reasons which have nothing to do with religion per se.

.

How Catholic is the Chapter, really?

Naturally there are elements in the liturgy and priestly celibacy.

But the Catholic liturgy did not spring forth fully formed either, and priestly celibacy is not a uniquely Christian practice either (many Buddhist groups, um...Vestal Virgins...have to be others as well).

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 3:04 PM, James Wynn <crushtv at gmail.com> wrote:

On the other hand, it is possible for a "Catholic Church" to have been established in the Commonwealth without a Jesus (complete with crosses) merely in correspondence to the vibrations of our Universe, just as in Green's dimension (There Are Doors) grooms wear black at weddings only because they do it in Lara's dimension.

In that case, the Chapter is a parody of an echo. But somehow I find that less satisfying.

J.

True for just about any character in a Wolfe story.

I'm not sure how trustworthy a source Lemur is...

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 10:36 AM, James Wynn<crushtv at gmail.com> wrote:

Doesn't Wolfe undermine the idea that Urth's universe has no Jesus in

"The

Book of the Long Sun"? Lemur told Silk that Scylla founded the Chapter

as a

"parody of the state religion of her own whorl". I suppose it is possible to

claim that that "state religion" was not Catholicism, but I don't know

why

anyone would bother.

Dan'I Danehy-Oakes — 04 Jun 2010, 19:22 · in reply to John Watkins

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 12:10 PM, John Watkins <john.watkins04 at gmail.com> wrote:

How Catholic is the Chapter, really?

A good question -- and one without clear answers. Certainly the Chiasmic (?) Writings quote from the Bible, but they quote from other things too. The order of the liturgy in the Chapter's "sacrifice" is not utterly unlike that in the sacrifice of the Mass.

Dan'I Danehy-Oakes

James Wynn — 04 Jun 2010, 19:22 · in reply to John Watkins

Taoism too, right?

I'm never sure what planet you're from.

For the record, Nietzsche shared your view that there was some biological benefit to preserving the seed. He too was a bit of a nutter.

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 3:20 PM, <brunians at brunians.org

<mailto:brunians at brunians.org>> wrote:

It is biologically based.

If a man does not have orgasms, he becomes capable to perform certain spiritual acts which he cannot otherwise perform, or not as well.

John Watkins — 04 Jun 2010, 19:23 · in reply to James Wynn

Well, no, obviously not...

I guess what I'm asking is, do that parallels between the Chapter and the Catholic Church rise to the level that within the fictive universe there must be a cause-and-effect relationship between them, or can they be interpreted as merely have a metafictional causal relationship, i.e., the author is a Catholic with something to say and playing around with ideas that are familiar to him?

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 3:21 PM, James Wynn <crushtv at gmail.com> wrote:
You could just as well ask "How Catholic is the Catholic Church?" Obviously there are parallels with other religions in this or that aspect. It's the whole package that is at issue. I can't imagine that any reader has said, "Oh! You think the Chapter seems like a twisted version of Catholic Church? I hadn't thought of that."

How Catholic is the Chapter, really?

Naturally there are elements in the liturgy and priestly celibacy. But the Catholic liturgy did not spring forth fully formed either, and priestly celibacy is not a uniquely Christian practice either (many Buddhist groups, um...Vestal Virgins...have to be others as well).

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 3:04 PM, James Wynn <crushtv at gmail.com> wrote:

On the other hand, it is possible for a "Catholic Church" to have been established in the Commonwealth without a Jesus (complete with crosses) merely in correspondence to the vibrations of our Universe, just as in Green's dimension (There Are Doors) grooms wear black at weddings only because they do it in Lara's dimension.

In that case, the Chapter is a parody of an echo. But somehow I find that less satisfying.

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 10:36 AM, James Wynn<crushtv at gmail.com> wrote:

Doesn't Wolfe undermine the idea that Urth's universe has no Jesus in "The Book of the Long Sun"? Lemur told Silk that Scylla founded the Chapter as a "parody of the state religion of her own whorl". I suppose it is possible to claim that that "state religion" was not Catholicism, but I don't know why anyone would bother.

James Wynn — 04 Jun 2010, 19:29 · in reply to John Watkins

Well, the concept of needing to confess to a priest as a path to absolution is pretty Catholic, I'd think. If Wolfe only wanted to play with familiar motifs, why include the plot element that the Chapter was founded as a parody of another specific religion?

Well, no, obviously not...I guess what I'm asking is, do that parallels between the Chapter and the Catholic Church rise to the level that within the fictive universe there must be a cause-and-effect relationship between them, or can they be interpreted as merely have a metafictional causal relationship, i.e., the author is a Catholic with something to say and playing around with ideas that are familiar to him?

You could just as well ask "How Catholic is the Catholic Church?" Obviously there are parallels with other religions in this or that aspect. It's the whole package that is at issue. I can't imagine that any reader has said, "Oh! You think the Chapter seems like a twisted version of Catholic Church? I hadn't thought of that."

How Catholic is the Chapter, really?

brunians at brunians.org — 04 Jun 2010, 19:30 · in reply to John Watkins

I am from this planet.

Besides Nietzsche and myself, who else has this idea?

.

I'm never sure what planet you're from.

For the record, Nietzsche shared your view that there was some biological benefit to preserving the seed. He too was a bit of a nutter.

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 3:20 PM, <brunians at brunians.org> wrote:

It is biologically based.

If a man does not have orgasms, he becomes capable to perform certain spiritual acts which he cannot otherwise perform, or not as well.

.

I disagree with that, actually.

I recognize that, oh, historically, there were various secular causes for priestly celibacy. But there's a pretty well-established human impulse to recognize things associated with the transcendent or divine by "setting them apart," and requiring that the intermediaries between God and man give up some form of "normal" human life is a perfectly natural way for that impulse to be satisfied.

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 3:11 PM, <brunians at brunians.org> wrote:

Priests are celibate for reasons which have nothing to do with religion per se.

.

How Catholic is the Chapter, really?

Naturally there are elements in the liturgy and priestly celibacy.

But
the

Catholic liturgy did not spring forth fully formed either, and
priestly
celibacy is not a uniquely Christian practice either (many Buddhist
groups,
um...Vestal Virgins...have to be others as well).

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 3:04 PM, James Wynn <crushtv at gmail.com>
wrote:

On the other hand, it is possible for a "Catholic Church" to have
been
established in the Commonwealth without a Jesus (complete with
crosses)
merely in correspondence to the vibrations of our Universe, just
as
in
Green's dimension (There Are Doors) grooms wear black at weddings
only
because they do it in Lara's dimension.

In that case, the Chapter is a parody of an echo. But somehow I
find
that
less satisfying.

J.

True for just about any character in a Wolfe story.

I'm not sure how trustworthy a source Lemur is...

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 10:36 AM, James Wynn<crushtv at gmail.com>
wrote:

Doesn't Wolfe undermine the idea that Urth's universe has no
Jesus
in
"The
Book of the Long Sun"? Lemur told Silk that Scylla founded the
Chapter
as a
"parody of the state religion of her own whorl". I suppose it
is
possible to
claim that that "state religion" was not Catholicism, but I
don't
know
why
anyone would bother.

'I am from this planet' is strictly accurate when you consider my physical person.

Actually, we are not on a planet.

We are in a World.

Planets are bright lights that move in the sky.

Are you planning upon attending the 2011 WorldCon, John?

.

I'm never sure what planet you're from.

For the record, Nietzsche shared your view that there was some biological benefit to preserving the seed. He too was a bit of a nutter.

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 3:20 PM, <brunians at brunians.org> wrote:

It is biologically based.

If a man does not have orgasms, he becomes capable to perform certain spiritual acts which he cannot otherwise perform, or not as well.

.

I disagree with that, actually.

I recognize that, oh, historically, there were various secular causes for priestly celibacy. But there's a pretty well-established human impulse to recognize things associated with the transcendent or divine by "setting them apart," and requiring that the intermediaries between God and man give up some form of "normal" human life is a perfectly natural way for that impulse to be satisfied.

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 3:11 PM, <brunians at brunians.org> wrote:

Priests are celibate for reasons which have nothing to do with religion per se.

.

How Catholic is the Chapter, really?

Naturally there are elements in the liturgy and priestly celibacy.

But the Catholic liturgy did not spring forth fully formed either, and priestly celibacy is not a uniquely Christian practice either (many Buddhist groups,

um...Vestal Virgins...have to be others as well).

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 3:04 PM, James Wynn <crushtv at gmail.com> wrote:

On the other hand, it is possible for a "Catholic Church" to have been established in the Commonwealth without a Jesus (complete with crosses) merely in correspondence to the vibrations of our Universe, just as in Green's dimension (There Are Doors) grooms wear black at weddings only because they do it in Lara's dimension.

In that case, the Chapter is a parody of an echo. But somehow I find that less satisfying.

J.

True for just about any character in a Wolfe story.

I'm not sure how trustworthy a source Lemur is...

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 10:36 AM, James Wynn<crushtv at gmail.com> wrote:

Doesn't Wolfe undermine the idea that Urth's universe has no Jesus in "The Book of the Long Sun"? Lemur told Silk that Scylla founded the Chapter as a "parody of the state religion of her own whorl". I suppose it is possible to claim that that "state religion" was not Catholicism, but I don't know why anyone would bother.

James Wynn — 04 Jun 2010, 19:33 · in reply to brunians at brunians.org

I am from this planet.

That's what a Visitor _would_ say.

Besides Nietzsche and myself, who else has this idea?

Are you watching out for homeboys?

brunians at brunians.org — 04 Jun 2010, 19:33 · in reply to James Wynn

All religions have similar doctrines regarding the use and retention of semen.

There are variations in practice.

.

Taoism too, right?

I'm never sure what planet you're from.

For the record, Nietzsche shared your view that there was some biological benefit to preserving the seed. He too was a bit of a nutter.

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 3:20 PM, <brunians at brunians.org
<mailto:brunians at brunians.org>> wrote:

It is biologically based.

If a man does not have orgasms, he becomes capable to perform certain spiritual acts which he cannot otherwise perform, or not as well.

brunians at brunians.org — 04 Jun 2010, 19:39 · in reply to James Wynn

A lot of people use confession.

Whether or not they got it from the Catholics is problematic.

How close is the form of confession used to the Catholic form?

.

Well, the concept of needing to confess to a priest as a path to absolution is pretty Catholic, I'd think.

If Wolfe only wanted to play with familiar motifs, why include the plot element that the Chapter was founded as a parody of another specific religion?

Well, no, obviously not...I guess what I'm asking is, do that parallels between the Chapter and the Catholic Church rise to the level that within the fictive universe there must be a cause-and-effect relationship between them, or can they be interpreted as merely have a metafictional causal relationship, i.e., the author is a Catholic with something to say and playing around with ideas that are familiar to him?

You could just as well ask "How Catholic is the Catholic Church?"

Obviously there are parallels with other religions in this or that aspect. It's the whole package that is at issue. I can't imagine that any reader has said, "Oh! You think the Chapter seems like a twisted version of Catholic Church? I hadn't thought of that."

How Catholic is the Chapter, really?

John Watkins — 04 Jun 2010, 19:40 · in reply to James Wynn

Because Wolfe is also playing with the notions of an anti-Christ or demiurge. Falsity and pretence to authority are pretty key parts of those notions. (And frankly Pas is a lot more demiurge than anti-Christ.)

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 3:29 PM, James Wynn <crushtv at gmail.com> wrote:

Well, the concept of needing to confess to a priest as a path to absolution is pretty Catholic, I'd think.

If Wolfe only wanted to play with familiar motifs, why include the plot element that the Chapter was founded as a parody of another specific religion?

Well, no, obviously not...I guess what I'm asking is, do that parallels between the Chapter and the Catholic Church rise to the level that within the fictive universe there must be a cause-and-effect relationship between them, or can they be interpreted as merely have a metafictional causal relationship, i.e., the author is a Catholic with something to say and playing around with ideas that are familiar to him?

You could just as well ask "How Catholic is the Catholic Church?"

Obviously there are parallels with other religions in this or that aspect. It's the whole package that is at issue. I can't imagine that any reader has said, "Oh! You think the Chapter seems like a twisted version of Catholic Church? I hadn't thought of that."

How Catholic is the Chapter, really?

brunians at brunians.org — 04 Jun 2010, 19:41 · in reply to James Wynn

I'm assuming that your mockery, here, is totally friendly and benign.

.

I am from this planet.

That's what a Visitor would say.

Besides Nietzsche and myself, who else has this idea?

Are you watching out for homeboys?

John Watkins — 04 Jun 2010, 19:41 · in reply to brunians at brunians.org

Is it in Reno? I'm unlikely to be in Reno.

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 3:32 PM, <brunians at brunians.org> wrote:

'I am from this planet' is strictly accurate when you consider my physical person.

Actually, we are not on a planet.

We are in a World.

Planets are bright lights that move in the sky.

Are you planning upon attending the 2011 WorldCon, John?

.

I'm never sure what planet you're from.

For the record, Nietzsche shared your view that there was some biological benefit to preserving the seed. He too was a bit of a nutter.

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 3:20 PM, <brunians at brunians.org> wrote:

It is biologically based.

If a man does not have orgasms, he becomes capable to perform certain spiritual acts which he cannot otherwise perform, or not as well.

.

I disagree with that, actually.

I recognize that, oh, historically, there were various secular causes for priestly celibacy. But there's a pretty well-established human impulse to recognize things associated with the transcendent or divine by "setting them apart," and requiring that the intermediaries between God and man give up some form of "normal" human life is a perfectly natural way for that impulse to be satisfied.

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 3:11 PM, <brunians at brunians.org> wrote:

Priests are celibate for reasons which have nothing to do with religion per se.

.

How Catholic is the Chapter, really?

Naturally there are elements in the liturgy and priestly celibacy.

But the Catholic liturgy did not spring forth fully formed either, and priestly celibacy is not a uniquely Christian practice either (many Buddhist groups, um...Vestal Virgins...have to be others as well).

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 3:04 PM, James Wynn <crushtv at gmail.com> wrote:

On the other hand, it is possible for a "Catholic Church" to have been established in the Commonwealth without a Jesus (complete with crosses)

merely in correspondence to the vibrations of our Universe, just
as
in
Green's dimension (There Are Doors) grooms wear black at weddings
only
because they do it in Lara's dimension.

In that case, the Chapter is a parody of an echo. But somehow I
find
that
less satisfying.

J.

True for just about any character in a Wolfe story.

I'm not sure how trustworthy a source Lemur is...

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 10:36 AM, James Wynn<crushtv at gmail.com>
wrote:

Doesn't Wolfe undermine the idea that Urth's universe has no
Jesus
in
"The
Book of the Long Sun"? Lemur told Silk that Scylla founded the
Chapter
as a
"parody of the state religion of her own whorl". I suppose it
is
possible to
claim that that "state religion" was not Catholicism, but I
don't
know
why
anyone would bother.

John Watkins — 04 Jun 2010, 19:42 · in reply to brunians at brunians.org

I think we're all friendly here.

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 3:41 PM, <brunians at brunians.org> wrote:
I'm assuming that your mockery, here, is totally friendly and benign.

.

I am from this planet.

That's what a Visitor _would_ say.

Besides Nietzsche and myself, who else has this idea?

Are you watching out for homeboys?

James Wynn — 04 Jun 2010, 19:42 · in reply to brunians at brunians.org

Absolutely.

I hoped that was obvious. Sorry if it wasn't.

I'm assuming that your mockery, here, is totally friendly and benign.

I am from this planet.

That's what a Visitor would say.

Besides Nietzsche and myself, who else has this idea?

Are you watching out for homeboys?

brunians at brunians.org — 04 Jun 2010, 19:48 · in reply to John Watkins

A demiourgos is an intermediate worker.

.
Because Wolfe is also playing with the notions of an anti-Christ or demiurge. Falsity and pretence to authority are pretty key parts of those notions. (And frankly Pas is a lot more demiurge than anti-Christ.)

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 3:29 PM, James Wynn <crushtv at gmail.com> wrote:

Well, the concept of needing to confess to a priest as a path to absolution is pretty Catholic, I'd think.
If Wolfe only wanted to play with familiar motifs, why include the plot element that the Chapter was founded as a parody of another specific religion?

Well, no, obviously not...I guess what I'm asking is, do that parallels between the Chapter and the Catholic Church rise to the level that within the fictive universe there must be a cause-and-effect relationship between them, or can they be interpreted as merely have a metafictional causal relationship, i.e., the author is a Catholic with something to say and playing around with ideas that are familiar to him?

You could just as well ask "How Catholic is the Catholic Church?"

Obviously there are parallels with other religions in this or that aspect.
It's the whole package that is at issue. I can't imagine that any reader has said, "Oh! You think the Chapter seems like a twisted version of Catholic Church? I hadn't thought of that."

How Catholic is the Chapter, really?

Dan'l Danehy-Oakes — 04 Jun 2010, 19:49 · in reply to John Watkins

Yes, it's in Reno.

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 12:41 PM, John Watkins <john.watkins04 at gmail.com> wrote:
Is it in Reno? I'm unlikely to be in Reno.

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 3:32 PM, <brunians at brunians.org> wrote:

'I am from this planet' is strictly accurate when you consider my physical person.

Actually, we are not on a planet.

We are in a World.

Planets are bright lights that move in the sky.

Are you planning upon attending the 2011 WorldCon, John?

.

I'm never sure what planet you're from.

For the record, Nietzsche shared your view that there was some biological benefit to preserving the seed. ?He too was a bit of a nutter.

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 3:20 PM, <brunians at brunians.org> wrote:

It is biologically based.

If a man does not have orgasms, he becomes capable to perform certain spiritual acts which he cannot otherwise perform, or not as well.

.

I disagree with that, actually.

I recognize that, oh, historically, there were various secular causes for priestly celibacy. ?But there's a pretty well-established human impulse to recognize things associated with the transcendent or divine by "setting them apart," and requiring that the intermediaries between God and man give up some form of "normal" human life is a perfectly natural way for that impulse to be satisfied.

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 3:11 PM, <brunians at brunians.org> wrote:

Priests are celibate for reasons which have nothing to do with religion per se.

.

How Catholic is the Chapter, really?

Naturally there are elements in the liturgy and priestly celibacy.

But
the
Catholic liturgy did not spring forth fully formed either, and
priestly
celibacy is not a uniquely Christian practice either (many
Buddhist
groups,
um...Vestal Virgins...have to be others as well).

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 3:04 PM, James Wynn <crushtv at gmail.com>
wrote:

On the other hand, it is possible for a "Catholic Church" to have
been
established in the Commonwealth without a Jesus (complete with
crosses)
merely in correspondence to the vibrations of our Universe, just
as
in
Green's dimension (There Are Doors) grooms wear black at weddings
only
because they do it in Lara's dimension.

In that case, the Chapter is a parody of an echo. But somehow I
find
that
less satisfying.

J.

True for just about any character in a Wolfe story.

I'm not sure how trustworthy a source Lemur is...

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 10:36 AM, James Wynn<crushtv at gmail.com>
?wrote:

Doesn't Wolfe undermine the idea that Urth's universe has no
Jesus
in
"The
Book of the Long Sun"? Lemur told Silk that Scylla founded the
Chapter
as a
"parody of the state religion of her own whorl". I suppose it
is
possible to
claim that that "state religion" was not Catholicism, but I
don't
know
why
anyone would bother.

Too bad.

That's the only convention that I am assured of attending.

.

Is it in Reno? I'm unlikely to be in Reno.

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 3:32 PM, <brunians at brunians.org> wrote:

'I am from this planet' is strictly accurate when you consider my physical person.

Actually, we are not on a planet.

We are in a World.

Planets are bright lights that move in the sky.

Are you planning upon attending the 2011 WorldCon, John?

.

I'm never sure what planet you're from.

For the record, Nietzsche shared your view that there was some biological benefit to preserving the seed. He too was a bit of a nutter.

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 3:20 PM, <brunians at brunians.org> wrote:

It is biologically based.

If a man does not have orgasms, he becomes capable to perform certain spiritual acts which he cannot otherwise perform, or not as well.

.

I disagree with that, actually.

I recognize that, oh, historically, there were various secular causes for priestly celibacy. But there's a pretty well-established human impulse to recognize things associated with the transcendent or divine by "setting them apart," and requiring that the intermediaries between God and man give up some form of "normal" human life is a perfectly natural way for that impulse to be satisfied.

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 3:11 PM, <brunians at brunians.org> wrote:

Priests are celibate for reasons which have nothing to do with religion per se.

.

How Catholic is the Chapter, really?

Naturally there are elements in the liturgy and priestly celibacy.

But the Catholic liturgy did not spring forth fully formed either, and priestly celibacy is not a uniquely Christian practice either (many Buddhist groups, um...Vestal Virgins...have to be others as well).

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 3:04 PM, James Wynn <crushtv at gmail.com> wrote:

On the other hand, it is possible for a "Catholic Church" to have been established in the Commonwealth without a Jesus (complete with crosses) merely in correspondence to the vibrations of our Universe, just as in Green's dimension (There Are Doors) grooms wear black at weddings only because they do it in Lara's dimension.

In that case, the Chapter is a parody of an echo. But somehow I find that less satisfying.

J.

True for just about any character in a Wolfe story.

I'm not sure how trustworthy a source Lemur is...

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 10:36 AM, James Wynn<crushtv at gmail.com> wrote:

Doesn't Wolfe undermine the idea that Urth's universe has no Jesus in "The Book of the Long Sun"? Lemur told Silk that Scylla founded the Chapter as a

"parody of the state religion of her own whorl". I suppose
it
is
possible to
claim that that "state religion" was not Catholicism, but I
don't
know
why
anyone would bother.

James Wynn — 04 Jun 2010, 19:50 · in reply to John Watkins

Because Wolfe is also playing with the notions of an anti-Christ or
demiurge. Falsity and pretence to authority are pretty key parts of
those notions.

Well, it works for that too.

Like I said, one could argue that the religion on which the Chapter is based is not the Catholic
Church, but I think that is quite cumbersome and distracts from the parallels and themes that (I
think) Wolfe is intentionally toying with. It's unsatisfying to me.

(And frankly Pas is a lot more demiurge than anti-Christ.)

I could not agree more than I am agreeing at this very moment. See my conversation with
David Stockhoff.

brunians at brunians.org — 04 Jun 2010, 19:50 · in reply to John Watkins

I think so too.

.

I think we're all friendly here.

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 3:41 PM, <brunians at brunians.org> wrote:

I'm assuming that your mockery, here, is totally friendly and benign.

.

I am from this planet.

That's what a Visitor _would_ say.

Besides Nietzsche and myself, who else has this idea?

Are you watching out for homeboys?

brunians at brunians.org — 04 Jun 2010, 19:51 · in reply to James Wynn

Oh no, James.

I had a question about John's use of terms.

It's been well answered.

.

Absolutely.
I hoped that was obvious. Sorry if it wasn't.
I'm assuming that your mockery, here, is totally friendly and benign.
I am from this planet.
That's what a Visitor would say.
Besides Nietzsche and myself, who else has this idea?
Are you watching out for homeboys?

brunians at brunians.org — 04 Jun 2010, 19:52 · in reply to James Wynn

Antichrist and demiurge are such totally different things, though.

.
Because Wolfe is also playing with the notions of an anti-Christ or demiurge. Falsity and pretence to authority are pretty key parts of those notions.

Well, it works for that too.

Like I said, one could argue that the religion on which the Chapter is based is not the Catholic Church, but I think that is quite cumbersome and distracts from the parallels and themes that (I think) Wolfe is intentionally toying with. It's unsatisfying to me.

(And frankly Pas is a lot more demiurge than anti-Christ.)

I could not agree more than I am agreeing at this very moment. See my conversation with David Stockhoff.

Jerry Friedman — 04 Jun 2010, 19:55 · in reply to James Wynn

It's in the /Journey to the West/. Whether Chinese Buddhism got it from Taoism I don't know. I believe it's also in Tantric Buddhism.

I will be very surprised to hear that Judaism has this idea.

Jerry Friedman has been surprised before.

James Wynn — 04 Jun 2010, 19:57 · in reply to brunians at brunians.org

This was a brain-dump. And I've never go around to editing it, but this was my take linkages between The Long Sun and Revelation:

<http://www.urth.org/whorlmap/apocalypse.htm>

Antichrist and demiurge are such totally different things, though.

Because Wolfe is also playing with the notions of an anti-Christ or demiurge. Falsity and pretence to authority are pretty key parts of those notions.

John Watkins — 04 Jun 2010, 20:02 · in reply to brunians at brunians.org

No, I know that.

Well, perhaps with interlocutors like you two, I should be very clear in what I mean. You are both very smart and know a lot about this stuff and so may have more refined understandings.

The anti-Christ is a speculative figure in Christian mythology. To the degree that there is/will be such a person, he seems to be a false or dark messiah--a human being or demon in human form--someone who usurps Christ's expected role in the Second Coming for a period and brings about various catastrophes before decisive defeat at the hands of Christ. The demiurge, as I understand it, is a Gnostic interpretation of the God of the Old Testament. In Gnostic myth this character is evil or stupid, at least in comparison to the real God, and responsible for this world being kind of, well, crappy. He is falsely believed by many to be the real God and may even style himself as such.

The two characters are not really similar except that they both contrast with the true divinity of their respective mythologies and are significant for their false representation as the true divinity. In Long Sun, at least, Pas much more closely mimics the demiurge.

Or to put it another way:

Anti-Christ: Brother Justin Crowe

Demiurge: Dalek Emperor.

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 3:52 PM, <brunians at brunians.org> wrote:
Antichrist and demiurge are such totally different things, though.

.

Because Wolfe is also playing with the notions of an anti-Christ or demiurge. Falsity and pretence to authority are pretty key parts of those notions.

Well, it works for that too.

Like I said, one could argue that the religion on which the Chapter is based is not the Catholic Church, but I think that is quite cumbersome and distracts from the parallels and themes that (I think) Wolfe is intentionally toying with. It's unsatisfying to me.

(And frankly Pas is a lot more demiurge than anti-Christ.)

I could not agree more than I am agreeing at this very moment. See my conversation with David Stockhoff.

brunians at brunians.org — 04 Jun 2010, 20:02 · in reply to Jerry Friedman

It's all through QBLH.

Be surprised.

.

It's in the /Journey to the West/. Whether Chinese Buddhism got it from Taoism I don't know. I believe it's also in Tantric Buddhism.

I will be very surprised to hear that Judaism has this idea.

Jerry Friedman has been surprised before.

From: James Wynn <crushtv at gmail.com>
To: The Urth Mailing List <urth at lists.urth.net>
Sent: Fri, June 4, 2010 1:22:53 PM
Subject: Re: (urth) Urth & Earth (was "Travelling North aka miscellaneous thoughts on Wolfe")

Taoism too, right?

I'm never sure what planet you're from.

For the record, Nietzsche shared your view that there was some biological benefit to preserving the seed. He too was a bit of a nutter.

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 3:20 PM, <brunians at brunians.org> wrote:

It
is biologically based.

If a man does not have orgasms, he becomes capable to perform certain spiritual acts which he cannot otherwise perform, or not as well.

David Stockhoff — 04 Jun 2010, 20:03 · follows John Watkins

Pretty much, yes, and for both sexes (not just semen, but orgasms). They are either controlled, or controlled and released, for individuals of a certain status, or for everyone.

Generally, due to its near-universality, I'd take the idea as coming down from prehistorical shamanism. Which is not to say that it's wrong or irrational---in fact, I'd call it common sense.

But it's as much to do with magic as with religion, and magic underlies all religions in some way. As it does football, where young men are told not to indulge before a big game (or used to be).

Message: 1
Date: Fri, 4 Jun 2010 15:33:51 -0400
From: brunians at brunians.org
To: "The Urth Mailing List" <urth at lists.urth.net>
Subject: Re: (urth) Urth & Earth (was "Travelling North aka miscellaneous thoughts on Wolfe")
Message-ID: <237a584c6ba9ce8b8f240876da60c044.squirrel at brunians.org>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=iso-8859-1

All religions have similar doctrines regarding the use and retention of semen.

There are variations in practice.

John Watkins — 04 Jun 2010, 20:04 · in reply to David Stockhoff

Boxing too. Apparently now, however, the opposite practice is encouraged.

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 4:03 PM, David Stockhoff <dstockhoff at verizon.net> wrote:
Pretty much, yes, and for both sexes (not just semen, but orgasms). They
are either controlled, or controlled and released, for individuals of a
certain status, or for everyone.

Generally, due to its near-universality, I'd take the idea as coming down
from prehistorical shamanism. Which is not to say that it's wrong or
irrational---in fact, I'd call it common sense.

But it's as much to do with magic as with religion, and magic underlies all
religions in some way. As it does football, where young men are told not to
indulge before a big game (or used to be).

Message: 1

Date: Fri, 4 Jun 2010 15:33:51 -0400

From: brunians at brunians.org

brunians at brunians.org — 04 Jun 2010, 20:05 · in reply to James Wynn

Interesting.

I'll try to get to it.

Incredible amount going on since mercury release.

.
This was a brain-dump. And I've never go around to editing it, but this
was my take linkages between The Long Sun and Revelation:
<http://www.urth.org/whorlmap/apocalypse.htm>

Antichrist and demiurge are such totally different things, though.

Because Wolfe is also playing with the notions of an anti-Christ or
demiurge. Falsity and pretence to authority are pretty key parts of
those notions.

brunians at brunians.org — 04 Jun 2010, 20:10 · in reply to John Watkins

No, I know that.

Well, perhaps with interlocutors like you two, I should be very clear in
what I mean.

Possibly so.

You are both very smart and know a lot about this stuff and
so may have more refined understandings.

I don't know how smart I am.

Learned, certainly.

The anti-Christ is a speculative figure in Christian mythology. To the degree that there is/will be such a person, he seems to be a false or dark messiah--a human being or demon in human form--someone who usurps Christ's expected role in the Second Coming for a period and brings about various catastrophes before decisive defeat at the hands of Christ.

My understanding is that antichrist is a pattern. There have been many antichrists.

Someday, by Christian theory, there will be one big one for the whole World.

All of these cosmic events take place on at least two levels.

The World ends when you die.

The World ends when the World ends.

Both are equally true.

It is an error to emphasize meaning number two, when reading the Apokalypsis, though it is certainly a part of the religion.

.

The demiurge, as I understand it, is a Gnostic interpretation of the God of the Old Testament. In Gnostic myth this character is evil or stupid, at least in comparison to the real God, and responsible for this world being kind of, well, crappy. He is falsely believed by many to be the real God and may even style himself as such.

The two characters are not really similar except that they both contrast with the true divinity of their respective mythologies and are significant for their false representation as the true divinity. In Long Sun, at least, Pas much more closely mimics the demiurge.

Or to put it another way:

Anti-Christ: Brother Justin Crowe

Demiurge: Dalek Emperor.

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 3:52 PM, <brunians at brunians.org> wrote:

Antichrist and demiurge are such totally different things, though.

.

Because Wolfe is also playing with the notions of an anti-Christ or demiurge. Falsity and pretence to authority are pretty key parts of those notions.

Well, it works for that too.

Like I said, one could argue that the religion on which the Chapter is based is not the Catholic Church, but I think that is quite cumbersome and distracts from the parallels and themes that (I think) Wolfe is intentionally toying with. It's unsatisfying to me.

(And frankly Pas is a lot more demiurge than anti-Christ.)

I could not agree more than I am agreeing at this very moment. See my conversation with David Stockhoff.

brunians at brunians.org — 04 Jun 2010, 20:10 · in reply to David Stockhoff

It's from biology.

Do it for a month.

.

Pretty much, yes, and for both sexes (not just semen, but orgasms). They are either controlled, or controlled and released, for individuals of a certain status, or for everyone.

Generally, due to its near-universality, I'd take the idea as coming down from prehistorical shamanism. Which is not to say that it's wrong or irrational---in fact, I'd call it common sense.

But it's as much to do with magic as with religion, and magic underlies all religions in some way. As it does football, where young men are told not to indulge before a big game (or used to be).

Message: 1

Date: Fri, 4 Jun 2010 15:33:51 -0400

From: brunians at brunians.org

brunians at brunians.org — 04 Jun 2010, 20:11 · in reply to David Stockhoff

Biologically it applies to men.

There is other stuff that applies to women.

I've been studying and practicing this stuff for forty years or more.

.

Pretty much, yes, and for both sexes (not just semen, but orgasms). They are either controlled, or controlled and released, for individuals of a certain status, or for everyone.

Generally, due to its near-universality, I'd take the idea as coming down from prehistorical shamanism. Which is not to say that it's wrong or irrational---in fact, I'd call it common sense.

But it's as much to do with magic as with religion, and magic underlies all religions in some way. As it does football, where young men are told not to indulge before a big game (or used to be).

Message: 1

Date: Fri, 4 Jun 2010 15:33:51 -0400

From: brunians at brunians.org

brunians at brunians.org — 04 Jun 2010, 20:12 · in reply to John Watkins

Any fighter I train follows the old rules.

.

Boxing too. Apparently now, however, the opposite practice is encouraged.

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 4:03 PM, David Stockhoff
<dstockhoff at verizon.net> wrote:

Pretty much, yes, and for both sexes (not just semen, but orgasms). They are either controlled, or controlled and released, for individuals of a certain status, or for everyone.

Generally, due to its near-universality, I'd take the idea as coming down from prehistorical shamanism. Which is not to say that it's wrong or irrational---in fact, I'd call it common sense. But it's as much to do with magic as with religion, and magic underlies all religions in some way. As it does football, where young men are told not to indulge before a big game (or used to be).

Message: 1
Date: Fri, 4 Jun 2010 15:33:51 -0400
From: brunians at brunians.org

Jeff Wilson — 04 Jun 2010, 20:24 · in reply to Lee Berman

On 6/4/2010 12:25 PM, Lee Berman wrote:
Also, I don't think just anyone can stroll up to the Jungle Hut and take a peek. The twisting path surely leads different people to different destinations. The labyrinthine path to the Jungle Hut resembles the path to the Atrium of Time and the path to the Last House. I think Severian is privileged in his access to these portals.

The Sand Garden seems less of a challenge, and even if normal joes get lost, they're getting lost in some other time or dimension instead of one scheduled for demolition in 40 years.

Jeff Wilson - jwilson at io.com
IEEE Student Chapter Blog at
< <http://ieeetamut.org> >

Jeff Wilson — 04 Jun 2010, 20:29 · in reply to John Watkins

On 6/4/2010 2:42 PM, John Watkins wrote:
I think we're all friendly here.

if only some of use were less so

Jeff Wilson - jwilson at io.com
IEEE Student Chapter Blog at
< <http://ieeetamut.org> >

James Wynn — 04 Jun 2010, 20:30 · in reply to John Watkins

Or to put it another way:
Anti-Christ: Brother Justin Crowe
Demiurge: Dalek Emperor.

Or to put it even another way:

A demiurge is a god who presents himself as The God. He's yet he is the creator of the world, worshipping him does not lead to salvation/enlightenment. The Antichrist (or in some cases, no doubt, an antichrist) is a MAN who presents himself as God.

Obviously, the very creation of Pas as an object of worship would be something an antichrist would do. But Typhon **did** create the Whorl. He is never overthrown from his creation. In fact, Silk and Auk help to place him back on his throne.

So Typhon/Pas (and I heard Wolfe say last September that they are absolutely equivalent) is a demiurge not The Antichrist of the New Testament.

J.

John Watkins — 04 Jun 2010, 20:38 · in reply to James Wynn

However, Pas's role in Short Sun is a little more complicated...

My interpretation is that the Short Sun is (inter alia) about the Outsider's long game of converting Pas into a reasonable facsimile of Himself.

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 4:30 PM, James Wynn <crushtv at gmail.com> wrote:

Or to put it another way:
Anti-Christ: Brother Justin Crowe
Demiurge: Dalek Emperor.

Or to put it even another way:

A demiurge is a god who presents himself as The God. He's yet he is the creator of the world, worshipping him does not lead to salvation/enlightenment.
The Antichrist (or in some cases, no doubt, an antichrist) is a MAN who presents himself as God.

Obviously, the very creation of Pas as an object of worship would be something an antichrist would do.

But Typhon **did** create the Whorl. He is never overthrown from his creation. In fact, Silk and Auk help to place him back on his throne.

So Typhon/Pas (and I heard Wolfe say last September that they are absolutely equivalent) is a demiurge not The Antichrist of the New Testament.

J.

brunians at brunians.org — 04 Jun 2010, 20:38 · in reply to Jeff Wilson

The Sand Garden obviously opens on the time of Christ.

.

On 6/4/2010 12:25 PM, Lee Berman wrote:

Also, I don't think just anyone can stroll up to the Jungle Hut and take a peek.

The twisting path surely leads different people to different destinations.

The labyrinthine path to the Jungle Hut resembles the path to the Atrium of

Time and the path to the Last House. I think Severian is privileged in his

access to these portals.

The Sand Garden seems less of a challenge, and even if normal joes get lost, they're getting lost in some other time or dimension instead of one scheduled for demolition in 40 years.

--

Jeff Wilson - jwilson at io.com
IEEE Student Chapter Blog at
< <http://ieeetamut.org> >

brunians at brunians.org — 04 Jun 2010, 20:40 · in reply to James Wynn

A demiurge is a ranking celestial who has been assigned by God to perform a particular task.

He (or she) may or may not behave as you describe.

It depends upon a lot of factors.

.

Or to put it another way:

Anti-Christ: Brother Justin Crowe

Demiurge: Dalek Emperor.

Or to put it even another way:

A demiurge is a god who presents himself as The God. He's yet he is the creator of the world, worshipping him does not lead to salvation/enlightenment.

The Antichrist (or in some cases, no doubt, an antichrist) is a MAN who presents himself as God.

Obviously, the very creation of Pas as an object of worship would be something an antichrist would do.

But Typhon *did* create the Whorl. He is never overthrown from his creation. In fact, Silk and Auk help to place him back on his throne.

So Typhon/Pas (and I heard Wolfe say last September that they are absolutely equivalent) is a demiurge not The Antichrist of the New Testament.

J.

brunians at brunians.org — 04 Jun 2010, 20:41 · in reply to brunians at brunians.org

A demiurge works between.

The guy who makes the parts that get made into cars is, in a sense, a demiurge.

.

A demiurge is a ranking celestial who has been assigned by God to perform a particular task.

He (or she) may or may not behave as you describe.

It depends upon a lot of factors.

.

Or to put it another way:

Anti-Christ: Brother Justin Crowe

Demiurge: Dalek Emperor.

Or to put it even another way:

A demiurge is a god who presents himself as The God. He's yet he is the creator of the world, worshipping him does not lead to salvation/enlightenment.

The Antichrist (or in some cases, no doubt, an antichrist) is a MAN who presents himself as God.

Obviously, the very creation of Pas as an object of worship would be something an antichrist would do.

But Typhon *did* create the Whorl. He is never overthrown from his creation. In fact, Silk and Auk help to place him back on his throne.

So Typhon/Pas (and I heard Wolfe say last September that they are absolutely equivalent) is a demiurge not The Antichrist of the New Testament.

J.

John Watkins — 04 Jun 2010, 20:43 · in reply to brunians at brunians.org

Like Arishem the Judge?

You know who's cooler than Arishem the Judge?

No one. That's who.

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 4:40 PM, <brunians at brunians.org> wrote:

A demiurge is a ranking celestial who has been assigned by God to perform a particular task.

He (or she) may or may not behave as you describe.

It depends upon a lot of factors.

.

Or to put it another way:

Anti-Christ: Brother Justin Crowe

Demiurge: Dalek Emperor.

Or to put it even another way:

A demiurge is a god who presents himself as The God. He's yet he is the creator of the world, worshipping him does not lead to salvation/enlightenment.

The Antichrist (or in some cases, no doubt, an antichrist) is a MAN who presents himself as God.

Obviously, the very creation of Pas as an object of worship would be something an antichrist would do.

But Typhon *did* create the Whorl. He is never overthrown from his creation. In fact, Silk and Auk help to place him back on his throne.

So Typhon/Pas (and I heard Wolfe say last September that they are absolutely equivalent) is a demiurge not The Antichrist of the New Testament.

J.

James Wynn — 04 Jun 2010, 20:48 · in reply to brunians at brunians.org

Okay. But I'm talking about the particular famous demiurge of 1st & 2nd c. Christian Gnostics. The one who was supposed to have spoken to Moses. The one I think Typhon/Pas models. There are lots of various actions of an antichrist as well, I suppose. He might only mislead regarding the Gospel.

A demiurge is a ranking celestial who has been assigned by God to perform a particular task.

He (or she) may or may not behave as you describe.

It depends upon a lot of factors.

A demiurge is a god who presents himself as The God. He's yet he is the creator of the world, worshipping him does not lead to salvation/enlightenment.

The Antichrist (or in some cases, no doubt, an antichrist) is a MAN who presents himself as God.

Obviously, the very creation of Pas as an object of worship would be something an antichrist would do.

But Typhon*did* create the Whorl. He is never overthrown from his creation. In fact, Silk and Auk help to place him back on his throne.

So Typhon/Pas (and I heard Wolfe say last September that they are absolutely equivalent) is a demiurge not The Antichrist of the New Testament.

brunians at brunians.org — 04 Jun 2010, 20:55 · in reply to John Watkins

Or Metatron.

.

Like Arishem the Judge?

You know who's cooler than Arishem the Judge?

No one. That's who.

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 4:40 PM, <brunians at brunians.org> wrote:

A demiurge is a ranking celestial who has been assigned by God to perform a particular task.

He (or she) may or may not behave as you describe.

It depends upon a lot of factors.

.

Or to put it another way:

Anti-Christ: Brother Justin Crowe

Demiurge: Dalek Emperor.

Or to put it even another way:

A demiurge is a god who presents himself as The God. He's yet he is the

creator of the world, worshipping him does not lead to salvation/enlightenment.

The Antichrist (or in some cases, no doubt, an antichrist) is a MAN who presents himself as God.

Obviously, the very creation of Pas as an object of worship would be something an antichrist would do.

But Typhon *did* create the Whorl. He is never overthrown from his creation. In fact, Silk and Auk help to place him back on his throne.

So Typhon/Pas (and I heard Wolfe say last September that they are absolutely equivalent) is a demiurge not The Antichrist of the New Testament.

J.

Jerry Friedman — 04 Jun 2010, 20:55 · in reply to Tony Ellis

From: Tony Ellis <tonyellis69 at btopenworld.com>

Jeff Wilson wrote:

How did Mary Shelly pick them out?

I'm not sure if that was a rhetorical question or not, but anyway:

Mary Shelley, famously, was inspired to write Frankenstein by a *dream* she had. At a villa on Lake (hint hint) Geneva. Dr Talos isn't saying events in his time influence events in ours, he's saying they influence our dreams.

What makes the ripples from the Frankenstein stone stand out from all the rest?

They don't, necessarily. Maybe we're all having dreams inspired by Urthian events, all the time. It's just that in this case the dream was recorded and that record - somewhat miraculously - survived long

enough for one of its instigators to identify it.

Again I think it depends on whether Urth is in our future or in a previous universe.

If it's in our future, then the story is relatively simple. There was Mary Shelley's dream, which led to /Frankenstein/, which Dr. Talos somehow knows about and recognizes. He assumes, maybe correctly, that he and Baldanders caused the dream backwards in time.

If it's in a past universe, as Mr. Wolfe has said, then there are three stories. The one Dr. Talos knows is from Urth's younger days and may have been inspired by a dream. He and Baldanders replay it, we don't know how faithfully. Shelley's dream and /Frankenstein/ are an echo of those two stories in our universe.

Jerry Friedman

John Watkins — 04 Jun 2010, 20:56 · in reply to brunians at brunians.org

It is required to refer to him as The Cosmic Metatron.

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 4:55 PM, <brunians at brunians.org> wrote:
Or Metatron.

.

Like Arishem the Judge?

You know who's cooler than Arishem the Judge?

No one. That's who.

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 4:40 PM, <brunians at brunians.org> wrote:

A demiurge is a ranking celestial who has been assigned by God to perform
a particular task.

He (or she) may or may not behave as you describe.

It depends upon a lot of factors.

.

Or to put it another way:
Anti-Christ: Brother Justin Crowe
Demiurge: Dalek Emperor.

Or to put it even another way:
A demiurge is a god who presents himself as The God. He's yet he is
the
creator of the world, worshipping him does not lead to
salvation/enlightenment.
The Antichrist (or in some cases, no doubt, an antichrist) is a MAN
who
presents himself as God.

Obviously, the very creation of Pas as an object of worship would be
something an antichrist would do.

But Typhon *did* create the Whorl. He is never overthrown from his
creation. In fact, Silk and Auk help to place him back on his throne.

So Typhon/Pas (and I heard Wolfe say last September that they are

absolutely equivalent) is a demiurge not The Antichrist of the New Testament.

J.

brunians at brunians.org — 04 Jun 2010, 20:57 · in reply to James Wynn
Jibrail is a demiurge.

.

Okay. But I'm talking about the particular famous demiurge of 1st & 2nd c. Christian Gnostics. The one who was supposed to have spoken to Moses. The one I think Typhon/Pas models. There are lots of various actions of an antichrist as well, I suppose. He might only mislead regarding the Gospel.

A demiurge is a ranking celestial who has been assigned by God to perform a particular task.

He (or she) may or may not behave as you describe.

It depends upon a lot of factors.

A demiurge is a god who presents himself as The God. He's yet he is the creator of the world, worshipping him does not lead to salvation/enlightenment. The Antichrist (or in some cases, no doubt, an antichrist) is a MAN who presents himself as God.

Obviously, the very creation of Pas as an object of worship would be something an antichrist would do. But Typhon*did* create the Whorl. He is never overthrown from his creation. In fact, Silk and Auk help to place him back on his throne.

So Typhon/Pas (and I heard Wolfe say last September that they are absolutely equivalent) is a demiurge not The Antichrist of the New Testament.

brunians at brunians.org — 04 Jun 2010, 20:58 · in reply to Jerry Friedman
Dreams do not take place in linear time.

Dreams do not take place just in this iteration of the World.

.

From: Tony Ellis <tonyellis69 at btopenworld.com>

Jeff Wilson wrote:

How did Mary Shelly pick them out?

I'm not sure if that was a rhetorical question or not, but anyway:

Mary Shelley, famously, was inspired to write Frankenstein by a *dream* she had. At a villa on Lake (hint hint) Geneva. Dr Talos isn't saying events in his time influence events in ours, he's saying they influence our dreams.

What makes the ripples from the Frankenstein stone stand out from all the rest?

They don't, necessarily. Maybe we're all having dreams inspired by Urthian events, all the time. It's just that in this case the dream was recorded and that record - somewhat miraculously - survived long enough for one of its instigators to identify it.

Again I think it depends on whether Urth is in our future or in a previous universe.

If it's in our future, then the story is relatively simple. There was Mary Shelley's dream, which led to /Frankenstein/, which Dr. Talos somehow knows about and recognizes. He assumes, maybe correctly, that he and Baldanders caused the dream backwards in time.

If it's in a past universe, as Mr. Wolfe has said, then there are three stories. The one Dr. Talos knows is from Urth's younger days and may have been inspired by a dream. He and Baldanders replay it, we don't know how faithfully. Shelley's dream and /Frankenstein/ are an echo of those two stories in our universe.

Jerry Friedman

brunians at brunians.org — 04 Jun 2010, 20:59 · in reply to John Watkins
Maybe for you.

Me and him go back.

.

It is required to refer to him as The Cosmic Metatron.

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 4:55 PM, <brunians at brunians.org> wrote:

Or Metatron.

.

Like Arishem the Judge?

You know who's cooler than Arishem the Judge?

No one. That's who.

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 4:40 PM, <brunians at brunians.org> wrote:

A demiurge is a ranking celestial who has been assigned by God to perform

a particular task.

He (or she) may or may not behave as you describe.

It depends upon a lot of factors.

.

Or to put it another way:

Anti-Christ: Brother Justin Crowe

Demiurge: Dalek Emperor.

Or to put it even another way:

A demiurge is a god who presents himself as The God. He's yet he is the

creator of the world, worshipping him does not lead to salvation/enlightenment.

The Antichrist (or in some cases, no doubt, an antichrist) is a MAN who presents himself as God.

Obviously, the very creation of Pas as an object of worship would be

something an antichrist would do.

But Typhon *did* create the Whorl. He is never overthrown from his creation. In fact, Silk and Auk help to place him back on his throne.

So Typhon/Pas (and I heard Wolfe say last September that they are absolutely equivalent) is a demiurge not The Antichrist of the New Testament.

J.

brunians at brunians.org — 04 Jun 2010, 21:00 · in reply to John Watkins

Typhon and Pas are not the same person.

Pas began as an iteration of Typhon.

Since then they have had separate histories and are now two persons.

.

It is required to refer to him as The Cosmic Metatron.

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 4:55 PM, <brunians at brunians.org> wrote:

Or Metatron.

.

Like Arishem the Judge?

You know who's cooler than Arishem the Judge?

No one. That's who.

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 4:40 PM, <brunians at brunians.org> wrote:

A demiurge is a ranking celestial who has been assigned by God to perform a particular task.

He (or she) may or may not behave as you describe.

It depends upon a lot of factors.

.

Or to put it another way:

Anti-Christ: Brother Justin Crowe

Demiurge: Dalek Emperor.

Or to put it even another way:

A demiurge is a god who presents himself as The God. He's yet he is the

creator of the world, worshipping him does not lead to salvation/enlightenment.

The Antichrist (or in some cases, no doubt, an antichrist) is a MAN who presents himself as God.

Obviously, the very creation of Pas as an object of worship would be

something an antichrist would do.

But Typhon *did* create the Whorl. He is never overthrown from his creation. In fact, Silk and Auk help to place him back on his throne.

So Typhon/Pas (and I heard Wolfe say last September that they are absolutely equivalent) is a demiurge not The Antichrist of the New Testament.

J.

Jeff Wilson — 04 Jun 2010, 21:01 · in reply to brunians at brunians.org

On 6/4/2010 3:38 PM, brunians at brunians.org wrote:

The Sand Garden obviously opens on the time of Christ.

What allegedly makes it obvious?

Jeff Wilson - jwilson at io.com
IEEE Student Chapter Blog at
< <http://ieeetamut.org> >

James Wynn — 04 Jun 2010, 21:13 · in reply to brunians at brunians.org

Typhon and Pas are not the same person.

Pas began as an iteration of Typhon.

Since then they have had separate histories and are now two persons.

Last September, I sat in a Q&A with Wolfe. The following words (in their essence, it's been 9 months now) were stated:

Some Guy: "Typhon managed to sort of be on the Whorl in the form of Pas."

Gene Wolfe: "No! Typhon **was** on the Whorl in the form of Pas."

I want to convey how emphatic Wolfe was when he made this correction.

Ergo, Pas is not the Typhon that Severian met and threw off the mountain, but (as Wolfe sees it) both THAT Typhon and Pas are the Typhon that created the Whorl.

Just as when Kypris possessed Chenille, she wasn't the Kypris that one might meet at that moment in a Sacred Window. But she **was** Kypris.

J.

Lee Berman — 04 Jun 2010, 21:15 · follows James Wynn

I wonder if the iterative Worlds and the parallel Worlds can be identified.

I think maybe yes.

They can be next to each other in more than one dimension.

I tend to agree with Brunians on this. If the process of creation and destruction and creation of sequential universes can be imagined as taking an ascending spiral shape then the "distance" between one universal coil and an adjacent one is small could put Urth and Earth or other corresponding entities in very close proximity, for those who know how to bridge the gap.

In regard to Silk's religion I find the celibacy and confession aspects of the augur's job somewhat less interesting than the slaughtering and sacrifice of animals in the interest of finding divine prophesy in the entrails. In that activity I find, once again, evidence that Wolfe is describing how the ills of Earth's ancient pagan societies will persist in the absence of a Jesus figure and be somewhat mitigated as the closest proximity to Jesus is found on a given planet or society.

If Silk is a clone of Typhon, and The Outsider is included, do we not have an inferior but still potent version of the Holy Trinity in place?

James Wynn — 04 Jun 2010, 21:29 · in reply to brunians at brunians.org

In the sense that (and in the cults where) archons are demiurges, yeah. In some cases, the world was made with the assistance of angels and this explains why the World is broken. That's not just Gnosticism. That's Kabbala. It goes all the way back to the Jewish philosopher Philo (who also provided the technical terminology for the 1st chapter of the Gospel of John; so there's your connection between Apostolic Christians and Gnostics).

However, typically when one refers to The Demiurge, there is a distinction between him and the other archons. Since Pas alone gets credit for making the Whorl, it's The Demiurge that is being referenced.

Jibrail is a demiurge.

Okay. But I'm talking about the particular famous demiurge of 1st& 2nd c. Christian Gnostics. The one who was supposed to have spoken to Moses. The one I think Typhon/Pas models.

There are lots of various actions of an antichrist as well, I suppose.
He might only mislead regarding the Gospel.

A demiurge is a ranking celestial who has been assigned by God to perform
a particular task.

brunians at brunians.org — 04 Jun 2010, 21:29 · in reply to Jeff Wilson

OK, it's not obvious.

Severian doesn't want to leave the Sand Garden.

Why?

What desert might particularly interest Gene Wolfe?

Perhaps Father Inire had a face to face with Jesus during a certain forty day period.

It would be like him.

And like a Friend of mine.

.

On 6/4/2010 3:38 PM, brunians at brunians.org wrote:

The Sand Garden obviously opens on the time of Christ.

What allegedly makes it obvious?

--

Jeff Wilson - jwilson at io.com
IEEE Student Chapter Blog at
< <http://ieeetamut.org> >

brunians at brunians.org — 04 Jun 2010, 21:32 · in reply to James Wynn

Pas was recorded from Typhon's brain.

Since that point their lives and experiences have been very different.

Pas has had many years to think.

Who would not be a different person after that many years?

.

Typhon and Pas are not the same person.

Pas began as an iteration of Typhon.

Since then they have had separate histories and are now two persons.

Last September, I sat in a Q&A with Wolfe. The following words (in their essence, it's been 9 months now) were stated:

Some Guy: "Typhon managed to sort of be on the Whorl in the form of Pas."

Gene Wolfe: "No! Typhon **was** on the Whorl in the form of Pas."

I want to convey how emphatic Wolfe was when he made this correction.

Ergo, Pas is not the Typhon that Severian met and threw off the mountain, but (as Wolfe sees it) both THAT Typhon and Pas are the Typhon that created the Whorl.

Just as when Kypris possessed Chenille, she wasn't the Kypris that one might meet at that moment in a Sacred Window. But she **was** Kypris.

J.

brunians at brunians.org — 04 Jun 2010, 21:33 · in reply to Lee Berman

Killing animals for religious purposes is OK.

What's wrong with killing animals for religious purposes?

The only reason Jews don't do it is because there is no Temple.

.

I wonder if the iterative Worlds and the parallel Worlds can be identified.

I think maybe yes.

They can be next to each other in more than one dimension.

I tend to agree with Brunians on this. If the process of creation and destruction and creation of sequential universes can be imagined as taking an ascending spiral shape then the "distance" between one universal coil and an adjacent one is small could put Urth and Earth or other corresponding entities in very close proximity, for those who know how to bridge the gap.

In regard to Silk's religion I find the celibacy and confession aspects of the augur's job somewhat less interesting than the slaughtering and sacrifice of animals in the interest of finding divine prophesy in the entrails. In that activity I find, once again, evidence that Wolfe is describing how the ills of Earth's ancient pagan societies will persist in the absence of a Jesus figure and be somewhat mitigated as the closest proximity to Jesus is found on a given planet or society.

If Silk is a clone of Typhon, and The Outsider is included, do we not have an inferior but still potent version of the Holy Trinity in place?

Hotmail has tools for the New Busy. Search, chat and e-mail from your inbox.

http://www.windowslive.com/campaign/thenewbusy?ocid=PID28326::T:WLMTAGL:ON:WL:en-US:WM_HMP:042010_1

Jeff Eoff — 04 Jun 2010, 21:33 · in reply to James Wynn

Was that DragonCon, James? I'm pretty sure I remember a moment like that in the Wolfe Q&A. I don't recall the exact phrasing, but I do recall we had to shout Typhon a couple of times before he recognized who we were talking about.

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 5:13 PM, James Wynn <crushtv at gmail.com> wrote:

Typhon and Pas are not the same person.

Pas began as an iteration of Typhon.

Since then they have had separate histories and are now two persons.

Last September, I sat in a Q&A with Wolfe. The following words (in their essence, it's been 9 months now) were stated:

Some Guy: "Typhon managed to sort of be on the Whorl in the form of Pas."

Gene Wolfe: "No! Typhon *was* on the Whorl in the form of Pas."

I want to convey how emphatic Wolfe was when he made this correction.

Ergo, Pas is not the Typhon that Severian met and threw off the mountain, but (as Wolfe sees it) both THAT Typhon and Pas are the Typhon that created the Whorl.

Just as when Kypris possessed Chenille, she wasn't the Kypris that one might meet at that moment in a Sacred Window. But she *was* Kypris.

J.

brunians at brunians.org — 04 Jun 2010, 21:34 · in reply to James Wynn

It goes back a lot further than that.

.

In the sense that (and in the cults where) archons are demiurges, yeah. In some cases, the world was made with the assistance of angels and this explains why the World is broken. That's not just Gnosticism. That's Kabbala. It goes all the way back to the Jewish philosopher Philo (who also provided the technical terminology for the 1st chapter of the Gospel of John; so there's your connection between Apostolic Christians and Gnostics).

However, typically when one refers to The Demiurge, there is a distinction between him and the other archons. Since Pas alone gets credit for making the Whorl, it's The Demiurge that is being referenced.

Jibrail is a demiurge.

Okay. But I'm talking about the particular famous demiurge of 1st&2nd

c. Christian Gnostics. The one who was supposed to have spoken to Moses.

The one I think Typhon/Pas models.

There are lots of various actions of an antichrist as well, I suppose.

He might only mislead regarding the Gospel.

A demiurge is a ranking celestial who has been assigned by God to perform

a particular task.

James Wynn — 04 Jun 2010, 21:38 · in reply to Jeff Eoff

Yeah, that was DragonCon. Wolfe was really on the ball for all of his panels in that convention.

Was that DragonCon, James? I'm pretty sure I remember a moment like that in the Wolfe Q&A. I don't recall the exact phrasing, but I do recall we had to shout Typhon a couple of times before he recognized who we were talking about.

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 5:13 PM, James Wynn<crushtv at gmail.com> wrote:

Typhon and Pas are not the same person.

Pas began as an iteration of Typhon.

Since then they have had separate histories and are now two persons.

Last September, I sat in a Q&A with Wolfe. The following words (in their essence, it's been 9 months now) were stated:

Some Guy: "Typhon managed to sort of be on the Whorl in the form of Pas."

Gene Wolfe: "No! Typhon *was* on the Whorl in the form of Pas."

I want to convey how emphatic Wolfe was when he made this correction.

Ergo, Pas is not the Typhon that Severian met and threw off the mountain, but (as Wolfe sees it) both THAT Typhon and Pas are the Typhon that created the Whorl.

Just as when Kypris possessed Chenille, she wasn't the Kypris that one might meet at that moment in a Sacred Window. But she *was* Kypris.

J.

James Wynn — 04 Jun 2010, 21:44 · in reply to brunians at brunians.org

Pas was recorded from Typhon's brain. Since that point their lives and experiences have been very different. Pas has had many years to think. Who would not be a different person after that many years?

What I'm saying is that Pas is as much Typhon as the Typhons Severian encountered in the The Book of the New Sun and the Urth of the New Sun. Maybe he's changed a lot from the creation of the Whorl. Maybe he's worse after all those centuries of children being sacrificed to him. Maybe not, though. The Typhon Severian met did not strike me as a man of introspection.

David Stockhoff — 04 Jun 2010, 21:54 · follows James Wynn

To distinguish him from the Transformers character, yes.

Message: 4

Date: Fri, 4 Jun 2010 16:56:16 -0400

From: John Watkins <john.watkins04 at gmail.com>
To: The Urth Mailing List <urth at lists.urth.net>
Subject: Re: (urth) Urth & Earth (was "Travelling North aka miscellaneous thoughts on Wolfe")
Message-ID:
<AANLkTil_v4-9tZjo_0GgbYYTjjMFomD5vh99oEuJLuwN at mail.gmail.com>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"

It is required to refer to him as The Cosmic Metatron.

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 4:55 PM, <brunians at brunians.org> wrote:

Or Metatron.

.

Jerry Friedman — 04 Jun 2010, 21:54 · in reply to brunians at brunians.org

Can you give me a citation, please? One would be enough for my surprise.

Jerry Friedman

From: "brunians at brunians.org" <brunians at brunians.org>
Subject: Re: (urth) Building up yang through 10 lifetimes (was Re: Urth & Earth (was "Travelling North aka >miscellaneous thoughts on Wolfe"))

It's all through QBLH.

Be surprised.

.

It's in the /Journey to the West/. Whether Chinese Buddhism got it from Taoism I don't know. I believe it's also in Tantric Buddhism.

I will be very surprised to hear that Judaism has this idea.

Jerry Friedman has been surprised before.

From: James Wynn <crushtv at gmail.com>
To: The Urth Mailing List <urth at lists.urth.net>
Sent: Fri, June 4, 2010 1:22:53 PM
Subject: Re: (urth) Urth & Earth (was "Travelling North aka miscellaneous thoughts on Wolfe")

Taoism too, right?

I'm never sure what planet you're from.

For the record, Nietzsche shared your view that there was some biological benefit to preserving the seed. He too was a bit of a nutter.

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 3:20 PM, <brunians at brunians.org> >wrote:

It
is biologically based.

If a man does not have orgasms, he becomes capable to perform certain
spiritual acts which he cannot otherwise perform, or not as well.

Urth Mailing List
To post, write urth at urth.net
Subscription/information: <http://www.urth.net>

brunians at brunians.org — 04 Jun 2010, 22:05 · in reply to David Stockhoff

I know nothing of this.

I know what Transformers is.

.

To distinguish him from the Transformers character, yes.

Message: 4
Date: Fri, 4 Jun 2010 16:56:16 -0400
From: John Watkins <john.watkins04@gmail.com>
To: The Urth Mailing List <urth@lists.urth.net>
Subject: Re: (urth) Urth & Earth (was "Travelling North aka
miscellaneous thoughts on Wolfe")
Message-ID:
<AANLkTil_v4-9tZjo_0GgbYYTjjMFomD5vh99oEuJLuwN@mail.gmail.com>
Content-Type: text/plain; charset="iso-8859-1"

It is required to refer to him as The Cosmic Metatron.

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 4:55 PM, <brunians@brunians.org> wrote:

Or Metatron.

.

brunians at brunians.org — 04 Jun 2010, 22:06 · in reply to Jerry Friedman

No.

It's in the Talmud also.

And before you ask: no.

No one spoon fed me.

.

Can you give me a citation, please? One would be enough for my surprise.

Jerry Friedman

From: "brunians at brunians.org" <brunians at brunians.org>

Subject: Re: (urth) Building up yang through 10 lifetimes (was Re: Urth & Earth (was "Travelling North aka >miscellaneous thoughts on Wolfe"))

It's all through QBLH.

Be surprised.

.

It's in the /Journey to the West/. Whether Chinese Buddhism got it from Taoism I don't know. I believe it's also in Tantric Buddhism.

I will be very surprised to hear that Judaism has this idea.

Jerry Friedman has been surprised before.

From: James Wynn <crushtv at gmail.com>

To: The Urth Mailing List <urth at lists.urth.net>

Sent: Fri, June 4, 2010 1:22:53 PM

Subject: Re: (urth) Urth & Earth (was "Travelling North aka miscellaneous thoughts on Wolfe")

Taoism too, right?

I'm never sure what planet you're from.

For the record, Nietzsche shared your view that there was some biological benefit to preserving the seed. He too was a bit of a nutter.

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 3:20 PM, <brunians at brunians.org> >wrote:

It

is biologically based.

If a man does not have orgasms, he becomes capable to perform certain spiritual acts which he cannot otherwise perform, or not as well.

Jeff Wilson — 04 Jun 2010, 22:21 · in reply to brunians at brunians.org

On 6/4/2010 4:29 PM, brunians at brunians.org wrote:

OK, it's not obvious.

Severian doesn't want to leave the Sand Garden.

Why?

What desert might particularly interest Gene Wolfe?

Perhaps Father Inire had a face to face with Jesus during a certain forty day period.

If I was in the "Urth preceeds Earth" camp, I might suggest that's why Sev feels as if he belonged there, standing where Jesus was meant to be. Or perhaps he merely feels it appropriate as various other prophets have sought it out, like John the Baptist. In fact, John might be the central figure of the Urthly NT, managing to get himself crucified instead of beheaded on that iteration.

Jeff Wilson - jwilson at io.com
IEEE Student Chapter Blog at
< <http://ieeetamut.org> >

brunians at brunians.org — 04 Jun 2010, 22:39 · in reply to Jeff Wilson

Dreams don't take place in linear time.

Why do you assume that something Father Inire built operates only in linear time?

.

On 6/4/2010 4:29 PM, brunians at brunians.org wrote:

OK, it's not obvious.

Severian doesn't want to leave the Sand Garden.

Why?

What desert might particularly interest Gene Wolfe?

Perhaps Father Inire had a face to face with Jesus during a certain
forty
day period.

If I was in the "Urth preceeds Earth" camp, I might suggest that's why
Sev feels as if he belonged there, standing where Jesus was meant to be.
Or perhaps he merely feels it appropriate as various other prophets have
sought it out, like John the Baptist. In fact, John might be the central
figure of the Urthly NT, managing to get himself crucified instead of
beheaded on that iteration.

--

Jeff Wilson - jwilson at io.com
IEEE Student Chapter Blog at
< <http://ieeetamut.org> >

Jerry Friedman — 04 Jun 2010, 22:47 · in reply to brunians at brunians.org

From: "brunians at brunians.org" <brunians at brunians.org>
No.

It's in the Talmud also.

Now that would be a much bigger surprise for me.

And before you ask: no.

No one spoon fed me.

Whatever.

Jerry Friedman

Can you give me a citation, please? One would be enough for my surprise.

Jerry Friedman

From: "brunians at brunians.org" <brunians at brunians.org>

Subject: Re: (urth) Building up yang through 10 lifetimes (was Re: Urth & Earth (was "Travelling North aka >miscellaneous thoughts on Wolfe"))

It's all through QBLH.

Be surprised.

.

It's in the /Journey to the West/. Whether Chinese Buddhism got it from Taoism I don't know. I believe it's also in Tantric Buddhism.

I will be very surprised to hear that Judaism has this idea.

Jerry Friedman has been surprised before.

From: James Wynn <crushtv at gmail.com>

To: The Urth Mailing List <urth at lists.urth.net>

Sent: Fri, June 4, 2010 1:22:53 PM

Subject: Re: (urth) Urth & Earth (was "Travelling North aka miscellaneous thoughts on Wolfe")

Taoism too, right?

I'm never sure what planet you're from.

For the record, Nietzsche shared your view that there was some biological benefit to preserving the seed. He too was a bit of a nutter.

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 3:20 PM, <brunians at brunians.org> >wrote:

It
is biologically based.

If a man does not have orgasms, he becomes capable to perform certain spiritual acts which he cannot otherwise perform, or not as well.

Urth Mailing List

To post, write urth at urth.net

Subscription/information: <http://www.urth.net>

Urth Mailing List

To post, write urth at urth.net

Subscription/information: <http://www.urth.net>

Urth Mailing List
To post, write urth at urth.net
Subscription/information: <http://www.urth.net>

brunians at brunians.org — 04 Jun 2010, 23:02 · in reply to Jerry Friedman

You expect laziness to be rewarded?

.

From: "brunians at brunians.org" <brunians at brunians.org>

No.

It's in the Talmud also.

Now that would be a much bigger surprise for me.

And before you ask: no.

No one spoon fed me.

Whatever.

Jerry Friedman

Can you give me a citation, please? One would be enough for my surprise.

Jerry Friedman

From: "brunians at brunians.org" <brunians at brunians.org>

Subject: Re: (urth) Building up yang through 10 lifetimes (was Re: Urth &

Earth (was "Travelling North aka >miscellaneous thoughts on Wolfe"))

It's all through QBLH.

Be surprised.

.

It's in the /Journey to the West/. Whether Chinese Buddhism got it from

Taoism I don't know. I believe it's also in Tantric Buddhism.

I will be very surprised to hear that Judaism has this idea.

Jerry Friedman has been surprised before.

From: James Wynn <crushtv at gmail.com>
To: The Urth Mailing List <urth at lists.urth.net>
Sent: Fri, June 4, 2010 1:22:53 PM
Subject: Re: (urth) Urth & Earth (was "Travelling North aka miscellaneous thoughts on Wolfe")

Taoism too, right?

I'm never sure what planet you're from.

For the record, Nietzsche shared your view that there was some biological benefit to preserving the seed. He too was a bit of a nutter.

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 3:20 PM, <brunians at brunians.org> wrote:

It
is biologically based.

If a man does not have orgasms, he becomes capable to perform certain spiritual acts which he cannot otherwise perform, or not as well.

Jeff Wilson — 04 Jun 2010, 23:24 · in reply to brunians at brunians.org

On 6/4/2010 5:39 PM, brunians at brunians.org wrote:
Dreams don't take place in linear time.

Why do you assume that something Father Inire built operates only in linear time?

Why do you assume I'm speaking of linear time?

Jeff Wilson - jwilson at io.com
IEEE Student Chapter Blog at
< <http://ieeetamut.org> >

Gwern Branwen — 04 Jun 2010, 23:30 · in reply to brunians at brunians.org

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 5:33 PM, <brunians at brunians.org> wrote:

Killing animals for religious purposes is OK.

What's wrong with killing animals for religious purposes?

The only reason Jews don't do it is because there is no Temple.

The Samaritans don't count as Jews?

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Samaritans#Religious_beliefs

gwern

brunians at brunians.org — 04 Jun 2010, 23:39 · in reply to Jeff Wilson

Something you said, or something I read, in your previous post made me think that.

If the text of your previous post was to hand I would pick it out, and either confront you with it or admit error.

I try not to argue with people, and I am not going to argue with you about this.

If you have your previous text, and would provide me with it, I will perform the action I describe in my second sentence above.

.
On 6/4/2010 5:39 PM, brunians at brunians.org wrote:

Dreams don't take place in linear time.

Why do you assume that something Father Inire built operates only in linear time?

Why do you assume I'm speaking of linear time?

--

Jeff Wilson - jwilson at io.com
IEEE Student Chapter Blog at
< <http://ieeetamut.org> >

brunians at brunians.org — 04 Jun 2010, 23:41 · in reply to Gwern Branwen

Not according to the Jews.

Why does a Jew always answer a question with a question?

.

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 5:33 PM, <brunians at brunians.org> wrote:

Killing animals for religious purposes is OK.

What's wrong with killing animals for religious purposes?

The only reason Jews don't do it is because there is no Temple.

The Samaritans don't count as Jews?

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Samaritans#Religious_beliefs

--

gwern

Jeff Wilson — 04 Jun 2010, 23:56 · in reply to Gwern Branwen

On 6/4/2010 6:30 PM, Gwern Branwen wrote:

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 5:33 PM,<brunians at brunians.org> wrote:

Killing animals for religious purposes is OK.

What's wrong with killing animals for religious purposes?

The only reason Jews don't do it is because there is no Temple.

The Samaritans don't count as Jews?

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Samaritans#Religious_beliefs

Israelites rather than Jews

Jerry Friedman — 05 Jun 2010, 02:09 · in reply to brunians at brunians.org

Not in general. I'm surprised you apparently inferred I did. I thought you might answer my request, though. Maybe I should say I'm not and wasn't criticizing your decision not to answer it.

I'll limit my comments on this subject to one that's on topic. In my life, I've seen my laziness and other people's rewarded on several occasions. But I don't recall ever seeing that happen in a Gene Wolfe story. In fact, I don't recall much laziness (but then there are a lot of books I don't remember very well). One example that comes to mind is the Rajan's major-domo or whatever he is.

Jerry Friedman

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

From: "brunians at brunians.org" <brunians at brunians.org>

To: The Urth Mailing List <urth at lists.urth.net>

Sent: Fri, June 4, 2010 5:02:04 PM

Subject: Re: (urth) Building up yang through 10 lifetimes (was Re: Urth & Earth (was "Travelling North aka miscellaneous thoughts on Wolfe"))

You expect laziness to be rewarded?

.

From: "brunians at brunians.org" <brunians at brunians.org>

No.

It's in the Talmud also.

Now that would be a much bigger surprise for me.

And before you ask: no.

No one spoon fed me.

Whatever.

Jerry Friedman

Can you give me a citation, please? One would be enough for my surprise.

Jerry Friedman

From: "brunians at brunians.org" <brunians at brunians.org>

Subject: Re: (urth) Building up yang through 10 lifetimes (was Re: Urth & Earth (was "Travelling North aka >miscellaneous thoughts on Wolfe"))

It's all through QBLH.

Be surprised.

.

It's in the /Journey to the West/. Whether Chinese Buddhism got it from

Taoism I don't know. I believe it's also in Tantric Buddhism.

I will be very surprised to hear that Judaism has this idea.

Jerry Friedman has been surprised before.

From: James Wynn <crushtv at gmail.com>
To: The Urth Mailing List <urth at lists.urth.net>
Sent: Fri, June 4, 2010 1:22:53 PM
Subject: Re: (urth) Urth & Earth (was "Travelling North aka miscellaneous thoughts on Wolfe")

Taoism too, right?

I'm never sure what planet you're from.

For the record, Nietzsche shared your view that there was some biological benefit to preserving the seed. He too was a bit of a nutter.

On Fri, Jun 4, 2010 at 3:20 PM, <brunians at brunians.org> >wrote:

It
is biologically based.

If a man does not have orgasms, he becomes capable to perform certain
spiritual acts which he cannot otherwise perform, or not as well.

Urth Mailing List
To post, write urth at urth.net
Subscription/information: <http://www.urth.net>

Urth Mailing List
To post, write urth at urth.net
Subscription/information: <http://www.urth.net>

Urth Mailing List
To post, write urth at urth.net
Subscription/information: <http://www.urth.net>

Urth Mailing List
To post, write urth at urth.net
Subscription/information: <http://www.urth.net>

Urth Mailing List
To post, write urth at urth.net
Subscription/information: <http://www.urth.net>

James Wynn — 05 Jun 2010, 02:32 · in reply to Jerry Friedman

It's in the Talmud also.
And before you ask: no.
[I won't tell you where.] No one spoon fed me.

It's not like you can go to the library and grab the volume called "Talmud". You could say what part of the Talmud you read it in and show off how smart you are. It would matter if it's from say a rabbi in the 15th c A.D. or someone from 2nd c BC. I'd believe that just about anything someone told me was in the QBLH.

brunians at brunians.org — 05 Jun 2010, 02:33 · in reply to Jerry Friedman

I have resolved to be less of a jerk, and I am sorry I fell short in that.

I have, in the past, had sort of a fucked up attitude, and want every one of you to know that I however harsh I may sound sometimes, there's nothing personal behind it.

I hate to say something that sounds like it might be an excuse, but I am sometimes overresponsive to physical pain. I have, more times than I like to think about, harshed on someone who had not done anything offensive, because I was in physical pain.

I have been getting much better at not allowing the higher levels of pain to grouchify me, but I am not perfect at it and probably never will be.

.

Not in general. I'm surprised you apparently inferred I did. I thought you might answer my request, though. Maybe I should say I'm not and wasn't criticizing your decision not to answer it.

I'll limit my comments on this subject to one that's on topic. In my life, I've seen my laziness and other people's rewarded on several occasions. But I don't recall ever seeing that happen in a Gene Wolfe story. In fact, I don't recall much laziness (but then there are a lot of books I don't remember very well). One example that comes to mind is the Rajan's major-domo or whatever he is.

Jerry Friedman

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

From: "brunians at brunians.org" <brunians at brunians.org>

To: The Urth Mailing List <urth at lists.urth.net>

Sent: Fri, June 4, 2010 5:02:04 PM

Subject: Re: (urth) Building up yang through 10 lifetimes (was Re: Urth & Earth (was "Travelling North aka miscellaneous thoughts on Wolfe"))

You expect laziness to be rewarded?

.

From: "brunians at brunians.org" <brunians at brunians.org>

No.

It's in the Talmud also.

Now that would be a much bigger surprise for me.

And before you ask: no.

No one spoon fed me.

Whatever.

Jerry Friedman

Can you give me a citation, please? One would be enough for my surprise.

Jerry Friedman

From: "brunians at brunians.org" <brunians at brunians.org>

Subject: Re: (urth) Building up yang through 10 lifetimes (was Re: Urth &

Earth (was "Travelling North aka >miscellaneous thoughts on Wolfe"))

It's all through QBLH.

Be surprised.

.

It's in the /Journey to the West/. Whether Chinese Buddhism got it from

Taoism I don't know. I believe it's also in Tantric Buddhism.

I will be very surprised to hear that Judaism has this idea.

Jerry Friedman has been surprised before.

From: James Wynn <crushtv at gmail.com>

brunians at brunians.org — 05 Jun 2010, 02:38 · in reply to James Wynn

What are we talking about?

Sexual energy as it is used in Judaism?

.

>> It's in the Talmud also.

And before you ask: no.

>>[I won't tell you where.] No one spoon fed me.

It's not like you can go to the library and grab the volume called "Talmud". You could say what part of the Talmud you read it in and show off how smart you are. It would matter if it's from say a rabbi in the 15th c A.D. or someone from 2nd c BC. I'd believe that just about anything someone told me was in the QBLH.

James Wynn — 05 Jun 2010, 02:39 · in reply to brunians at brunians.org

Or as I've heard it called "holding your chain".

On 6/4/2010 9:38 PM, brunians at brunians.org wrote:
are we talking about?

Sexual energy as it is used in Judaism?

brunians at brunians.org — 05 Jun 2010, 02:41 · in reply to James Wynn

In all of the following questions, the term 'a Jew' refers to a Jewish man who is conforming to halacha (ie, is orthoprax).

With whom may a Jew have sex?

May a Jew have any kind of sex?

When may a Jew have sex?

May a Jew masturbate?

.

>> It's in the Talmud also.

And before you ask: no.

>>[I won't tell you where.] No one spoon fed me.

It's not like you can go to the library and grab the volume called "Talmud". You could say what part of the Talmud you read it in and show off how smart you are. It would matter if it's from say a rabbi in the 15th c A.D. or someone from 2nd c BC. I'd believe that just about anything someone told me was in the QBLH.

brunians at brunians.org — 05 Jun 2010, 02:42 · in reply to James Wynn

Please do be so kind as to review my previous post.

.

Or as I've heard it called "holding your chain".

On 6/4/2010 9:38 PM, brunians at brunians.org wrote:
are we talking about?

Sexual energy as it is used in Judaism?

Jeff Wilson — 05 Jun 2010, 04:17 · in reply to brunians at brunians.org

On 6/4/2010 6:39 PM, brunians at brunians.org wrote:

Something you said, or something I read, in your previous post made me think that.

If the text of your previous post was to hand I would pick it out, and either confront you with it or admit error.

I try not to argue with people, and I am not going to argue with you about this.

If you have your previous text, and would provide me with it, I will perform the action I describe in my second sentence above.

Rather than reward laziness, I'll hand you a (somewhat) Wolfean riddle:

My writ is three steps' march or four kilometers from my foot, behind the baseboards with everyone else's.

Jeff Wilson - jwilson at io.com
IEEE Student Chapter Blog at
< <http://ieeetamut.org> >

Jerry Friedman — 05 Jun 2010, 04:29 · in reply to brunians at brunians.org

As I said, I don't object to anything in that reply to me. I don't think you have anything to apologize for. I'm sorry to hear you're in pain, though, and I hope it goes away.

As far as I know, what we're talking about is whether Judaism has the idea that men who don't have orgasms attain spiritual capabilities unavailable to other men.

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

From: "brunians at brunians.org" <brunians at brunians.org>

In all of the following questions, the term 'a Jew' refers to a Jewish man who is conforming to halacha (ie, is orthoprax).

With whom may a Jew have sex?

His wife. Most men are obliged to marry by the age of 20, but I'll mention exceptions below.

May a Jew have any kind of sex?

No.

When may a Jew have sex?

Any time, as long as he doesn't do it in the street and frighten the horses. (Apparently it's not allowed in the presence of any creature.)

May a Jew masturbate?

No.

You left out: How often must a Jew have sex?

As often as his wife asks for her conjugal rights, up to a maximum that depends on his job, from every night for men who do not-too-demanding physical work in the city where they live, to once every six months for a sailor.

There are some interesting glimpses of Maimonides' statements on this subject on limited preview at

http://books.google.com/books?id=JFny1k_bv5cC&pg=PA163#v=onepage&q&f=false

It says he thought that a student may delay marriage--not for any stated spiritual reasons, but to avoid distractions. He also seems to said the rabbi Ben Azzai (who said being childless was as evil as shedding blood) was permitted not to marry at because Ben Azzai was interested only in study, not in sex, though other authorities of the time thought Ben Azzai was sinning. In general, Maimonides seems to have seen sexuality as a distraction, though a required one.

Jerry Friedman

brunians at brunians.org — 05 Jun 2010, 04:54 · in reply to Jeff Wilson

I'm not normally good at riddles, and I'm definitely not playing this tonight.

On 6/4/2010 6:39 PM, brunians at brunians.org wrote:

Something you said, or something I read, in your previous post made me think that.

If the text of your previous post was to hand I would pick it out, and either confront you with it or admit error.

I try not to argue with people, and I am not going to argue with you about this.

If you have your previous text, and would provide me with it, I will perform the action I describe in my second sentence above.

Rather than reward laziness, I'll hand you a (somewhat) Wolfean riddle:

My writ is three steps' march or four kilometers from my foot, behind the baseboards with everyone else's.

--

Jeff Wilson - jwilson at io.com
IEEE Student Chapter Blog at
< <http://ieeetamut.org> >

brunians at brunians.org — 05 Jun 2010, 05:00 · in reply to Jerry Friedman

So basically, this guy spends half his time not having sex and not masturbating.

He goes for one good week without having sex every month.

He's still wrapping phylacteries every day isn't he?

Still saying the normal prayers?

As I said, I don't object to anything in that reply to me. I don't think you have anything to apologize for. I'm sorry to hear you're in pain, though, and I hope it goes away.

As far as I know, what we're talking about is whether Judaism has the idea that men who don't have orgasms attain spiritual capabilities unavailable to other men.

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

From: "brunians at brunians.org" <brunians at brunians.org>

In all of the following questions, the term 'a Jew' refers to a Jewish man who is conforming to halacha (ie, is orthoprax).

With whom may a Jew have sex?

His wife. Most men are obliged to marry by the age of 20, but I'll mention exceptions below.

May a Jew have any kind of sex?

No.

When may a Jew have sex?

Any time, as long as he doesn't do it in the street and frighten the horses. (Apparently it's not allowed in the presence of any creature.)

May a Jew masturbate?

No.

You left out: How often must a Jew have sex?

As often as his wife asks for her conjugal rights, up to a maximum that depends on his job, from every night for men who do not-too-demanding physical work in the city where they live, to once every six months for a sailor.

There are some interesting glimpses of Maimonides' statements on this subject on limited preview at

http://books.google.com/books?id=JFny1k_bv5cC&pg=PA163#v=onepage&q&f=false

It says he thought that a student may delay marriage--not for any stated spiritual reasons, but to avoid distractions. He also seems to said the rabbi Ben Azzai (who said being childless was as evil as shedding blood) was permitted not to marry at because Ben Azzai was interested only in study, not in sex, though other authorities of the time thought Ben Azzai was sinning. In general, Maimonides seems to have seen sexuality as a distraction, though a required one.

Jerry Friedman

Jeff Wilson — 05 Jun 2010, 11:21 · in reply to brunians at brunians.org

On 6/4/2010 11:54 PM, brunians at brunians.org wrote:

I'm not normally good at riddles, and I'm definitely not playing this tonight.

Rather than reward laziness, I'll hand you a (somewhat) Wolfean riddle:

My writ is three steps' march or four kilometers from my foot, behind the baseboards with everyone else's.

If you could peek into one of the other universes for the answer, that would still count.

Jeff Wilson - jwilson at io.com
IEEE Student Chapter Blog at
< <http://ieeetamut.org> >

Jerry Friedman — 05 Jun 2010, 12:56 · in reply to brunians at brunians.org

I'm afraid I don't follow. Who is "this guy"? What do you mean by "spends half his time not having sex and not masturbating"? Half his life? And if we're talking about a real person such as Ben Azzai, I believe people who are forbidden by their religion to have sex sometimes do anyway, and even more so for masturbation, so I couldn't even guess whether someone abstained from orgasms.

The sentence with "week" and "month" makes no sense to me.

Whoever it is, if he's an Orthodox Jew, he probably does say the normal prayers and put on phylacteries ("lay tefillin", as many American Jews say) every day.

Jerry Friedman

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

From: "brunians at brunians.org" <brunians at brunians.org>

To: The Urth Mailing List <urth at lists.urth.net>

Sent: Fri, June 4, 2010 11:00:20 PM

Subject: Re: (urth) Building up yang through 10 lifetimes (was Re: Urth & Earth (was "Travelling North aka miscellaneous thoughts on Wolfe"))

So basically, this guy spends half his time not having sex and not masturbating.

He goes for one good week without having sex every month.

He's still wrapping phylacteries every day isn't he?

Still saying the normal prayers?

.

As I said, I don't object to anything in that reply to me. I don't think you have anything to apologize for. I'm sorry to hear you're in pain, though, and I hope it goes away.

As far as I know, what we're talking about is whether Judaism has the idea that men who don't have orgasms attain spiritual capabilities unavailable

to other men.

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

From: "brunians at brunians.org" <brunians at brunians.org>

In all of the following questions, the term 'a Jew' refers to a Jewish man who is conforming to halacha (ie, is orthoprax).

With whom may a Jew have sex?

His wife. Most men are obliged to marry by the age of 20, but I'll mention exceptions below.

May a Jew have any kind of sex?

No.

When may a Jew have sex?

Any time, as long as he doesn't do it in the street and frighten the horses. (Apparently it's not allowed in the presence of any creature.)

May a Jew masturbate?

No.

You left out: How often must a Jew have sex?

As often as his wife asks for her conjugal rights, up to a maximum that depends on his job, from every night for men who do not-too-demanding physical work in the city where they live, to once every six months for a sailor.

There are some interesting glimpses of Maimonides' statements on this subject on limited preview at

http://books.google.com/books?id=JFny1k_bv5cC&pg=PA163#v=onepage&q&f=false

It says he thought that a student may delay marriage--not for any stated spiritual reasons, but to avoid distractions. He also seems to said the rabbi Ben Azzai (who said being childless was as evil as shedding blood) was permitted not to marry at because Ben Azzai was interested only in study, not in sex, though other authorities of the time thought Ben Azzai was sinning. In general, Maimonides seems to have seen sexuality as a distraction, though a required one.

Jerry Friedman

Urth Mailing List

To post, write urth at urth.net

Subscription/information: <http://www.urth.net>

It was a mistake for me to even bring this up.

I am sorry I did it.

I'm done now.

I'm afraid I don't follow. Who is "this guy"? What do you mean by "spends half his time not having sex and not masturbating"? Half his life? And if we're talking about a real person such as Ben Azzai, I believe people who are forbidden by their religion to have sex sometimes do anyway, and even more so for masturbation, so I couldn't even guess whether someone abstained from orgasms.

The sentence with "week" and "month" makes no sense to me.

Whoever it is, if he's an Orthodox Jew, he probably does say the normal prayers and put on phylacteries ("lay tefillin", as many American Jews say) every day.

Jerry Friedman

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

From: "brunians at brunians.org" <brunians at brunians.org>

To: The Urth Mailing List <urth at lists.urth.net>

Sent: Fri, June 4, 2010 11:00:20 PM

Subject: Re: (urth) Building up yang through 10 lifetimes (was Re: Urth & Earth (was "Travelling North aka miscellaneous thoughts on Wolfe"))

So basically, this guy spends half his time not having sex and not masturbating.

He goes for one good week without having sex every month.

He's still wrapping phylacteries every day isn't he?

Still saying the normal prayers?

As I said, I don't object to anything in that reply to me. I don't think you have anything to apologize for. I'm sorry to hear you're in pain, though, and I hope it goes away.

As far as I know, what we're talking about is whether Judaism has the idea that men who don't have orgasms attain spiritual capabilities unavailable to other men.

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

From: "brunians at brunians.org" <brunians at brunians.org>

In all of the following questions, the term 'a Jew' refers to a Jewish man who is conforming to halacha (ie, is orthoprax).

With whom may a Jew have sex?

His wife. Most men are obliged to marry by the age of 20, but I'll mention exceptions below.

May a Jew have any kind of sex?

No.

When may a Jew have sex?

Any time, as long as he doesn't do it in the street and frighten the horses. (Apparently it's not allowed in the presence of any creature.)

May a Jew masturbate?

No.

You left out: How often must a Jew have sex?

As often as his wife asks for her conjugal rights, up to a maximum that depends on his job, from every night for men who do not-too-demanding physical work in the city where they live, to once every six months for a sailor.

There are some interesting glimpses of Maimonides' statements on this subject on limited preview at

http://books.google.com/books?id=JFny1k_bv5cC&pg=PA163#v=onepage&q&f=false

It says he thought that a student may delay marriage--not for any stated spiritual reasons, but to avoid distractions. He also seems to said the rabbi Ben Azzai (who said being childless was as evil as shedding blood) was permitted not to marry at because Ben Azzai was interested only in study, not in sex, though other authorities of the time thought Ben Azzai was sinning. In general, Maimonides seems to have seen sexuality as a distraction, though a required one.

Jerry Friedman

Adam Thornton — 05 Jun 2010, 15:59 · in reply to Jerry Friedman

On 06/05/2010 07:56 AM, Jerry Friedman wrote:

I'm afraid I don't follow. Who is "this guy"? What do you mean by "spends half his time not having sex and not masturbating"? Half his life?

Hell, even I do this. I mean, at least now that I'm not working from home.

Adam

Lee Berman — 05 Jun 2010, 19:05 · follows Jeff Wilson

All religions have similar doctrines regarding the use and retention of semen.

And let's not forget the Sweet Science as this exchange in the gym demonstrates

Mickey: " Listen, kid, you! You lay off that pet shop dame. Women weaken legs."

Rocky: "Yeah, but I really like this girl, ya know?"

Mickey: "Then let her train ya!!"

Rocky: "... Okay, okay.. no more foolin' around.....Women weaken legs"

Jeff Wilson — 06 Jun 2010, 05:01 · in reply to Jeff Wilson

On 6/4/2010 11:17 PM, Jeff Wilson wrote:

On 6/4/2010 6:39 PM, brunians at brunians.org wrote:

If you have your previous text, and would provide me with it, I will perform the action I describe in my second sentence above.

Rather than reward laziness, I'll hand you a (somewhat) Wolfean riddle:

My writ is three steps' march or four kilometers from my foot, behind the baseboards with everyone else's.

I think that's enough of a head start for Brunians; the rest of you are invited to "play" and solve the riddle.

Jeff Wilson - jwilson at io.com
IEEE Student Chapter Blog at
< <http://ieeetamut.org> >

brunians at brunians.org — 06 Jun 2010, 05:12 · in reply to Jeff Wilson

Shadow.

.

On 6/4/2010 11:17 PM, Jeff Wilson wrote:

On 6/4/2010 6:39 PM, brunians at brunians.org wrote:

If you have your previous text, and would provide me with it, I will perform the action I describe in my second sentence above.

Rather than reward laziness, I'll hand you a (somewhat) Wolfean riddle:

My writ is three steps' march or four kilometers from my foot, behind the baseboards with everyone else's.

I think that's enough of a head start for Brunians; the rest of you are invited to "play" and solve the riddle.

--

Jeff Wilson - jwilson at io.com
IEEE Student Chapter Blog at
< <http://ieeetamut.org> >

brunians at brunians.org — 06 Jun 2010, 05:13 · in reply to brunians at brunians.org

I'll reserve my turn.

Shadow.

On 6/4/2010 11:17 PM, Jeff Wilson wrote:

On 6/4/2010 6:39 PM, brunians at brunians.org wrote:

If you have your previous text, and would provide me with it, I will perform the action I describe in my second sentence above.

Rather than reward laziness, I'll hand you a (somewhat) Wolfean riddle:

My writ is three steps' march or four kilometers from my foot, behind the baseboards with everyone else's.

I think that's enough of a head start for Brunians; the rest of you are invited to "play" and solve the riddle.

--

Jeff Wilson - jwilson at io.com
IEEE Student Chapter Blog at
< <http://ieeetamut.org> >

Gerry Quinn — 06 Jun 2010, 16:13 · in reply to Lee Berman

From: "Lee Berman" <severiansola at hotmail.com>

That's not really the interpretation I am presenting. Urth becomes Ushas not Earth. Urth is part of an entire universe, named BriaH, which Big Bangs

into existence, runs its course then collapses and Grand Gnabs itself into a single mass and out of existence. This single mass then Big Bangs itself into a creation of the next universe which is called Yesod.

Severian's universe (which is also ours IMO) is named Yesod.

That of the Hierodules is called BriaH.

- Gerry Quinn.

brunians at brunians.org — 06 Jun 2010, 16:38 · in reply to Gerry Quinn

We live in Assiah.

From: "Lee Berman" <severiansola at hotmail.com>

That's not really the interpretation I am presenting. Urth becomes Ushas

not Earth. Urth is part of an entire universe, named BriaH, which Big Bangs

into existence, runs its course then collapses and Grand Gnabs itself into

a single mass and out of existence. This single mass then Big Bangs
itself
into a creation of the next universe which is called Yesod.

Severian's universe (which is also ours IMO) is named Yesod.

That of the Hierodules is called BriaH.

- Gerry Quinn.

Jeff Wilson — 06 Jun 2010, 18:50 · in reply to brunians at brunians.org

On 6/6/2010 12:12 AM, brunians at brunians.org wrote:
Shadow.

.

On 6/4/2010 11:17 PM, Jeff Wilson wrote:

On 6/4/2010 6:39 PM, brunians at brunians.org wrote:

If you have your previous text, and would provide me with it, I will
perform the action I describe in my second sentence above.

Rather than reward laziness, I'll hand you a (somewhat) Wolfean riddle:

My writ is three steps' march or four kilometers from my foot, behind
the baseboards with everyone else's.

I think that's enough of a head start for Brunians; the rest of you are
invited to "play" and solve the riddle.

It's not in _Shadow_, though some items are common to both.

Jeff Wilson - jwilson at io.com
IEEE Student Chapter Blog at
< <http://ieeetamut.org> >

Jeff Wilson — 06 Jun 2010, 19:02 · in reply to Gerry Quinn

On 6/6/2010 11:13 AM, Gerry Quinn wrote:
From: "Lee Berman" <severiansola at hotmail.com>

That's not really the interpretation I am presenting. Urth becomes
Ushas
not Earth. Urth is part of an entire universe, named BriaH, which Big
Bangs
into existence, runs its course then collapses and Grand Gnabs itself
into
a single mass and out of existence. This single mass then Big Bangs
itself
into a creation of the next universe which is called Yesod.

Severian's universe (which is also ours IMO) is named Yesod.

That of the Hierodules is called BriaH.

I'm afraid you've got that reversed from the texts. From the opening of URTH's Chapter XV
Yesod:

"...I now saw our universe, a circle no larger than an ebon moon in the sky of Yesod, ..."

brunians at brunians.org — 06 Jun 2010, 19:03 · in reply to Jeff Wilson

The answer to the riddle is 'your shadow'.

And, as I say, I am reserving my turn.

You may regret that you started this game.

.

On 6/6/2010 12:12 AM, brunians at brunians.org wrote:

Shadow.

.

On 6/4/2010 11:17 PM, Jeff Wilson wrote:

On 6/4/2010 6:39 PM, brunians at brunians.org wrote:

If you have your previous text, and would provide me with it, I will perform the action I describe in my second sentence above.

Rather than reward laziness, I'll hand you a (somewhat) Wolfean riddle:

My writ is three steps' march or four kilometers from my foot, behind the baseboards with everyone else's.

I think that's enough of a head start for Brunians; the rest of you are invited to "play" and solve the riddle.

It's not in _Shadow_, though some items are common to both.

--

Jeff Wilson - jwilson at io.com
IEEE Student Chapter Blog at
< <http://ieeetamut.org> >

Jeff Wilson — 06 Jun 2010, 22:30 · in reply to brunians at brunians.org

On 6/6/2010 2:03 PM, brunians at brunians.org wrote:

The answer to the riddle is 'your shadow'.

Either way that's a fair guess at a partial solution, though I considered a book is a more suitable place to find writing than a silhouette.

And, as I say, I am reserving my turn.

It's not meant to be a turnwise game as far as guessing goes, just like people don't have to take turns reading Wolfe's stories and figuring out what they mean. The person gets their turn to make a riddle by solving the previous one. I suppose we might decide that there needs to be some stopping conditions for unsolved riddles.

Rather than reward laziness, I'll hand you a (somewhat) Wolfean riddle:

My writ is three steps' march or four kilometers from my foot, behind the baseboards with everyone else's.

I think that's enough of a head start for Brunians; the rest of you are invited to "play" and solve the riddle.

Jeff Wilson - jwilson at io.com
IEEE Student Chapter Blog at
< <http://ieeetamut.org> >

brunians at brunians.org — 06 Jun 2010, 22:34 · in reply to Jeff Wilson

The riddle game is an ancient game.

It is a game of turns and forfeits.

You did not name your forfeit: would you care to name it now?

.

On 6/6/2010 2:03 PM, brunians at brunians.org wrote:

The answer to the riddle is 'your shadow'.

Either way that's a fair guess at a partial solution, though I considered a book is a more suitable place to find writing than a silhouette.

And, as I say, I am reserving my turn.

It's not meant to be a turnwise game as far as guessing goes, just like people don't have to take turns reading Wolfe's stories and figuring out what they mean. The person gets their turn to make a riddle by solving the previous one. I suppose we might decide that there needs to be some stopping conditions for unsolved riddles.

Rather than reward laziness, I'll hand you a (somewhat) Wolfean riddle:

My writ is three steps' march or four kilometers from my foot,
behind
the baseboards with everyone else's.

I think that's enough of a head start for Brunians; the rest of you are invited to "play" and solve the riddle.

--

Jeff Wilson - jwilson at io.com
IEEE Student Chapter Blog at
< <http://ieeetamut.org> >

Jeff Wilson — 07 Jun 2010, 00:49 · in reply to brunians at brunians.org

On 6/6/2010 5:34 PM, brunians at brunians.org wrote:

The riddle game is an ancient game.

It is a game of turns and forfeits.

You did not name your forfeit: would you care to name it now?

I specified a somewhat Wolfean riddle - the stakes and rules are equally Wolfean, i.e. a contest of riddle crafting where the solver's prize is the hidden information and the maker's prize is recognition for having made a riddle that is solvable through some combination of virtues. I much prefer the "speak friend and enter" sort of contest than the "what have I got in my

pocket" kind.

Jeff Wilson - jwilson at io.com
IEEE Student Chapter Blog at
< <http://ieeetamut.org> >

brunians at brunians.org — 07 Jun 2010, 00:59 · in reply to Jeff Wilson

If that is the game you like, that is the game you should play.

You did not.

These games are not random.

.

On 6/6/2010 5:34 PM, brunians at brunians.org wrote:

The riddle game is an ancient game.

It is a game of turns and forfeits.

You did not name your forfeit: would you care to name it now?

I specified a somewhat Wolfean riddle - the stakes and rules are equally Wolfean, i.e. a contest of riddle crafting where the solver's prize is the hidden information and the maker's prize is recognition for having made a riddle that is solvable through some combination of virtues. I much prefer the "speak friend and enter" sort of contest than the "what have I got in my pocket" kind.

--

Jeff Wilson - jwilson at io.com
IEEE Student Chapter Blog at
< <http://ieeetamut.org> >

Adam Thornton — 07 Jun 2010, 00:59 · in reply to Jeff Wilson

On Jun 6, 2010, at 7:49 PM, Jeff Wilson wrote:

On 6/6/2010 5:34 PM, brunians at brunians.org wrote:

The riddle game is an ancient game.

It is a game of turns and forfeits.

You did not name your forfeit: would you care to name it now?

I specified a somewhat Wolfean riddle - the stakes and rules are equally Wolfean, i.e. a contest of riddle crafting where the solver's prize is the hidden information and the maker's prize is recognition for having made a riddle that is solvable through some combination of virtues. I much prefer the "speak friend and enter" sort of contest than the "what have I got in my pocket" kind.

TEETH! Answer's always "teeth."

Well, sometimes it's "swordfish."

Adam

brunians at brunians.org — 07 Jun 2010, 01:01 · in reply to Adam Thornton

Ooo, that makes me cringe just thinking about it.

.

On Jun 6, 2010, at 7:49 PM, Jeff Wilson wrote:

On 6/6/2010 5:34 PM, brunians at brunians.org wrote:

The riddle game is an ancient game.

It is a game of turns and forfeits.

You did not name your forfeit: would you care to name it now?

I specified a somewhat Wolfean riddle - the stakes and rules are equally Wolfean, i.e. a contest of riddle crafting where the solver's prize is the hidden information and the maker's prize is recognition for having made a riddle that is solvable through some combination of virtues. I much prefer the "speak friend and enter" sort of contest than the "what have I got in my pocket" kind.

TEETH! Answer's always "teeth."

Well, sometimes it's "swordfish."

Adam_____

brunians at brunians.org — 07 Jun 2010, 01:01 · in reply to Adam Thornton

The teeth.

The swordfish not so much.

.

On Jun 6, 2010, at 7:49 PM, Jeff Wilson wrote:

On 6/6/2010 5:34 PM, brunians at brunians.org wrote:

The riddle game is an ancient game.

It is a game of turns and forfeits.

You did not name your forfeit: would you care to name it now?

I specified a somewhat Wolfean riddle - the stakes and rules are equally Wolfean, i.e. a contest of riddle crafting where the solver's prize is the hidden information and the maker's prize is recognition for having made a riddle that is solvable through some combination of virtues. I much prefer the "speak friend and enter" sort of contest than the "what have I got in my pocket" kind.

TEETH! Answer's always "teeth."

Well, sometimes it's "swordfish."

Adam_____

Adam Thornton — 07 Jun 2010, 01:02 · in reply to brunians at brunians.org

On Jun 6, 2010, at 8:01 PM, brunians at brunians.org wrote:
The teeth.

The swordfish not so much.

That's not a swordfish in your pocket?

Then I guess you ARE happy to see me.

Adam

brunians at brunians.org — 07 Jun 2010, 01:28 · in reply to Adam Thornton

Your turn in the barrel, darlin'...

.

On Jun 6, 2010, at 8:01 PM, brunians at brunians.org wrote:
The teeth.

The swordfish not so much.

That's not a swordfish in your pocket?

Then I guess you ARE happy to see me.

Adam_____

Jeff Wilson — 07 Jun 2010, 01:43 · in reply to brunians at brunians.org

On 6/6/2010 7:59 PM, brunians at brunians.org wrote:
If that is the game you like, that is the game you should play.

You did not.

These games are not random.

If you can point out where I overtly agreed to play some other kind of riddle game, I'll apologize handsomely.

Jeff Wilson - jwilson at io.com
IEEE Student Chapter Blog at
< <http://ieeetamut.org> >

brunians at brunians.org — 07 Jun 2010, 01:53 · in reply to Jeff Wilson

You started the game.

.

On 6/6/2010 7:59 PM, brunians at brunians.org wrote:
If that is the game you like, that is the game you should play.

You did not.

These games are not random.

If you can point out where I overtly agreed to play some other kind of riddle game, I'll apologize handsomely.

--

Jeff Wilson - jwilson at io.com
IEEE Student Chapter Blog at
< <http://ieeetamut.org> >

Jeff Wilson — 07 Jun 2010, 03:22 · in reply to brunians at brunians.org

On 6/6/2010 8:53 PM, brunians at brunians.org wrote:
You started the game.

Ergo you agreed to play my game. Thank you!

Jeff Wilson - jwilson at io.com
IEEE Student Chapter Blog at
< <http://ieeetamut.org> >

brunians at brunians.org — 07 Jun 2010, 06:26 · in reply to Jeff Wilson

It is not your game.

It has in fact begun.

.

On 6/6/2010 8:53 PM, brunians at brunians.org wrote:

You started the game.

Ergo you agreed to play my game. Thank you!

--

Jeff Wilson - jwilson at io.com
IEEE Student Chapter Blog at
< <http://ieeetamut.org> >

Jeff Wilson — 07 Jun 2010, 11:51 · in reply to brunians at brunians.org

On 6/7/2010 1:26 AM, brunians at brunians.org wrote:
It is not your game.

It has in fact begun.

Then you can consider my forfeit is for you to leave off your notion of the game and continue under mine, as I am not terribly keen for a stranger who packs both heat and a disregard for social norms to unilaterally decide I owe him something.

Jeff Wilson - jwilson at io.com
IEEE Student Chapter Blog at
< <http://ieeetamut.org> >

brunians at brunians.org — 07 Jun 2010, 11:53 · in reply to Jeff Wilson

The point where the game may end has passed.

.

On 6/7/2010 1:26 AM, brunians at brunians.org wrote:

It is not your game.

It has in fact begun.

Then you can consider my forfeit is for you to leave off your notion of the game and continue under mine, as I am not terribly keen for a stranger who packs both heat and a disregard for social norms to unilaterally decide I owe him something.

--

Jeff Wilson - jwilson at io.com
IEEE Student Chapter Blog at
< <http://ieeetamut.org> >

brunians at brunians.org — 07 Jun 2010, 11:54 · in reply to brunians at brunians.org

The point where you may have introduced a forfeit is long passed.

It is not my fault that you did not believe the stories you were told when you were a small child.

.

The point where the game may end has passed.

.

On 6/7/2010 1:26 AM, brunians at brunians.org wrote:

It is not your game.

It has in fact begun.

Then you can consider my forfeit is for you to leave off your notion of the game and continue under mine, as I am not terribly keen for a stranger who packs both heat and a disregard for social norms to unilaterally decide I owe him something.

--

Jeff Wilson - jwilson at io.com
IEEE Student Chapter Blog at
< <http://ieeetamut.org> >

Gerry Quinn — 07 Jun 2010, 12:39 · in reply to Jeff Wilson

You're right - I got them back to front.

But I still think Yesod and Briah are different universes, not the same universe at different times.

- Gerry Quinn

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

From: "Jeff Wilson" <jwilson at io.com>
To: "The Urth Mailing List" <urth at lists.urth.net>
Sent: Sunday, June 06, 2010 8:02 PM
Subject: Re: (urth) Travelling North aka miscellaneous thoughts on Wolfe
On 6/6/2010 11:13 AM, Gerry Quinn wrote:

From: "Lee Berman" <severiansola at hotmail.com>

That's not really the interpretation I am presenting. Urth becomes Ushas not Earth. Urth is part of an entire universe, named Briah, which Big Bangs into existence, runs its course then collapses and Grand Gnabs itself into a single mass and out of existence. This single mass then Big Bangs itself into a creation of the next universe which is called Yesod.

Severian's universe (which is also ours IMO) is named Yesod.

That of the Hierodules is called Briah.

I'm afraid you've got that reversed from the texts. From the opening of URTH's Chapter XV Yesod:

"...I now saw our universe, a circle no larger than an ebon moon in the sky of Yesod, ..."

--

Jeff Wilson - jwilson at io.com
IEEE Student Chapter Blog at
< <http://ieeetamut.org> >

brunians at brunians.org — 07 Jun 2010, 12:55 · in reply to Gerry Quinn

In QBLH they are nested Worlds.

.

You're right - I got them back to front.

But I still think Yesod and Briah are different universes, not the same universe at different times.

- Gerry Quinn

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

From: "Jeff Wilson" <jwilson at io.com>

To: "The Urth Mailing List" <urth at lists.urth.net>

Sent: Sunday, June 06, 2010 8:02 PM

Subject: Re: (urth) Travelling North aka miscellaneous thoughts on Wolfe

On 6/6/2010 11:13 AM, Gerry Quinn wrote:

From: "Lee Berman" <severiansola at hotmail.com>

That's not really the interpretation I am presenting. Urth becomes Ushas not Earth. Urth is part of an entire universe, named Briah, which Big Bangs into existence, runs its course then collapses and Grand Gnabs itself into a single mass and out of existence. This single mass then Big Bangs itself into a creation of the next universe which is called Yesod.

Severian's universe (which is also ours IMO) is named Yesod.

That of the Hierodules is called BriaH.

I'm afraid you've got that reversed from the texts. From the opening of URTH's Chapter XV Yesod:

"...I now saw our universe, a circle no larger than an ebon moon in the sky of Yesod, ..."

--

Jeff Wilson - jwilson at io.com
IEEE Student Chapter Blog at
< <http://ieeetamut.org> >

Jeff Wilson — 07 Jun 2010, 13:06 · in reply to Gerry Quinn

On 6/7/2010 7:39 AM, Gerry Quinn wrote:

You're right - I got them back to front.

But I still think Yesod and BriaH are different universes, not the same univese at different times.

I don't think anyone's asserted they are.

Jeff Wilson - jwilson at io.com
IEEE Student Chapter Blog at
< <http://ieeetamut.org> >

James Wynn — 07 Jun 2010, 16:14 · in reply to Gerry Quinn

I guess I thought that Yesod was a megauniverse with BriaH being equivalent to a planet within it? Is that wrong?

On 6/7/2010 7:39 AM, Gerry Quinn wrote:

You're right - I got them back to front.

But I still think Yesod and BriaH are different universes, not the same univese at different times.

- Gerry Quinn

----- Original Message ----- From: "Jeff Wilson" <jwilson at io.com>
To: "The Urth Mailing List" <urth at lists.urth.net>
Sent: Sunday, June 06, 2010 8:02 PM
Subject: Re: (urth) Travelling North aka miscellaneous thoughts on Wolfe

On 6/6/2010 11:13 AM, Gerry Quinn wrote:

From: "Lee Berman" <severiansola at hotmail.com>

That's not really the interpretation I am presenting. Urth becomes Ushas not Earth. Urth is part of an entire universe, named BriaH, which Big Bangs into existence, runs its course then collapses and Grand Gnabs itself into a single mass and out of existence. This single mass then Big Bangs

itself
into a creation of the next universe which is called Yesod.
Severian's universe (which is also ours IMO) is named Yesod.

That of the Hierodules is called Briah.

I'm afraid you've got that reversed from the texts. From the opening of URTH's Chapter XV Yesod:

"...I now saw our universe, a circle no larger than an ebon moon in the sky of Yesod, ..."

--

Jeff Wilson - jwilson at io.com
IEEE Student Chapter Blog at
< <http://ieeetamut.org> >

Jeff Wilson — 07 Jun 2010, 17:31 · in reply to James Wynn

On 6/7/2010 11:14 AM, James Wynn wrote:
I guess I thought that Yesod was a megauniverse with Briah being equivalent to a planet within it? Is that wrong?

Briah is a universe very much like our own, with lots of galaxies. All we see of Yesod is a huge planet-like mechanism that supposedly has an island or group of islands for each inhabited galaxy or group of galaxies in Briah. This makes the Yesod universe still pretty small compared to Briah, or it could be that The Ship is just very accurate in where it emerges into the higher dimension.

The Yesodis show they are able to open peep-holes into Briah, and in fact that is how Severian returns to our universe by leaping through one to join The Ship "after" it has left without him. I say "after" with the quotes because some of the people on The Ship are younger than he encountered them before, and it famously arrives a thousand years before he first boarded it.

This peep-hole between the dimensions is described as moonlike in appearance, just as the dimensional aperture where The Ship entered Yesod was. This was the basis for my pet theory that the Whorl could have been secretly diverted by the Yesodis to just about anywhere in Briah's space or time, allowing Blue and Green to be Urth and Lune PLANET OF THE APES-style, but that's largely fallen by the wayside now.

Jeff Wilson - jwilson at io.com
IEEE Student Chapter Blog at
< <http://ieeetamut.org> >

Lee Berman — 07 Jun 2010, 17:40 · follows Jeff Wilson

Jeff Wilson posts:

I'm afraid you've got that reversed from the texts. From the opening of URTH's Chapter XV Yesod:
"...I now saw our universe, a circle no larger than an ebon moon in the sky of Yesod, ..."

I'm not clear on how this passage contradicts the idea of universal collapse of Briah leading to a Big Bang creation of Yesod. In describing travel from one universe to another I can see how Wolfe might envision it this way. Some explanation please?

Jeff Wilson — 07 Jun 2010, 18:13 · in reply to Lee Berman

On 6/7/2010 12:40 PM, Lee Berman wrote:

Jeff Wilson posts:

I'm afraid you've got that reversed from the texts. From the opening of URTH's Chapter XV Yesod:

"...I now saw our universe, a circle no larger than an ebon moon in the sky of Yesod, ..."

I'm not clear on how this passage contradicts the idea of universal collapse of Briah leading to a Big Bang creation of Yesod. In describing travel from one universe to another I can see how Wolfe might envision it this way. Some explanation please?

Yesod's too small in scope; just one enormous machine-planet.

Jeff Wilson - jwilson at io.com
IEEE Student Chapter Blog at
< <http://ieeetamut.org> >

Gerry Quinn — 07 Jun 2010, 18:55 · in reply to James Wynn

I don't think so. To travel to Yesod it is necessary to break the laws of physics in Briah by travelling faster than light (though the mechanism proposed, tacking across the light from the stars, is cute but unfeasible).

- Gerry Quinn

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

I guess I thought that Yesod was a megauniverse with Briah being equivalent to a planet within it? Is that wrong?

On 6/7/2010 7:39 AM, Gerry Quinn wrote:

You're right - I got them back to front.

But I still think Yesod and Briah are different universes, not the same universe at different times.

- Gerry Quinn

Eugene Zaretskiy — 07 Jun 2010, 20:13 · in reply to Gerry Quinn

On Mon, Jun 7, 2010 at 2:55 PM, Gerry Quinn <gerryq at indigo.ie> wrote:

I don't think so. — To travel to Yesod it is necessary to break the laws of physics in Briah by travelling faster than light (though the mechanism proposed, tacking across the light from the stars, is cute but unfeasible).

I don't mean to pick on you, but I've always thought these types of statements were quite presumptive. Yours is a common argument to make against many ideas presented in science fiction. Educated folk mere decades ago explained in simple science why some of the technologies available today would be impossible to make. Yet the ingenuity of the modern inventor constantly foils such assumptions. I'm sure you could point out the fallacy in their thinking, but the fact remains that countless millennia have passed between now and the time these ships were "invented" (assuming someone, at some point, had to come up with the technology). Are you absolutely certain that it simply isn't possible that Severian's one-line explanation of how the ship sails is accurate?

Not that it really matters. I just think it's rather groundless to predict that a proposed method of travel used millennia from now is unfeasible when we can't even predict what the weather tomorrow will be.

- Gerry Quinn

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

I guess I thought that Yesod was a megauniverse with Briah being equivalent to a planet within it? Is that wrong?

On 6/7/2010 7:39 AM, Gerry Quinn wrote:

You're right - I got them back to front.

But I still think Yesod and Briah are different universes, not the same universe at different times.

- Gerry Quinn

Gerry Quinn — 09 Jun 2010, 15:38 · in reply to Eugene Zaretskiy

I know that even 'hard' SF writers generally get a free pass when it comes to FTL travel. But the method described in 'Urth of the New Sun' has two problems with it.

First, there is the usual issue of travelling faster than light. Special relativity is well established, and while it could be replaced by a new 'aether' theory, any such theory would have the same issue with a maximum speed. We regularly push stuff to >99% of light speed and we know what happens.

Secondly, the 'tacking' method of travelling faster than the wind works for sailboats. But the analogy between wind and light radiation doesn't hold up because light does not exert pressure in directions orthogonal to its direction of travel, as moving air does.

It's not a big issue, and in fact I mentioned it because I think it's a very nice idea. But we can be pretty certain that no future technology will use it.

- Gerry Quinn

From: "Eugene Zaretskiy" <eugene.zar at gmail.com>

On Mon, Jun 7, 2010 at 2:55 PM, Gerry Quinn <gerryq at indigo.ie> wrote:

I don't think so. To travel to Yesod it is necessary to break the laws of physics in Briah by travelling faster than light (though the mechanism proposed, tacking across the light from the stars, is cute but unfeasible).

I don't mean to pick on you, but I've always thought these types of statements were quite presumptive. Yours is a common argument to make against many ideas presented in science fiction. Educated folk mere decades ago explained in simple science why some of the technologies available today would be impossible to make. Yet the ingenuity of the modern inventor constantly foils such assumptions. I'm sure you could point out the fallacy in their thinking, but the fact remains that countless millennia have passed between now and the time

these ships were "invented" (assuming someone, at some point, had to come up with the technology). Are you absolutely certain that it simply isn't possible that Severian's one-line explanation of how the ship sails is accurate?

Not that it really matters. I just think it's rather groundless to predict that a proposed method of travel used millennia from now is unfeasible when we can't even predict what the weather tomorrow will be.

brunians at brunians.org — 09 Jun 2010, 15:47 · in reply to Gerry Quinn

I find it very difficult to take any purported Irishman who claims not to believe in fairies seriously.

Especially when he is spurting this fanboy stuff all over the Gene Wolfe list.

I believe that Wolfe describes the Book of the New Sun as science fantasy.

.

I know that even 'hard' SF writers generally get a free pass when it comes to FTL travel. But the method described in 'Urth of the New Sun' has two problems with it.

First, there is the usual issue of travelling faster than light. Special relativity is well established, and while it could be replaced by a new 'aether' theory, any such theory would have the same issue with a maximum speed. We regularly push stuff to >99% of light speed and we know what happens.

Secondly, the 'tacking' method of travelling faster than the wind works for sailboats. But the analogy between wind and light radiation doesn't hold up because light does not exert pressure in directions orthogonal to its direction of travel, as moving air does.

It's not a big issue, and in fact I mentioned it because I think it's a very nice idea. But we can be pretty certain that no future technology will use it.

- Gerry Quinn

From: "Eugene Zaretskiy" <eugene.zar at gmail.com>

On Mon, Jun 7, 2010 at 2:55 PM, Gerry Quinn <gerryq at indigo.ie> wrote:

I don't think so. To travel to Yesod it is necessary to break the laws of physics in Briah by travelling faster than light (though the mechanism proposed, tacking across the light from the stars, is cute but unfeasible).

I don't mean to pick on you, but I've always thought these types of statements were quite presumptive. Yours is a common argument to make against many ideas presented in science fiction. Educated folk mere

decades ago explained in simple science why some of the technologies available today would be impossible to make. Yet the ingenuity of the modern inventor constantly foils such assumptions. I'm sure you could point out the fallacy in their thinking, but the fact remains that countless millennia have passed between now and the time these ships were "invented" (assuming someone, at some point, had to come up with the technology). Are you absolutely certain that it simply isn't possible that Severian's one-line explanation of how the ship sails is accurate?

Not that it really matters. I just think it's rather groundless to predict that a proposed method of travel used millennia from now is unfeasible when we can't even predict what the weather tomorrow will be.

Tony Ellis — 09 Jun 2010, 16:55 · follows brunians at brunians.org

Gerry Quinn wrote:

Secondly, the 'tacking' method of travelling faster than the wind works for sailboats. But the analogy between wind and light radiation doesn't hold up because light does not exert pressure in directions orthogonal to its direction of travel, as moving air does.

The sails in question aren't your common-or-garden solar sails, but the same monster-summoning, space-warping mirrors found in the Autarch's book and Father Inire's workshop. It's not a pressure-driven means of transport.

Jeff Wilson — 10 Jun 2010, 07:38 · in reply to Gerry Quinn

On 6/9/2010 10:38 AM, Gerry Quinn wrote:

I know that even 'hard' SF writers generally get a free pass when it comes to FTL travel. But the method described in 'Urth of the New Sun' has two problems with it.

First, there is the usual issue of travelling faster than light. Special relativity is well established, and while it could be replaced by a new 'aether' theory, any such theory would have the same issue with a maximum speed. We regularly push stuff to >99% of light speed and we know what happens.

Secondly, the 'tacking' method of travelling faster than the wind works for sailboats. But the analogy between wind and light radiation doesn't hold up because light does not exert pressure in directions orthogonal to its direction of travel, as moving air does.

That's not entirely correct; if the light is reflected at an angle, it imparts momentum at an angle normal to the reflecting surface. For example if light traveling due north strikes a mirror facing SW and is reflected to the west, the mirror is pushed NE. This sort of thing really happens, and produces a measureable effect on natural and artificial satellites over a period of years.

The trick then is not how The Ship is propelled, but rather how The Ship's inertia is nullified to allow this more-feeble-than-a-thousand-year-old-butterfly push to make it accelerate so quickly.

Jeff Wilson - jwilson at io.com
IEEE Student Chapter Blog at
< <http://ieeetamut.org> >

Gerry Quinn — 10 Jun 2010, 12:50 · in reply to Jeff Wilson

From: "Jeff Wilson" <jwilson at io.com>

On 6/9/2010 10:38 AM, Gerry Quinn wrote:

Secondly, the 'tacking' method of travelling faster than the wind works for sailboats. But the analogy between wind and light radiation doesn't hold up because light does not exert pressure in directions orthogonal to its direction of travel, as moving air does.

That's not entirely correct; if the light is reflected at an angle, it imparts momentum at an angle normal to the reflecting surface. For example if light traveling due north strikes a mirror facing SW and is reflected to the west, the mirror is pushed NE. This sort of thing really happens, and produces a measureable effect on natural and artificial satellites _over_a_period_of_years_.

Yes, but this is different from the 'airfoil' mechanism that can propel a boat faster than the wind, and which is not available in the case of light. That said, I think I was wrong to place so much store in this, as light also has compensating advantages - unlike air, it will not necessarily resist objects that are already in motion relative to it

There still is the issue of accelerating *past* the speed of light, however, which applies to all similar FTL mechanisms.

- Gerry Quinn

.

brunians at brunians.org — 10 Jun 2010, 13:18 · in reply to Gerry Quinn

All you need are two streams, in one or two media, which flow at different speeds.

The lengthy masts might be to catch different currents in the flow.

I have designed a wind powered airship: it is the same principle.

.

From: "Jeff Wilson" <jwilson at io.com>

On 6/9/2010 10:38 AM, Gerry Quinn wrote:

Secondly, the 'tacking' method of travelling faster than the wind works for sailboats. But the analogy between wind and light radiation doesn't hold up because light does not exert pressure in directions orthogonal to its direction of travel, as moving air does.

That's not entirely correct; if the light is reflected at an angle, it imparts momentum at an angle normal to the reflecting surface. For example if light traveling due north strikes a mirror facing SW and is reflected to the west, the mirror is pushed NE. This sort of thing really happens, and produces a measureable effect on natural and artificial satellites _over_a_period_of_years_.

Yes, but this is different from the 'airfoil' mechanism that can propel a boat faster than the wind, and which is not available in the case of light.

That said, I think I was wrong to place so much store in this, as light also has compensating advantages - unlike air, it will not necessarily resist

objects that are already in motion relative to it

There still is the issue of accelerating *past* the speed of light, however, which applies to all similar FTL mechanisms.

- Gerry Quinn

.

Jack Smith — 10 Jun 2010, 13:45 · in reply to Gerry Quinn

On Thu, Jun 10, 2010 at 8:50 AM, Gerry Quinn <gerryq at indigo.ie> wrote:

From: "Jeff Wilson" <jwilson at io.com>

On 6/9/2010 10:38 AM, Gerry Quinn wrote:

Secondly, the 'tacking' method of travelling faster than the wind works for sailboats. But the analogy between wind and light radiation doesn't hold up because light does not exert pressure in directions orthogonal to its direction of travel, as moving air does.

That's not entirely correct; if the light is reflected at an angle, it imparts momentum at an angle normal to the reflecting surface. For example if light traveling due north strikes a mirror facing SW and is reflected to the west, the mirror is pushed NE. This sort of thing really happens, and produces a measureable effect on natural and artificial satellites _over_a_period_of_years_.

Yes, but this is different from the 'airfoil' mechanism that can propel a boat faster than the wind, and which is not available in the case of light. That said, I think I was wrong to place so much store in this, as light also has compensating advantages - unlike air, it will not necessarily resist objects that are already in motion relative to it

There still is the issue of accelerating *past* the speed of light, however, which applies to all similar FTL mechanisms.

- Gerry Quinn

.

It is also not clear that moving faster than the speed of light would allow you to go backward in time. If the mathematics of the relativity equations correctly describes reality, then a velocity greater than the speed of light puts you not into negative time but into imaginary time.

Maybe SF should just rely on old-fashioned hyperspace.

Paul Zinn-Justin — 10 Jun 2010, 13:54 · in reply to Jack Smith

That is incorrect. Some quantities might become imaginary but that is a mathematical artefact. The real point is, if you combine faster than light travel and Lorentz invariance of the laws of physics (the invariance principle that is the basis of Einstein's theory of special relativity), then you can indeed have trajectories which connect two arbitrary points of spacetime i.e. in a given reference frame it will look like you can move freely forward or backwards in time (you're not going ``straight" into the past -- you're making little loops, like travelling to a distant star faster than light and then coming back the same way).

On 06/10/2010 03:45 PM, Jack Smith wrote:

It is also not clear that moving faster than the speed of light would allow you to go backward in time. If the mathematics of the relativity equations correctly describes reality, then a velocity greater than the speed of light puts you not into negative time but into imaginary time.

brunians at brunians.org — 10 Jun 2010, 14:07 · in reply to Paul Zinn-Justin

Cool.

]

.

That is incorrect. Some quantities might become imaginary but that is a mathematical artefact.

The real point is, if you combine faster than light travel and Lorentz invariance of the laws of physics (the invariance principle that is the basis of Einstein's theory of special relativity), then you can indeed have trajectories which connect two arbitrary points of spacetime i.e. in a given reference frame it will look like you can move freely forward or backwards in time (you're not going ``straight" into the past -- you're making little loops, like travelling to a distant star faster than light and then coming back the same way).

On 06/10/2010 03:45 PM, Jack Smith wrote:

It is also not clear that moving faster than the speed of light would allow you to go backward in time. If the mathematics of the relativity equations correctly describes reality, then a velocity greater than the speed of light puts you not into negative time but into imaginary time.

brunians at brunians.org — 10 Jun 2010, 14:07 · in reply to Paul Zinn-Justin

Cool.

.

That is incorrect. Some quantities might become imaginary but that is a mathematical artefact.

The real point is, if you combine faster than light travel and Lorentz invariance of the laws of physics (the invariance principle that is the basis of Einstein's theory of special relativity), then you can indeed have trajectories which connect two arbitrary points of spacetime i.e. in a given reference frame it will look like you can move freely forward or backwards in time (you're not going ``straight" into the past -- you're making little loops, like travelling to a distant star faster

than light and then coming back the same way).

On 06/10/2010 03:45 PM, Jack Smith wrote:

It is also not clear that moving faster than the speed of light would allow you to go backward in time. If the mathematics of the relativity equations correctly describes reality, then a velocity greater than the speed of light puts you not into negative time but into imaginary time.

James Wynn — 10 Jun 2010, 19:45 · in reply to Paul Zinn-Justin

That said, I'd prefer to travel in imaginary time.

On 6/10/2010 8:54 AM, Paul Zinn-Justin wrote:

That is incorrect. Some quantities might become imaginary but that is a mathematical artefact.

On 06/10/2010 03:45 PM, Jack Smith wrote:

It is also not clear that moving faster than the speed of light would allow you to go backward in time. If the mathematics of the relativity equations correctly describes reality, then a velocity greater than the speed of light puts you not into negative time but into imaginary time.

Jeff Wilson — 10 Jun 2010, 23:46 · in reply to Gerry Quinn

On 6/10/2010 7:50 AM, Gerry Quinn wrote:

From: "Jeff Wilson" <jwilson at io.com>

On 6/9/2010 10:38 AM, Gerry Quinn wrote:

Secondly, the 'tacking' method of travelling faster than the wind works for sailboats. But the analogy between wind and light radiation doesn't hold up because light does not exert pressure in directions orthogonal to its direction of travel, as moving air does.

That's not entirely correct; if the light is reflected at an angle, it imparts momentum at an angle normal to the reflecting surface. For example if light traveling due north strikes a mirror facing SW and is reflected to the west, the mirror is pushed NE. This sort of thing really happens, and produces a measureable effect on natural and artificial satellites over a period of years.

Yes, but this is different from the 'airfoil' mechanism that can propel a boat faster than the wind, and which is not available in the case of light. That said, I think I was wrong to place so much store in this, as light also has compensating advantages - unlike air, it will not necessarily resist objects that are already in motion relative to it

That's true, but it is still tacking in the sense of rigging the sails at similar angles to get transverse propulsion - and since the speakers are originally educated as wet sailors rather than physicists, "tacking" is the most accurate word they have for it. And The Ship does end up going faster than light, just like a surface vessel tacking against the wind can make better than windspeed, so again "tacking" is the metaphorically most correct word a simple sailor can use.

There still is the issue of accelerating **past** the speed of light, however, which applies to all similar FTL mechanisms.

The Ship going FTL can be attributed to it traveling into that unseen direction that Juturna points into and the direction F B & O's saucer takes when it leaves Baldanders' castle, the conceit being that relativity doesn't cover that fifth dimension with the same constraints as our familiar four.

There is a mathematical concept analogous to this called surreal numbers, invented about 1976 and covered in some popular science literature, and the notation employed used a metaphor similar to Zeno's paradox, of traveling an infinite distance in one direction, then one step more, and mapping this additional distance to the side, and repeating that ad infinitum, producing not just a new dimension but all kinds of mathematical structures with suggestive names like transfinite ordered fields that could easily be an influence on the imagery of Yesod.

Jeff Wilson - jwilson@io.com
IEEE Student Chapter Blog at
< <http://ieeetamut.org> >

Adam Thornton — 11 Jun 2010, 00:03 · in reply to Jeff Wilson

On Jun 10, 2010, at 6:46 PM, Jeff Wilson wrote:

There is a mathematical concept analogous to this called surreal numbers, invented about 1976 and covered in some popular science literature, and the notation employed used a metaphor similar to Zeno's paradox, of traveling an infinite distance in one direction, then one step more, and mapping this additional distance to the side, and repeating that ad infinitum, producing not just a new dimension but all kinds of mathematical structures with suggestive names like transfinite ordered fields that could easily be an influence on the imagery of Yesod.

Invented earlier than that....in 1970 or so (at least, those are the first lectures) by John Horton Conway, whom you may know from the mathematical recreation "The Game Of Life". Notable because its moniker and first publication came from Don Knuth, who of course is most famous for his Mad Magazine article, "The Potrzebie System of Weights and Measures" (his subsequent career at Stanford University has also been of some minor interest), and is unusual--perhaps unique--for the first public appearance of a mathematical theory in that it is presented in the form of a love story. That novella (1974) is entitled Surreal Numbers and is still in print, should you wish to order a copy. The theory is worked out in a more traditional form in Conway's On Numbers and Games, published in 1976 and with a second edition in 2001. It is the most beautiful example of bootstrapping something from very nearly nothing that I know.

The Wikipedia article at http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Surreal_number is a pretty good introduction, but I can't recommend ONAG too highly. And the "On Games" part? Well, not to give it away, but a game is a number with certain of the definitory conditions relaxed; it turns out that both numbers and games-which-are-not-numbers (numbers are all games, but not vice-versa) can be used as descriptions of positions in a certain class of what-we-commonly-call-games, namely those in which there are two players, both have perfect knowledge of the game state, and there is no random element. You can prove all sorts of interesting things with this theory.

Also: regarding Brunians' airship design, I demand that he grow long white whiskers, as it is now impossible for me to visualize him as anything other than the White Knight. I wonder whether he balances very badly when sliding down pokers.

Adam

Jeff Wilson — 11 Jun 2010, 00:04 · in reply to Paul Zinn-Justin

On 6/10/2010 8:54 AM, Paul Zinn-Justin wrote:

That is incorrect. Some quantities might become imaginary but that is a

mathematical artefact.

The real point is, if you combine faster than light travel and Lorentz invariance of the laws of physics (the invariance principle that is the basis of Einstein's theory of special relativity), then you can indeed have trajectories which connect two arbitrary points of spacetime i.e. in a given reference frame it will look like you can move freely forward or backwards in time (you're not going ``straight" into the past -- you're making little loops, like travelling to a distant star faster than light and then coming back the same way).

Yes, the limerick is not just cute but technically accurate:

There was a young lady named Bright
Whose speed was much faster than light;
She set out one day,
In a relative way
And returned on the previous night.

- Inflicted by Arthur Henry Reginald Buller, in the December 19, 1923 issue of Punch

Jeff Wilson - jwilson at io.com
IEEE Student Chapter Blog at
< <http://ieeetamut.org> >