

(no subject)

The Urth list — 1 messages, 1 voices, 16 Dec 2010

<https://urth.darkrealm.vip/thread/urth/5834>

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.

Lee Berman — 16 Dec 2010, 19:42

David Stockhoff- Urth phase: Much like the Old Testament. (No offense to Jews of course.)

None taken from this former one, anyway. The Old Testament is a cesspool of genocide all in the name of the Chosen People. Joshua was as merciless and bloodthirsty as any conqueror in history. Happen to have the bad luck of being an Egyptian? Too bad, locusts and frogs in your yard, boils on your skin then your oldest son dies. I can remember being 8 years old and thinking "Damn, God is a real *****!. Pharaoh wants to let the Hebrews go but every time he tries, God hardens his heart. WTF is the guy supposed to do?"

Next phase: Future iterations build on the improvements of our universe. With each universe bound to get a Christ, they just get better. Thus the universes progress toward an inevitable merging with God.

That's the impression I get. Might have been the basis for my Wolfe-as-Heretic thread. Jesus Christ is better, less of a torturer, than Severian. But the next universe might get someone even better. Maybe Jesus v.2 will stop the wickedness of the moneychangers in the Temple with a simple word or two and a gentle hand to the shoulder instead of a whip.

Gerry Quinn- We do see evidence for Jesus in the text

Not by name. Nor do we see any significant whiff of Salvation, indicating a Jesus Christ. This point has been made too many times already by David and me.

Gene Wolfe certainly likes to throw in gnostic names and concepts (and names and concepts from many other sources) - but Christian concepts are everywhere too, even if not always mentioned by name.

Many think names are extremely important in the work of Gene Wolfe. By dismissing named characters and philosophies and elevating non-named vaguely addressed characters and philosophies you are imposing your own worldview on the text.

It is okay, to do this. That's what Peter Wright does with his atheistic interpretation of BotNS. But I think

it is good to acknowledge one's own bias and viewpoint when interpreting from a "self" point of view.

it is always a leap to assume that absence of evidence constitutes evidence of absence.

Wise words to consider when people start discussing their intuitive theories. Good to recognize that when you accuse others of making an "unlikely leap" you are in the process of leaping yourself.