

More on Frog and Fish

The Urth list — 14 messages, 6 voices, 25 May 2011

<https://urth.darkrealm.vip/thread/urth/6025>

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

Andrew Mason — 25 May 2011, 21:19

James Wynn wrote:

Except that his name, "Spring Wind", makes no sense as a designation for Mars.

It makes perfect sense to me. 'March winds' is a well-established phrase, enshrined in a nursery rhyme.

And a garbled retelling the Romulus tale is kind of lame and

unimaginative. And, well, there's really nothing Wolfean about that reading. I contend, Wolfe just would not do what you are saying he did. Even a Freshman writer wouldn't do something as lame as that.

That depends what you think he's doing with it. I don't suppose he's just saying 'Here's a garbled retelling of the Romulus tale'. The myths which are incorporated into the story are there for a purpose. Dr Talos later says, in connection with Frankenstein, that events can have a backward influence, so that stories from the past reflect the future. I think the Romulus and Mowgli stories are to be seen as pointing to Severian. Not only was he brought up by 'wolves' and became a ruler, but his mother, it seems, was a virgin priestess, and he had a twin. Also as a baby he was carried in a basket. (It's not clear why that would be important, but Wolfe seems to think it is - he mentions baskets repeatedly.) On the face of it, he's a better fit for Frog than Ymar was. But of course the story isn't a record of his life; it's a myth that looks forward to him.

We know that Wonders of Urth and Sky incorporates material from our own time, and earlier; it contains direct quotations from Genesis and from Marlowe. Jonas recognises the Theseus story as a source, and is able to clarify a puzzling point in 'The Student and his Son' by reference to it. In the light of that it seems reasonable to try to interpret 'Frog' in the light of stories extant now; and in fact almost everything in it can be so explained. The bits that don't fit Romulus can be explained by reference to Mowgli, and the bits that don't fit Mowgli can be explained by reference to Romulus. If events closer to Severian's time have been incorporated into it, it's not clear what difference they can have made. Either Ymar's life recapitulated that of Romulus in amazing detail, with an interlude in which it was more like that of Mowgli, or the myths have actually corrupted the way the story is told, in which case we can't use it to find out the truth about Ymar. This is even more true of Spring Wind, whose life seems to follow that of Mars in every detail.

By the way, it occurs to me that there is a source for 'Fish', other than its being a neat counterpart to 'Frog'. It comes at the end, 'The Plowing of the Fish'. . The author has linked the burying of a victim under the foundations of a city with the ploughing of literal fish into the fields,. as the Pilgirm Father did on the advice of the historical Squanto.

Lee Berman — 25 May 2011, 23:35 · follows Andrew Mason

Andrew Mason: it seems reasonable to try to interpret 'Frog' in the light of stories extant now; and in fact almost everything in it can be so explained. The bits that don't fit Romulus can be explained by reference to Mowgli, and the bits that don't fit Mowgli can be explained by reference to Romulus.

I agree with this approach for many of Wolfe's mysteries. We have a story with many gaps left unexplained but we are provided with multiple source materials. Where one source does not explain, another can often be found which does. Where mythology fails, the Bible may step in, etc.

I think the Romulus and Mowgli stories are to be seen as pointing to Severian. Not only was he brought up by 'wolves' and became a ruler, but his mother, it seems, was a virgin priestess, and he had a twin. Also as a baby he was carried in a basket. (It's not clear why that would be important, but Wolfe seems to think it is - he mentions baskets repeatedly.) On the face of it, he's a better fit for Frog than Ymar was. But of course the story isn't a record of his life; it's a myth that looks forward to him.

Great insight, Andrew. Perhaps Severian should be considered the foremost subject of the myth. Still, especially with UotNS, there is much to suggest Ymar can be considered as a "little" or "first" version of Severian. And, as I noted in another post, the Tale of the Boy Called Frog is told to a character named Little Severian. The legends are said to reverberate both forward and backward in the corridors of time.

James Wynn — 26 May 2011, 02:21 · in reply to Lee Berman

I think the Romulus and Mowgli stories are to be seen as pointing to Severian. Not only was he brought up by 'wolves' and became a ruler, but his mother, it seems, was a virgin priestess, and he had a twin. Also as a baby he was carried in a basket. (It's not clear why that would be important, but Wolfe seems to think it is - he mentions baskets repeatedly.) On the face of it, he's a better fit for Frog than Ymar was. But of course the story isn't a record of his life; it's a myth that looks forward to him.

This was actually my first assumption. I was motivated to make it work. But we know more about Severian than anyone else in the book, yet beyond very broad outlines (in some cases), he doesn't seem to map or be mappable. The whole bit about the Butcher and the wolves...and just can't see how to force him into it. And there are elements that don't really seem to work at all. Even after Urth of the New Sun, the end-story doesn't look like Severian at all. That flood would be hard to miss.

J.

Andrew Mason — 26 May 2011, 20:06 · follows James Wynn

James Wynn wrote:

But we know more about Severian than anyone else in the book, yet beyond very broad outlines (in some cases), he doesn't seem to map or be mappable. The whole bit about the Butcher and the wolves...and just can't see how to force him into it. And there are elements that don't really seem to work at all. Even after Urth of the New Sun, the end-story doesn't look like Severian at all. That flood would be hard to miss.

But I don't think the myth has to be applicable in every detail. The myths which are applied to Jesus don't fit him in every detail;

Frankenstein doesn't fit Baldanders in every detail (though, come to think of it, his backward influence may explain why so many people confuse the creator with the monster). The story follows the myths so closely (counting _The Jungle Book_ as a myth, as it will be by then), that I don't think it can apply in detail to any future person, unless his life bore an incredibly close resemblance to the myths. So the connection must be looser. (That doesn't rule out there being some hidden connections as well as the obvious ones. I don't know what, though.)

James Wynn — 30 May 2011, 19:32 · in reply to Andrew Mason

Andrew Mason:

I'm not sure why June is OK for Juno, but March is not OK for Mars.

(We're asking what a redactor of the myth might think. What associations the name might have outside the story, what symbolic value Wolfe might give it, is another question.)

Because the "redactors" are not sloppy. That's the beauty of what Wolfe has done here. It is possible to imagine an intelligent scholar translating Juno as "Early Summer" and Rhea Silvia as "woodland bird" or Bird of the Woods. The name for the bird was chosen from the name of the goddess. "March Winds" is possibly a fine stand-in for Zephyr. But the word March is a direct translation of 'Mars'. Mars is not associated with the _winds_ that arise during that time period. The object is different for each one. Do you see that one of these things is not like the others?

Regarding the evidence of dates: every bit of it can be answered.

Severian may be wrong about the date of the Conciliator. Cyriaca may be wrong about the book - she's certainly wrong about some things. (I was wrong, in any case, to say she says the book was several chiliads old; she says no one has looked at it for a chiliad, though that implies it's considerably earlier than that.) A lot of early autarchs may have had short reigns, which allowed the mountains to be carved quickly. (It's the number of autarchs, rather than the time it takes to carve a mountain, which is the problem.)

Why should we assume that only autarchs carved their forms into mountains? I don't believe it is said so. Isn't that something any authority would do if he had the means?

Thus, Wolfe was able to

make Typhon just a chiliad earlier without direct contradiction - its not as if he had made Typhon say 'I was born five thousand eight hundred and forty-three years ago'. But a lot of people get the feel of a much earlier Typhon - all the bits of evidence seem naturally to point to it. and are confused when, in _Short Sun_, the gap seems to be much shorter.

At the time, I had the feeling that Ymar's history was quite distant as well. I found the date of 1000 years since Ymar to be quite jarring.

James Wynn:

But we know more about Severian than anyone else in the book, yet beyond very broad outlines (in some cases), he doesn't seem to map or be mappable. The whole bit about the Butcher and the wolves...and just can't see how to force him into it. And there are elements that don't really seem to work at all. Even after Urth of the New Sun, the end-story doesn't look like Severian at all. That flood would be hard to miss.

But I don't think the myth has to be applicable in every detail. The myths which are applied to Jesus don't fit him in every detail;

Frankenstein doesn't fit Baldanders in every detail (though, come to think of it, his backward influence may explain why so many people confuse the creator with the monster).

This not the same as either of those. Those are merely references (one of them uniquely declared as a reference). This is more -- or at least quite different. Wolfe didn't have anyone retell the story of Frankenstein badly. Because that would be stupid. By the same token, I just don't believe Wolfe would tell this story as you say he is. This is like Severian finding the Lunar Landing portrait with Rudisen. He doesn't recognize the character (at least not at the time), but _we_ are expected to divine *some* of its meaning from details in the story. This is a story told in intricate detail in the characters are merely thrice-removed in narration. The story must be able to fit in every detail or explain why it doesn't. For example, I recognize that Typhon's mother's name was not "June " or "Juno" or anything like it. The same is true for "Bird of the Woods". Those name were applied to those characters BECAUSE the compilers didn't have their actual names and believed, wrongly, that the story Romulus was an alternated telling of the same story--because the stories ARE so similar.

The story follows the myths so closely (counting _The Jungle Book_ as a myth, as it will be by then), that I don't think it can apply in detail to any future person, unless his life bore an incredibly close resemblance to the myths.

I keep using people who equate Jesus with Dionysus or Mithras. Additionally, the other dying gods who St. Justin argued against equating with Jesus in the 2nd century. Wolfe's opinion is not like Justin's. It's closer to CS Lewis'. Wolfe believes that the myths come to us from an eternal pattern and, presumably, he believes Jesus is the fulfillment of that pattern. That we are hard-wired to detect that eternal pattern because it is "real". Lee mentions Alexander. Alexander and King Arthur were real people whose deeds were seen as fitting that pattern as well, and therefore Alexander became a character of myth, and Arthur of legend.

By the same token, the high-points of the story birth of Frog was, based on evidence, close enough to the story of Romulus that an intellectually honest scholar could conclude they were the same. It's the same situation as the Frankenstein analogy (which might or might not be genuine; I mean, how much could Dr. Talos be expected to know about temporal ESP, after all).

Is that relevant, though? The gap the characters are trying to determine is between Rigoglio's departure (Typhon's time) and his return (Severian's time) - both on Urth. What the Rajan's home time is, on Blue, is another issue.

Is it necessary that the period at which Rigoglio dies be the same as the one where they meet Severian? Aren't those separate trips?

J.

Gerry Quinn — 30 May 2011, 20:12 · in reply to James Wynn

[I can't interleaf my response due to the formatting.]

I think you are over-interpreting here with regard to the name - or half the name - of Spring Wind.. Why do any scholars need to be involved at all? Somebody could have written down the story just as it had evolved to when he heard it. Bird of the Woods and Spring Wind might have got their names separately at any time during its evolution. Stories about talking wolves carrying knives do not have the air of a serious scholarly effort to uncover historical facts. Instead, I think, some scholar of a chiliad or two ago wrote it down along with all the other collected legends, just as it was told to him.

Mars might have become Spring Wind in various ways. The wind is actually mentioned in the story as having two interpretations. Perhaps Wolfe added that because the real reason he put it in was that he wanted a not-easily recognisable alternate name for Mars, but Spring was simply too short and obviously symbolic.

Bird of the Wood and Early Summer sound like real names, personalised and non-symbolic. Summer for a woman might not be too bad (perhaps because it is used in our culture today, though it is recent), but Spring for a man would instantly raise the question of what it means, and Wolfe wants that question to be secondary to the actual story of the people concerned. (As with everything else in his stories.)

On the separate matter of Rigoglio, I think you are right that there were separate visits, but surely there is every indication that the visits were to the same time period?

- Gerry Quinn

From: James Wynn

Andrew Mason:

I'm not sure why June is OK for Juno, but March is not OK for Mars. (We're asking what a redactor of the myth might think. What associations the name might have outside the story, what symbolic value Wolfe might give it, is another question.)

Because the "redactors" are not sloppy. That's the beauty of what Wolfe has done here. It is possible to imagine an intelligent scholar translating Juno as "Early Summer" and Rhea Silvia as "woodland bird" or Bird of the Woods. The name for the bird was chosen from the name of the goddess.

"March Winds" is possibly a fine stand-in for Zephyr. But the word March is a direct translation of 'Mars'. Mars is not associated with the _winds_ that arise during that time period. The object is different for each one. Do you see that one of these things is not like the others?

[--]Is that relevant, though? The gap the characters are trying to determine is between Rigoglio's departure (Typhon's time) and his return (Severian's time) - both on Urth. What the Rajan's home time is, on Blue, is another issue.

Is it necessary that the period at which Rigoglio dies be the same as the one where they meet Severian? Aren't those separate trips?

J.

James Wynn — 30 May 2011, 20:28 · in reply to Gerry Quinn

On 5/30/2011 3:12 PM, Gerry Quinn wrote:

[I can't interleaf my response due to the formatting.]

I think you are over-interpreting here with regard to the name - or half the name - of Spring Wind.. Why do any scholars need to be involved at all? Somebody could have written down the story just as it had evolved to when he heard it.

There aren't any scholars. There is author. A very good one. He's shown his skill with this sort of thing in the other two names. There's none of that skill on display in your interpretation of the name or story.

J

Gerry Quinn — 30 May 2011, 23:13 · in reply to James Wynn

From: James Wynn

On 5/30/2011 3:12 PM, Gerry Quinn wrote:

I think you are over-interpreting here with regard to the name - or half the name - of Spring Wind.. Why do any scholars need to be involved at all? Somebody could have written down the story just as it had evolved to when he heard it.

There aren't any scholars. There is author. A very good one. He's shown his skill with this sort of thing in the other two names. There's none of that skill on display in your interpretation of the name or story.

I don't understand how you draw that conclusion. Somebody collected a bunch of old legends a chiliad or three before Severian's time. From our vantage in prehistory, we can easily see the main sources of these tales (presumably neither ordinary people nor scholars of late Urth would have). The names may have been acquired at any time in the past, for any reason.

Rumpelstiltskin means something like 'poltergeist', which does not really fit the Grimm's story at all. Wikipedia doesn't tell me if the Grimms used the name because it sounded good, or because that name was traditional. Similar stories exist with different names. You can't place so great a stake on such a trivial thing, in my opinion.

And I don't see what's so especially masterful about the name Bird of the Wood. At some time 'Rhea' was grossly misinterpreted. Perhaps out of a half-understanding of Latin, perhaps for fun [in truth, it's a typically Wolfean joke, and that is its real origin, a joke directed to the reader of BotNS by the 'translator' rather than the apparent author], perhaps because it sounded good. It's possible that the name originated with the person who finally wrote down the story in Severian's book, but it is at least as likely that the substitution happened long long ago at the hands of some unknown Homer.

Your thesis that the writer mistook the story (whose roots we know) for a story about the deeds of Typhon does not ring true to me. It's just an ancient story, I believe. Spring Wind is Mars, maybe with some random accretions but nothing that obviously comes from Typhon. Somehow over chiliads of retelling, the story of Romulus and Remus became associated with the story of The Jungle Book. Some names got changed in various ways.

If another story conflates the Monitor and the Minotaur, can we really say that names mean anything?

I don't agree with you aesthetically about what you see as deficiencies in the name 'Spring Wind', and I also don't agree that Wolfe needed to embed any secret history of Urth in it. [I do see a possible secret history in the way the animals are seen as carrying hand weapons, just as the people in the antechamber imagined them. But I don't set too much store by this; Wolfe simply doesn't give us enough to go on to draw such conclusions.]

- Gerry Quinn

David Stockhoff — 31 May 2011, 11:48 · in reply to James Wynn

On 5/30/2011 3:32 PM, James Wynn wrote:

Wolfe believes that the myths come to us from an eternal pattern and, presumably, he believes Jesus is the fulfillment of that pattern. That we are hard-wired to detect that eternal pattern because it is "real". Lee mentions Alexander. Alexander and King Arthur were real people whose deeds were seen as fitting that pattern as well, and therefore Alexander became a character of myth, and Arthur of legend.

This is an excellent summary of Wolfe's attitude toward myth. Literally, to Wolfe, the story of Jesus/Christ is The Greatest Story Ever Told.

You mention green and blue and I'd be interested in your ideas there too. I just read mantis's great essay on why bears and wolves and cats keep appearing too, and maybe they are related. Although his ideas sometimes seem about to run off into areas that your theory above does not predict; that is, I think Wolfe is more purposeful than mantis suggests.

Lee Berman — 31 May 2011, 14:46 · follows David Stockhoff

James Wynn: Wolfe believes that the myths come to us from an eternal pattern and, presumably, he believes Jesus is the fulfillment of that pattern. That we are hard-wired to detect that eternal pattern because it is "real".

David Stockhoff: This is an excellent summary of Wolfe's attitude toward myth. Literally, to Wolfe, the story of Jesus/Christ is The Greatest Story Ever Told.

I agree. I think this is a great way to look at Wolfe's work. My own leaning is to attribute the Campbellian monomyth as a function of human psychology, culture and society. While clearly Wolfe recognizes that, as a religious man, he is also likely to see a higher, spiritual basis for the monomyth pattern that goes beyond humanity.

Stanislaus B. — 12 Jun 2011, 16:01 · in reply to Lee Berman

Campbell's Monomyth is a distorted version of the mythical world-view. He tries to reduce all myths to one myth - and this is his own invention.

The mythical worldview is that there is one superior world of gods - the True World, and the Secondary World in which we live. The true patterns from the True World are repeated many times in the Secondary World - but each time they are distorted by the matter and accidents, so the repetitions are never exact. For that reason Poetry is more true than History.

Aristotle, Poetics:

<http://classics.mit.edu/Aristotle/poetics.1.1.html>

"Part IX

It is, moreover, evident from what has been said, that it is not the function of the poet to relate what has happened, but what may happen- what is possible according to the law of probability or necessity. The poet and the historian differ not by writing in verse or in prose. The work of Herodotus might be put into verse, and it would still be a species of history, with meter no less than without it. The true difference is that one relates what has happened, the other what may happen. Poetry, therefore, is a more philosophical and a higher thing than history: for poetry tends to express the universal, history the particular. By the universal I mean how a person of a

certain type on occasion speak or act, according to the law of probability or necessity; and it is this universality at which poetry aims in the names she attaches to the personages. The particular is- for example- what Alcibiades did or suffered."

Or to quote the Fragment of Saga http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/S%C3%B6gubrot_af_Nokkrum <http://www.oe.eclipse.co.uk/nom/Fragment.htm> "It happened that one night, as the king was sleeping on the poop-deck of his ship, that he dreamt that a great dragon flew out of the sea, sparks from it soaring into the sky like sparks from a forge, lighting up all the lands around it. And after it flew all the birds he thought there were in the Northlands. Next he saw a great cloud come up from the north, and he sees that it brings with it such great rain and gales that he thought all woods and all land would be washed away in the water that rained down. There was thunder and lightning with it. And when that great dragon flew from the sea onto the land, there came at him the rain and the storm and such great darkness that in a moment he could see neither the dragon nor the birds, though he heard a great din of the thunder and the storm, and it all went south and west over the land, and engulfed the whole of his realm. And he thought he looked towards the ships then, and they were nothing but whales now, all of them, and they swim out to sea.

And then he awoke and called to him his foster father Hord and tells him his dream and asks him to interpret it. Hord declares himself too old to know how to understand dreams. He was stood on a rock under the head of the pier while the king lay on the poop-deck, lifting the edges of the tent, as they spoke.

The king was in a foul mood and said, "Come aboard, Hord, and interpret my dream."

Hord said he couldn't come aboard, "but your dream needs no interpreting. You can see for yourself what it means, and most likely it won't be long before there's a change of rulers in Sweden and Denmark. And now the greed of the grave is on you, the hunger that betokens a man's end, with this thought of yours to subjugate all the realms, but what you don't know is that the outcome will be your death, and your enemies will have your kingdom."

The king said, "Come here and speak your prophesies of doom!"

Hord said, "Here will I stand and from here speak them."

The king said, "Who was Halfdan the Brave among the Aesir?"

Hord replies, "He was Baldr among the Aesir, and all the gods wept, not like you."

"You speak well," said the king. "Come here and tell me your tidings."

Hord replies, "Here will I stand and from here tell them."

The king asks, "Who was Hroerek among the Aesir?"

Hord replies, "He was Hoenir who was the most scared of the Aesir, though he was bad to you."

"Who was Helgi the Bold among the Aesir," says he king.

Hord replies, "He was Hermod who had the best of courage, and no good to you."

The king asked, "Who was Gudrod among the Aesir?"

Hord replies, "He was Heimdall, who was the most foolish of the Aesir, though he was bad to you."

The king said, "Who am I among the Aesir?"

Hord replies, "You must be the serpent that's worst in the world, the one they call the Midgard Serpent."

The king answers, very angry, "If you pronounce my doom, then let me tell you you'll live no longer, for I know you where you stand, you big boggart. [1] So get you to the Midgard Serpent, and let's see which of us is best when push comes to shove."

Then the king sprang from the poop-deck, and he was so angry that he sprang out through the bottom edge of the tent. Hord dropped from the rock and plunged into the sea, and that was the last the watchmen aboard the king's ship saw of either of them."

2011-05-31 16:46, Lee Berman wrote:

James Wynn: Wolfe believes that the myths come to us from an eternal pattern and, presumably, he believes Jesus is the fulfillment of that pattern. That we are hard-wired to detect that eternal pattern because it is "real".

David Stockhoff: This is an excellent summary of Wolfe's attitude toward myth. Literally, to Wolfe, the story of Jesus/Christ is The Greatest Story Ever Told.

I agree. I think this is a great way to look at Wolfe's work. My own leaning is to attribute the Campbellian monomyth as a function of human psychology, culture and society. While clearly Wolfe recognizes that, as a religious man, he is also likely to see a higher, spiritual basis for the monomyth pattern that goes beyond humanity.

Lee Berman — 14 Jun 2011, 12:16 · follows Stanislaus B.

Stanislaus B: The mythical worldview is that there is one superior world of gods - the True World, and the Secondary World in which we live. The true patterns from the True World are repeated many times in the Secondary World - but each time they are distorted by the matter and accidents, so the repetitions are never exact. For that reason Poetry is more true than History.

This sentiment claws to the heart of the Sun Series for me, especially BotNS.

It may be that Wolfe considers the problem of which world to consider "superior" and "True" to be relativistic. That is, from a religious/mythological perspective, the world of God(s) is the true one and our human world is a shadowy created reflection of that true world. While from a humanistic/scientific view, our world is the real one and the stories of God and gods is a shadowy reflection of our reality.

The circularity Wolfe gives humans and Hierogrammates in BotNS suggests to me he considers both perspectives to have equal footing and validity.

David Stockhoff — 14 Jun 2011, 12:26 · in reply to Lee Berman

Yes. Wolfe would be a pretty bad engineer if he believed our physical laws to be mere shadows of the True Laws that rule a higher existence. (Consider how you would feel if your doctor told you that.) Or so I would think.

In fact, one might argue that to even attempt to "realistically" depict a "higher" universe is to bring it down to our level to begin with, putting them on a par with one another. The Celtic/pagan otherworld is a far more useful fictional mode than the Christian, however much they have in common. So this "equal validity" is crucial to Wolfe's fiction in more than one way.

On 6/14/2011 8:16 AM, Lee Berman wrote:

Stanislaus B: The mythical worldview is that there is one superior world of gods - the True World, and the Secondary World in which we live. The true patterns from the True World are repeated many times in the Secondary World - but each time they are distorted by the matter and accidents, so the repetitions are never exact. For that reason Poetry is more true than History.

This sentiment claws to the heart of the Sun Series for me, especially BotNS.

It may be that Wolfe considers the problem of which world to consider "superior" and "True" to be relativistic. That is, from a religious/mythological perspective, the world of God(s) is the true one and our human world is a shadowy created reflection of that true world. While from a humanistic/scientific view, our world is the real one and the stories of God and gods is a shadowy reflection of our reality.

The circularity Wolfe gives humans and Hierogrammates in BotNS suggests to me he considers both perspectives to have equal footing and validity.

Stanislaus B. — 14 Jun 2011, 17:36 · in reply to David Stockhoff

Engineering is a rather interesting discipline. It must take into account both perspectives:

- it absolutely depends on the Platonic world of mathematical formulas, which order the behaviour of the matter,
- but it also must take into account that matter doesn't follow perfectly the patterns. Parts are designed with tolerances - how far can they diverge from standard; machines wear out in predictable and unpredictable ways. Chaotic matter disturbs the perfect mechanism of celestial wheels

But it is true that the default Western worldview puts much more trust into the superior patterns than did Greeks and Romans. For them, the material world was irreparably corrupt; the reflections of the perfect heavenly system were rare, and were more often than not stifled by random chaos of matter. For us, everything goes according to mathematical patterns, and even random and chaotic events are ruled by the rules of probability, quantum waves etc.

But there is also a third worldview - also perfectly known to Wolfe, who indeed explained it best. It is the eastern worldview, according to which reality is not an imperfect reflection of the perfect original - but one which resembles it in large extent, but a random concatenation of unconnected factors, mostly having to do with emotions, which hides the true reality. It is the worldview of Buddhism, and also of the most part of the modern philosophy. In it, the true reality is unknowable (transcendental, to Kant), and the scientific rules of the universe which we can learn are only artefact of our own mind - and have nothing to do with things in themselves.

This worldview, as I said, is popular in modern philosophy, for various reasons - it is both absolutely sceptic, because it holds that true reality is absolutely unknowable, and it also in effect identifies humanity - represented by philosophers - with God. Since everything we can know and experience are creations of our own mind, our mind creates everything which matters. We (or rather, I - because in reality every man is the same) are the creators of the

universe. And we do not need to learn - since our mind creates the world, we can deduct it from the first principles, or assume it to agree with our wishes.

For obvious reasons, this way of thinking is not very consistent with engineering. Engineers certainly can learn true laws of physics - this is how they make bridges which do not fall down. And they must confirm those laws by experiment - Kantian assumptions won't keep the ship afloat. "The comets do not follow my theories? So much the worse for comets!", or "Give me matter, and I will construct a world out of it!" - those are not principles of a successful engineer.

And, returning to the Neoplatonic worldview, with perfect originals and imperfect copies, there is an interesting variant of it. Generally, originals are held to be earlier than copies. Originals are arches, principles, or, as it is called now, archetypes. But in Bible, the final, perfect originals will come at the end of the world. Until then, we have to do with a series of types, imperfect shadows thrown before the great events.

<http://www.bible-researcher.com/type.html>

The following article on the typology of Scripture by William G. Moorehead is reproduced from /The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia/, ed. James Orr (Chicago: Howard-Severance Co., 1930), vol. 5, pp. 3029-3030.

TYPE

The Bible furnishes abundant evidence of the presence of types and of typical instruction in the Sacred Word. The New Testament attests this fact. It takes up a large number of persons and things and events of former dispensations, and it treats them as adumbrations and prophecies of the future. A generation ago a widespread interest in the study of typology prevailed; latterly the interest has largely subsided, chiefly because of the vagaries and extravagances which attended its treatment on the part of not a few writers. Pressing the typical teaching of Scripture so far as to imperil the historical validity of God's word is both dangerous and certain to be followed by reaction and neglect of the subject.

1. Definition of Type

The word "type" is derived from a Greek term *τύπος* (/tupos/), which occurs 16 times in the New Testament. It is variously translated in the King James Version, e.g. twice "print" (John 20:25 <<http://www.biblegateway.com/bible?language=english&version=KJV&passage=John+20:25>>); twice "figure" (Acts 7:43 <<http://www.biblegateway.com/bible?language=english&version=KJV&passage=Acts+7:43>>; Romans 5:14 <<http://www.biblegateway.com/bible?language=english&version=KJV&passage=Romans+5:14>>); twice "pattern" (Titus 2:7 <<http://www.biblegateway.com/bible?language=english&version=KJV&passage=Titus+2:7>>; Hebrews 8:5 <<http://www.biblegateway.com/bible?language=english&version=KJV&passage=Hebrews+8:5>>); once "fashion" (Acts 7:44 <<http://www.biblegateway.com/bible?language=english&version=KJV&passage=Acts+7:44>>); once "manner" (Acts 23:25 <<http://www.biblegateway.com/bible?language=english&version=KJV&passage=Acts+23:25>>); once "form" (Romans 6:17 <<http://www.biblegateway.com/bible?language=english&version=KJV&passage=Romans+6:17>>); and seven times "example" (1 Corinthians 10:6,11 <<http://www.biblegateway.com/bible?language=english&version=KJV&passage=1Corinthians+10:6-11>>; Philippians 3:17 <<http://www.biblegateway.com/bible?language=english&version=KJV&passage=Philippians+3:17>>; 1 Thessalonians 1:7 <<http://www.biblegat>

eway.com/bible?language=english&version=KJV&passage=1Thessalonians+1:7>; 2 Thessalonians 3:9 <<http://www.biblegateway.com/bible?language=english&version=KJV&passage=2Thessalonians+3:9>>; 1 Timothy 4:12 <<http://www.biblegateway.com/bible?language=english&version=KJV&passage=1Timothy+4:12>>; 1 Peter 5:3 <<http://www.biblegateway.com/bible?language=english&version=KJV&passage=1Peter+5:3>>). It is clear from these texts that the New Testament writers use the word "type" with some degree of latitude; yet one general idea is common to all, namely, "likeness." A person, event or thing is so fashioned or appointed as to resemble another; the one is made to answer to the other in some essential feature; in some particulars the one matches the other. The two are called type and antitype; and the link which binds them together is the correspondence, the similarity, of the one with the other.

Three other words in the New Testament express the same general idea. One is "shadow" (skia, /skia/, Hebrews 10:1 <<http://www.biblegateway.com/bible?language=english&version=KJV&passage=Hebrews+10:1>>), "For the law having a shadow of the good things to come"--as if the substance or reality that was still future cast its shadow backward into the old economy. "Shadow" implies dimness and transitoriness; but it also implies a measure of resemblance between the one and the other.

The second term is "parable" (parabolh, /parabole/, Hebrews 9:9 <<http://www.biblegateway.com/bible?language=english&version=KJV&passage=Hebrews+9:9>>); the tabernacle with its services was an acted parable for the time then present, adumbrating thus the blessed reality which was to come.

The third term is "copy" or "pattern" (upodeigma, /hupodeigma/), a word that denotes a sketch or draft of something future, invisible (Hebrews 9:23 <<http://www.biblegateway.com/bible?language=english&version=KJV&passage=Hebrews+9:23>>); the tabernacle and its furniture and services were copies, outlines of heavenly things.

Types are pictures, object-lessons, by which God taught His people concerning His grace and saving power. The Mosaic system was a sort of kindergarten in which God's people were trained in divine things, by which also they were led to look for better things to come. An old writer thus expresses it: "God in the types of the last dispensation was teaching His children their letters. In this dispensation He is teaching them to put the letters together, and they find that the letters, arrange them as they will, spell Christ, and nothing but Christ."

In creation the Lord uses one thing for many purposes. One simple instrument meets many ends. For how many ends does water serve! And the atmosphere: it supplies the lungs, conveys sound, diffuses odors, drives ships, supports fire, gives rain, fulfills besides one knows not how many other purposes. And God's Word is like His work, is His work, and, like creation, is inexhaustible. Whatever God touches, be it a mighty sun or an insect's wing, a vast prophecy or a little type, He perfects for the place and the purpose He has in mind.

2. Distinctive Features

What are the distinctive features of a type? A type, to be such in reality, must possess three well-defined qualities. (1) It must be a true picture of the person or the thing it represents or prefigures. A type is a draft or sketch of some well-defined feature of redemption, and therefore it must in some distinct way resemble its antitype, e.g. Aaron as high priest is a rough figure of Christ the Great High Priest, and the Day of Atonement in Israel (Leviticus 16) must be a true picture of the atoning work of Christ. (2) The type must be of divine appointment. In its institution it is designed to bear a likeness to the antitype. Both type and antitype are preordained as constituent parts of the scheme of redemption. As centuries sometimes lie

between the type and its accomplishment in the antitype, of course infinite wisdom alone can ordain the one to be the picture of the other. Only God can make types. (3) A type always prefigures something future. A Scriptural type and predictive prophecy are in substance the same, differing only in form. This fact distinguishes between a symbol and a type. A symbol may represent a thing of the present or of the past as well as of the future, e.g. the symbols in the Lord's Supper. A type always looks to the future; an element of prediction must necessarily be in it.

3. Classification of Types

Another thing in the study of types should be borne in mind, namely, that a thing in itself evil cannot be the type of what is good and pure. It is somewhat difficult to give a satisfactory classification of Biblical types, but broadly they may be distributed under three heads: (1) Personal types, by which are meant those personages of Scripture whose lives and experiences illustrate some principle or truth of redemption. Such are Adam, who is expressly described as the "figure of him that was to come" (Romans 5:14), Melchizedek, Abraham, Aaron, Joseph, Jonah, etc. (2) Historical types, in which are included the great historical events that under Providence became striking foreshadowings of good things to come, e.g. the Deliverance from the Bondage of Egypt; the Wilderness Journey; the Conquest of Canaan; the Call of Abraham; Deliverances by the Judges, etc. (3) Ritual types, such as the Altar, the Offerings, the Priesthood, the Tabernacle and its furniture. There are typical persons, places, times, things, actions, in the Old Testament, and a reverent study of them leads into a thorough acquaintance with the fullness and the blessedness of the word of God.

2011-06-14 14:26, David Stockhoff wrote:

Yes. Wolfe would be a pretty bad engineer if he believed our physical laws to be mere shadows of the True Laws that rule a higher existence. (Consider how you would feel if your doctor told you that.) Or so I would think.

In fact, one might argue that to even attempt to "realistically" depict a "higher" universe is to bring it down to our level to begin with, putting them on a par with one another. The Celtic/pagan otherworld is a far more useful fictional mode than the Christian, however much they have in common. So this "equal validity" is crucial to Wolfe's fiction in more than one way.

On 6/14/2011 8:16 AM, Lee Berman wrote:

Stanislaus B: The mythical worldview is that there is one superior world of gods
- the True World, and the Secondary World in which we live. The true patterns
from the True World are repeated many times in the Secondary World -
but
each time they are distorted by the matter and accidents, so the repetitions are never exact. For that reason Poetry is more true than History.

This sentiment claws to the heart of the Sun Series for me, especially BotNS.

It may be that Wolfe considers the problem of which world to consider "superior" and "True" to be relativistic. That is, from a religious/mythological perspective, the world of God(s) is the true one and our human world is a shadowy created

reflection of that true world. While from a humanistic/scientific view, our world is the real one and the stories of God and gods is a shadowy reflection of our reality.

The circularity Wolfe gives humans and Hierogrammates in BotNS suggests to me he considers both perspectives to have equal footing and validity.
