

NPR taking suggestions for The Best Science Fiction and

The Urth list — 22 messages, 11 voices, 23 Jun 2011

<https://urth.darkrealm.vip/thread/urth/6039>

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 — 23 Jun 2011, 14:55

Greg Bates wrote:

That was incredibly difficult. I wish it was five fantasy and five sci fi.

Of course, that would cause demarcation problems in some cases - and in no case more than with Wolfe. I think the _Sun_ cycle, taken as a whole, has to be read as both SF and fantasy - it has some distinctive features which are scientific or technological, and others which are magical or supernatural.

Greg Bates — 23 Jun 2011, 14:58 · in reply to Andrew Mason

Obviously the answer is to put it on both :D

On Thu, Jun 23, 2011 at 10:55 AM, Andrew Mason <[andrew.mason53 at gmail.com](mailto:andrew.mason53@gmail.com)> wrote:

Greg Bates wrote:

That was incredibly difficult. I wish it was five fantasy and five sci fi.

Of course, that would cause demarcation problems in some cases - and in no case more than with Wolfe. I think the _Sun_ cycle, taken as a whole, has to be read as both SF and fantasy - it has some distinctive features which are scientific or technological, and others which are magical or supernatural.

Andrew Mason — 23 Jun 2011, 14:58 · follows Greg Bates

Dan'l Danehy-Oakes wrote:

On Wed, Jun 22, 2011 at 1:09 PM, <[antonio at gmail.com](mailto:antonio@gmail.com)> wrote:

Ha. The Book of the Long Sun is so much better!

I agree. But is it better if you haven't read "Short Sun?" (I *think* it is anyway, but I haven't experienced it in that order.)

You read _Short Sun_ first? Was that not a rather puzzling experience?

Dan'l Danehy-Oakes — 23 Jun 2011, 15:46 · in reply to Andrew Mason

Oops, brain fart. I meant ... "if you haven't read New Sun."

On Thu, Jun 23, 2011 at 7:58 AM, Andrew Mason

<[andrew.mason53 at gmail.com](mailto:andrew.mason53@gmail.com)> wrote:

Dan'l Danehy-Oakes wrote:

On Wed, Jun 22, 2011 at 1:09 PM, ?<[antonio at gmail.com](mailto:antonio@gmail.com)> wrote:

Ha. The Book of the Long Sun is so much better!

I agree. But is it better if you haven't read "Short Sun?" (I *think* it is anyway, but I haven't experienced it in that order.)

You read _Short Sun_ first? Was that not a rather puzzling experience?

Daniel Petersen — 23 Jun 2011, 16:31 · in reply to Andrew Mason

You know, I actually did read On Blue's Waters, then stopped and went back and read Long Sun before then re-reading Blue and the rest of Short Sun. It was indeed a very, very strange experience - but hugely enticing.

Unfortunately it took away some of the mystery I think I would have encountered in reading Long Sun if I had had no or little clue what was coming.

I think John Clute wondered in a review whether jumping right into Wolfe at Blue might be the best way. I've always wondered the same.

DOJP

On Thu, Jun 23, 2011 at 3:58 PM, Andrew Mason <andrew.mason53 at gmail.com>

wrote:

Dan'l Danehy-Oakes wrote:

On Wed, Jun 22, 2011 at 1:09 PM, <antonio at gmail.com> wrote:

Ha. The Book of the Long Sun is so much better!

I agree. But is it better if you haven't read "Short Sun?" (I *think* it is anyway, but I haven't experienced it in that order.)

You read _Short Sun_ first? Was that not a rather puzzling experience?

Mo Holkar — 23 Jun 2011, 16:50 · in reply to Daniel Petersen

At 17:31 23/06/2011, you wrote:

You know, I actually did read On Blue's Waters, then stopped and went back and read Long Sun before then re-reading Blue and the rest of Short Sun. It was indeed a very, very strange experience - but hugely enticing. Unfortunately it took away some of the mystery I think I would have encountered in reading Long Sun if I had had no or little clue what was coming.

I think John Clute wondered in a review whether jumping right into Wolfe at Blue might be the best way. I've always wondered the same.

DOJP

I first read the four books of BotNS in the wrong order, as they became available in our local library (I was about 14-15 at the time). The later books are so packed with back-references to prior events, that I thought by the time I got to SotT there would be little to surprise me... how wrong I was!

Mo

~ # ~

WolfeWiki -- a wiki about Gene Wolfe

<http://www.wolfewiki.com/pmwiki/>

Marc Aramini — 24 Jun 2011, 22:02 · in reply to Daniel Petersen

You could read Long Sun before New or Short Sun, but starting at Short Sun just ruins so many little cool things, like the whole "I caught the ball, I won the game" thing at the end of On Blue's Water, Horn talking about "his" dancing toy, things that undeniably let you know there is something of Silk running around in that narrator.

I like the published order, but Long and New should both be read before Short. If you don't have a thorough understanding of the positive outlook of Silk and his "out of character" suicidal impulse Short Sun could never make full sense.

--- On Thu, 6/23/11, Daniel Petersen <danielottojackpetersen at gmail.com> wrote:

From: Daniel Petersen <danielottojackpetersen at gmail.com>

Subject: Re: (urth) NPR taking suggestions for The Best Science Fiction and To: "The Urth Mailing List" <urth at lists.urth.net> Date: Thursday, June 23, 2011, 9:31 AM

You know, I actually did read On Blue's Waters, then stopped and went back and read Long Sun before then re-reading Blue and the rest of Short Sun. ?It was indeed a very, very strange experience - but hugely enticing. ?Unfortunately it took away some of the mystery I think I would have encountered in reading Long Sun if I had had no or little clue what was coming. ?

I think John Clute wondered in a review whether jumping right into Wolfe at Blue might be the best way. ?I've always wondered the same.

DOJP

On Thu, Jun 23, 2011 at 3:58 PM, Andrew Mason <andrew.mason53 at gmail.com> wrote:

Dan'l Danehy-Oakes wrote:

On Wed, Jun 22, 2011 at 1:09 PM, ?<antonio at gmail.com> wrote:

Ha. The Book of the Long Sun is so much better!

I agree. But is it better if you haven't read "Short Sun?" (I *think* it is anyway, but I haven't experienced it in that order.)

You read _Short Sun_ first? Was that not a rather puzzling experience?

-----Inline Attachment Follows-----

Stuart Hamm — 24 Jun 2011, 23:31 · in reply to Marc Aramini

Interesting...

I think the Short Sun series might be the most entertaining of the 3 series as a stand alone trilogy and could be an enjoyable read to the un-initiated..BUT if you have read the previous 2 series there so many more GW layers to open and try to unravel,,,brilliant..never thought of it that way before

STUHAMM.COM

FACEBOOK/STUART.HAMM

? ??

--- On Fri, 6/24/11, Marc Aramini <marcaramini at yahoo.com> wrote:

From: Marc Aramini <marcaramini at yahoo.com>

Subject: Re: (urth) NPR taking suggestions for The Best Science Fiction and To: "The Urth Mailing List" <urth at lists.urth.net> Date: Friday, June 24, 2011, 3:02 PM

You could read Long Sun before New or Short Sun, but starting at Short Sun just ruins so many little cool things, like the whole "I caught the ball, I won the game" thing at the end of On Blue's Water, Horn talking about "his" dancing toy, things that undeniably let you know there is something of Silk running around in that narrator.

I like the published order, but Long and New should both be read before Short. If you don't have a thorough understanding of the positive outlook of Silk and his "out of character" suicidal impulse Short Sun could never make full sense.

--- On Thu, 6/23/11, Daniel Petersen <danielottojackpetersen at gmail.com> wrote:

From: Daniel Petersen <danielottojackpetersen at gmail.com>

Subject: Re: (urth) NPR taking suggestions for The Best Science Fiction and To: "The Urth Mailing List" <urth at lists.urth.net> Date: Thursday, June 23, 2011, 9:31 AM

You know, I actually did read On Blue's Waters, then stopped and went back and read Long Sun before then re-reading Blue and the rest of Short Sun. ?It was indeed a very, very strange experience - but hugely enticing. ?Unfortunately it took away some of the mystery I think I would have encountered in reading Long Sun if I had had no or little clue what was coming. ?

I think John Clute wondered in a review whether jumping right into Wolfe at Blue might be the best way. ?I've always wondered the same.

DOJP

On Thu, Jun 23, 2011 at 3:58 PM, Andrew Mason <andrew.mason53 at gmail.com> wrote:

Dan'I Danehy-Oakes wrote:

On Wed, Jun 22, 2011 at 1:09 PM, ?<antonio at gmail.com> wrote:

Ha. The Book of the Long Sun is so much better!

I agree. But is it better if you haven't read "Short Sun?" (I *think* it is anyway, but I haven't experienced it in that order.)

You read _Short Sun_ first? Was that not a rather puzzling experience?

-----Inline Attachment Follows-----

Daniel Petersen — 26 Jun 2011, 13:42 · in reply to Marc Aramini

You're probably right, Marc. But being plunged into all that mystery through the wonders of Short Sun is still quite exciting and inviting. I sometimes feel people on this board are far more into solving little (and huge) puzzles than they are into a sense of wonder, awe, magic, thrill, humanity, divinity, great writing, and so on in Gene Wolfe. I know the puzzles are integral to his art - but I just don't feel like the other aspects get much air time.

DOJP

On Fri, Jun 24, 2011 at 11:02 PM, Marc Aramini <marcaramini at yahoo.com>wrote:
You could read Long Sun before New or Short Sun, but starting at Short Sun just ruins so many little cool things, like the whole "I caught the ball, I won the game" thing at the end of On Blue's Water, Horn talking about "his" dancing toy, things that undeniably let you know there is something of Silk running around in that narrator.
I like the published order, but Long and New should both be read before Short. If you don't have a thorough understanding of the positive outlook of Silk and his "out of character" suicidal impulse Short Sun could never make full sense.

--- On *Thu, 6/23/11, Daniel Petersen <danielottojackpetersen at gmail.com>*wrote:

From: Daniel Petersen <danielottojackpetersen at gmail.com>
Subject: Re: (urth) NPR taking suggestions for The Best Science Fiction and
To: "The Urth Mailing List" <urth at lists.urth.net>
Date: Thursday, June 23, 2011, 9:31 AM

You know, I actually did read On Blue's Waters, then stopped and went back and read Long Sun before then re-reading Blue and the rest of Short Sun. It was indeed a very, very strange experience - but hugely enticing. Unfortunately it took away some of the mystery I think I would have encountered in reading Long Sun if I had had no or little clue what was coming.

I think John Clute wondered in a review whether jumping right into Wolfe at Blue might be the best way. I've always wondered the same.

DOJP

On Thu, Jun 23, 2011 at 3:58 PM, Andrew Mason <andrew.mason53 at googlemail.com<<http://us.mc1618.mail.yahoo.com/mc/compose?to=andrew.mason53 at googlemail.com>>
wrote:

Dan'I Danehy-Oakes wrote:

On Wed, Jun 22, 2011 at 1:09 PM, <antonio at gmail.com<<http://us.mc1618.mail.yahoo.com/mc/compose?to=antonio at gmail.com>>>
wrote:

Ha. The Book of the Long Sun is so much better!

I agree. But is it better if you haven't read "Short Sun?" (I *think* it is anyway, but I haven't experienced it in that order.)

You read _Short Sun_ first? Was that not a rather puzzling experience?

Jordon Flato — 05 Jul 2011, 22:31 · in reply to Daniel Petersen

Well, they picked their list. Not having read many of them, I can't comment, but of course I think it's ridiculous to not include New Sun.

<http://www.npr.org/2011/06/30/137003853/mind-bending-sci-fi-books-for-a-fantastical-summer>

On Sun, Jun 26, 2011 at 6:42 AM, Daniel Petersen <danielottojackpetersen at gmail.com> wrote:

You're probably right, Marc. But being plunged into all that mystery through the wonders of Short Sun is still quite exciting and inviting. I sometimes feel people on this board are far more into solving little (and huge) puzzles than they are into a sense of wonder, awe, magic, thrill, humanity, divinity, great writing, and so on in Gene Wolfe. I know the puzzles are integral to his art - but I just don't feel like the other aspects get much air time.

DOJP

On Fri, Jun 24, 2011 at 11:02 PM, Marc Aramini <marcaramini at yahoo.com>wrote:

You could read Long Sun before New or Short Sun, but starting at Short Sun just ruins so many little cool things, like the whole "I caught the ball, I won the game" thing at the end of On Blue's Water, Horn talking about "his" dancing toy, things that undeniably let you know there is something of Silk running around in that narrator.

I like the published order, but Long and New should both be read before Short. If you don't have a thorough understanding of the positive outlook of Silk and his "out of character" suicidal impulse Short Sun could never make full sense.

--- On *Thu, 6/23/11, Daniel Petersen <danielottojackpetersen at gmail.com>*wrote:

From: Daniel Petersen <danielottojackpetersen at gmail.com>
Subject: Re: (urth) NPR taking suggestions for The Best Science Fiction and
To: "The Urth Mailing List" <urth at lists.urth.net>
Date: Thursday, June 23, 2011, 9:31 AM

You know, I actually did read On Blue's Waters, then stopped and went back and read Long Sun before then re-reading Blue and the rest of Short Sun. It was indeed a very, very strange experience - but hugely enticing. Unfortunately it took away some of the mystery I think I would have encountered in reading Long Sun if I had had no or little clue what was coming.

I think John Clute wondered in a review whether jumping right into Wolfe at Blue might be the best way. I've always wondered the same.

DOJP

On Thu, Jun 23, 2011 at 3:58 PM, Andrew Mason <andrew.mason53 at googlemail.com<<http://us.mc1618.mail.yahoo.com/mc/compose?to=andrew.mason53 at googlemail.com>>
wrote:

Dan'I Danehy-Oakes wrote:

On Wed, Jun 22, 2011 at 1:09 PM, <antonio at gmail.com<<http://us.mc1618.mail.yahoo.com/mc/compose?to=antonio at gmail.com>>>

wrote:

Ha. The Book of the Long Sun is so much better!

I agree. But is it better if you haven't read "Short Sun?" (I *think* it is anyway, but I haven't experienced it in that order.)

You read _Short Sun_ first? Was that not a rather puzzling experience?

Jordon Flato — 05 Jul 2011, 22:31 · in reply to Jordon Flato

Let me rephrase that 'many' to 'any'.

On Tue, Jul 5, 2011 at 3:31 PM, Jordon Flato <jordonflatourth at gmail.com> wrote:
Well, they picked their list. Not having read many of them, I can't comment, but of course I think it's ridiculous to not include New Sun.

<http://www.npr.org/2011/06/30/137003853/mind-bending-sci-fi-books-for-a-fantastical-summer>

On Sun, Jun 26, 2011 at 6:42 AM, Daniel Petersen <danielottojackpetersen at gmail.com> wrote:

You're probably right, Marc. But being plunged into all that mystery through the wonders of Short Sun is still quite exciting and inviting. I sometimes feel people on this board are far more into solving little (and huge) puzzles than they are into a sense of wonder, awe, magic, thrill, humanity, divinity, great writing, and so on in Gene Wolfe. I know the puzzles are integral to his art - but I just don't feel like the other aspects get much air time.

DOJP

On Fri, Jun 24, 2011 at 11:02 PM, Marc Aramini <marcaramini at yahoo.com> wrote:

You could read Long Sun before New or Short Sun, but starting at Short Sun just ruins so many little cool things, like the whole "I caught the ball, I won the game" thing at the end of On Blue's Water, Horn talking about "his" dancing toy, things that undeniably let you know there is something of Silk running around in that narrator.

I like the published order, but Long and New should both be read before Short. If you don't have a thorough understanding of the positive outlook of Silk and his "out of character" suicidal impulse Short Sun could never make full sense.

--- On *Thu, 6/23/11, Daniel Petersen <danielottojackpetersen at gmail.com>
* wrote:

From: Daniel Petersen <danielottojackpetersen at gmail.com>
Subject: Re: (urth) NPR taking suggestions for The Best Science Fiction and
To: "The Urth Mailing List" <urth at lists.urth.net>
Date: Thursday, June 23, 2011, 9:31 AM

You know, I actually did read On Blue's Waters, then stopped and went

back and read Long Sun before then re-reading Blue and the rest of Short Sun. It was indeed a very, very strange experience - but hugely enticing. Unfortunately it took away some of the mystery I think I would have encountered in reading Long Sun if I had had no or little clue what was coming.

I think John Clute wondered in a review whether jumping right into Wolfe at Blue might be the best way. I've always wondered the same.

DOJP

On Thu, Jun 23, 2011 at 3:58 PM, Andrew Mason <andrew.mason53 at googlemail.com<<http://us.mc1618.mail.yahoo.com/mc/compose?to=andrew.mason53 at googlemail.com>>> wrote:

Dan'I Danehy-Oakes wrote:

On Wed, Jun 22, 2011 at 1:09 PM, <antonio at gmail.com<<http://us.mc1618.mail.yahoo.com/mc/compose?to=antonio at gmail.com>>> wrote:

Ha. The Book of the Long Sun is so much better!

I agree. But is it better if you haven't read "Short Sun?" (I **think** it is anyway, but I haven't experienced it in that order.)

You read _Short Sun_ first? Was that not a rather puzzling experience?

Dan'I Danehy-Oakes — 05 Jul 2011, 22:42 · in reply to Jordon Flato

It's clearly a list based on what's currently new on the stands. Given that, it isn't a bad list.

On Tue, Jul 5, 2011 at 3:31 PM, Jordon Flato <jordonflatourth at gmail.com> wrote:
Let me rephrase that 'many' to 'any'.

On Tue, Jul 5, 2011 at 3:31 PM, Jordon Flato <jordonflatourth at gmail.com> wrote:

Well, they picked their list. Not having read many of them, I can't comment, but of course I think it's ridiculous to not include New Sun.

<http://www.npr.org/2011/06/30/137003853/mind-bending-sci-fi-books-for-a-fantastical-summer>

On Sun, Jun 26, 2011 at 6:42 AM, Daniel Petersen <danielottojackpetersen at gmail.com> wrote:

You're probably right, Marc. But being plunged into all that mystery through the wonders of Short Sun is still quite exciting and inviting. I sometimes feel people on this board are far more into solving little (and huge) puzzles than they are into a sense of wonder, awe, magic, thrill, humanity, divinity, great writing, and so on in Gene Wolfe. I know the puzzles are integral to his art - but I just don't feel like the other aspects get much air time.

DOJP

On Fri, Jun 24, 2011 at 11:02 PM, Marc Aramini <marcaramini at yahoo.com>wrote:

You could read Long Sun before New or Short Sun, but starting at Short Sun just ruins so many little cool things, like the whole "I caught the ball, I won the game" thing at the end of On Blue's Water, Horn talking about "his" dancing toy, things that undeniably let you know there is something of Silk running around in that narrator.

I like the published order, but Long and New should both be read before Short. If you don't have a thorough understanding of the positive outlook of Silk and his "out of character" suicidal impulse Short Sun could never make full sense.

--- On *Thu, 6/23/11, Daniel Petersen <danielottojackpetersen at gmail.com>
* wrote:

From: Daniel Petersen <danielottojackpetersen at gmail.com>
Subject: Re: (urth) NPR taking suggestions for The Best Science Fiction and
To: "The Urth Mailing List" <urth at lists.urth.net>
Date: Thursday, June 23, 2011, 9:31 AM

You know, I actually did read On Blue's Waters, then stopped and went back and read Long Sun before then re-reading Blue and the rest of Short Sun. It was indeed a very, very strange experience - but hugely enticing. Unfortunately it took away some of the mystery I think I would have encountered in reading Long Sun if I had had no or little clue what was coming.

I think John Clute wondered in a review whether jumping right into Wolfe at Blue might be the best way. I've always wondered the same.

DOJP

On Thu, Jun 23, 2011 at 3:58 PM, Andrew Mason <andrew.mason53 at googlemail.com><<http://us.mc1618.mail.yahoo.com/mc/compose?to=andrew.mason53 at googlemail.com>>
wrote:

Dan'l Danehy-Oakes wrote:

On Wed, Jun 22, 2011 at 1:09 PM, <antonio at gmail.com><<http://us.mc1618.mail.yahoo.com/mc/compose?to=antonio at gmail.com>>>
wrote:

Ha. The Book of the Long Sun is so much better!

I agree. But is it better if you haven't read "Short Sun?" (I *think* it is anyway, but I haven't experienced it in that order.)

You read _Short Sun_ first? Was that not a rather puzzling experience?

Jordon Flato — 05 Jul 2011, 22:43 · in reply to Dan'l Danehy-Oakes

Having billed it as a 'best of all time' list, I'd say it's pretty lame. It is highly likely that this is a related but separate list. I'm hoping so.

On Tue, Jul 5, 2011 at 3:42 PM, Dan'l Danehy-Oakes <danldo at gmail.com> wrote:
It's clearly a list based on what's currently new on the stands. Given that, it isn't a bad list.

On Tue, Jul 5, 2011 at 3:31 PM, Jordon Flato <jordonflatourth at gmail.com> wrote:
Let me rephrase that 'many' to 'any'.

On Tue, Jul 5, 2011 at 3:31 PM, Jordon Flato <jordonflatourth at gmail.com> wrote:
Well, they picked their list. Not having read many of them, I can't comment, but of course I think it's ridiculous to not include New Sun.

<http://www.npr.org/2011/06/30/137003853/mind-bending-sci-fi-books-for-a-fantastical-summer>

On Sun, Jun 26, 2011 at 6:42 AM, Daniel Petersen <danielottojackpetersen at gmail.com> wrote:

You're probably right, Marc. But being plunged into all that mystery through the wonders of Short Sun is still quite exciting and inviting. I sometimes feel people on this board are far more into solving little (and huge) puzzles than they are into a sense of wonder, awe, magic, thrill, humanity, divinity, great writing, and so on in Gene Wolfe. I know the puzzles are integral to his art - but I just don't feel like the other aspects get much air time.

DOJP

On Fri, Jun 24, 2011 at 11:02 PM, Marc Aramini <marcaramini at yahoo.com> wrote:

You could read Long Sun before New or Short Sun, but starting at Short Sun just ruins so many little cool things, like the whole "I caught the ball, I won the game" thing at the end of On Blue's Water, Horn talking about "his" dancing toy, things that undeniably let you know there is something of Silk running around in that narrator.
I like the published order, but Long and New should both be read before Short. If you don't have a thorough understanding of the positive outlook of Silk and his "out of character" suicidal impulse Short Sun could never make full sense.

--- On *Thu, 6/23/11, Daniel Petersen <danielottojackpetersen at gmail.com>* wrote:

From: Daniel Petersen <danielottojackpetersen at gmail.com>
Subject: Re: (urth) NPR taking suggestions for The Best Science Fiction and
To: "The Urth Mailing List" <urth at lists.urth.net>
Date: Thursday, June 23, 2011, 9:31 AM

You know, I actually did read On Blue's Waters, then stopped and went back and read Long Sun before then re-reading Blue and the rest of Short Sun. It was indeed a very, very strange experience - but hugely enticing. Unfortunately it took away some of the mystery I think I would have encountered in reading Long Sun if I had had no or little clue what was coming.

I think John Clute wondered in a review whether jumping right into Wolfe at Blue might be the best way. I've always wondered the same.

DOJP

On Thu, Jun 23, 2011 at 3:58 PM, Andrew Mason <[andrew.mason53 at gmail.com](mailto:andrew.mason53@gmail.com)<[http://us.mc1618.mail.yahoo.com/mc/compose?to=andrew.mason53 at gmail.com](http://us.mc1618.mail.yahoo.com/mc/compose?to=andrew.mason53@gmail.com)>> wrote:

Dan'l Danehy-Oakes wrote:

On Wed, Jun 22, 2011 at 1:09 PM, <[antonio at gmail.com](mailto:antonio@gmail.com)<[http://us.mc1618.mail.yahoo.com/mc/compose?to=antonio at gmail.com](http://us.mc1618.mail.yahoo.com/mc/compose?to=antonio@gmail.com)>> wrote:

Ha. The Book of the Long Sun is so much better!

I agree. But is it better if you haven't read "Short Sun?" (I *think* it is anyway, but I haven't experienced it in that order.)

You read _Short Sun_ first? Was that not a rather puzzling experience?

Jordon Flato — 05 Jul 2011, 22:45 · in reply to Jordon Flato

Oops. Clearly this is not the list. If I had bothered to read my original post, I'd have seen they were accepting nominations for the top 100 sci fi of all time. This is not 100 books, therefore....

sorry folks

On Tue, Jul 5, 2011 at 3:43 PM, Jordon Flato <[jordonflatourth at gmail.com](mailto:jordonflatourth@gmail.com)>wrote:
Having billed it as a 'best of all time' list, I'd say it's pretty lame.
It is highly likely that this is a related but separate list. I'm hoping so.

On Tue, Jul 5, 2011 at 3:42 PM, Dan'l Danehy-Oakes <[danldo at gmail.com](mailto:danldo@gmail.com)>wrote:
It's clearly a list based on what's currently new on the stands. Given that, it isn't a bad list.

On Tue, Jul 5, 2011 at 3:31 PM, Jordon Flato <[jordonflatourth at gmail.com](mailto:jordonflatourth@gmail.com)>wrote:
Let me rephrase that 'many' to 'any'.

On Tue, Jul 5, 2011 at 3:31 PM, Jordon Flato <[jordonflatourth at gmail.com](mailto:jordonflatourth@gmail.com)>wrote:

Well, they picked their list. Not having read many of them, I can't comment, but of course I think it's ridiculous to not include New Sun.

<http://www.npr.org/2011/06/30/137003853/mind-bending-sci-fi-books-for-a-fantastical-summer>

On Sun, Jun 26, 2011 at 6:42 AM, Daniel Petersen <danielottojackpetersen at gmail.com> wrote:

You're probably right, Marc. But being plunged into all that mystery through the wonders of Short Sun is still quite exciting and inviting. I sometimes feel people on this board are far more into solving little (and huge) puzzles than they are into a sense of wonder, awe, magic, thrill, humanity, divinity, great writing, and so on in Gene Wolfe. I know the puzzles are integral to his art - but I just don't feel like the other aspects get much air time.

DOJP

On Fri, Jun 24, 2011 at 11:02 PM, Marc Aramini <marcaramini at yahoo.com> wrote:

You could read Long Sun before New or Short Sun, but starting at Short Sun just ruins so many little cool things, like the whole "I caught the ball, I won the game" thing at the end of On Blue's Water, Horn talking about "his" dancing toy, things that undeniably let you know there is something of Silk running around in that narrator. I like the published order, but Long and New should both be read before Short. If you don't have a thorough understanding of the positive outlook of Silk and his "out of character" suicidal impulse Short Sun could never make full sense.

--- On *Thu, 6/23/11, Daniel Petersen <danielottojackpetersen at gmail.com>* wrote:

From: Daniel Petersen <danielottojackpetersen at gmail.com>
Subject: Re: (urth) NPR taking suggestions for The Best Science Fiction and
To: "The Urth Mailing List" <urth at lists.urth.net>
Date: Thursday, June 23, 2011, 9:31 AM

You know, I actually did read On Blue's Waters, then stopped and went back and read Long Sun before then re-reading Blue and the rest of Short Sun. It was indeed a very, very strange experience - but hugely enticing. Unfortunately it took away some of the mystery I think I would have encountered in reading Long Sun if I had had no or little clue what was coming.

I think John Clute wondered in a review whether jumping right into Wolfe at Blue might be the best way. I've always wondered the same.

DOJP

On Thu, Jun 23, 2011 at 3:58 PM, Andrew Mason <

andrew.mason53 at
gmail.com<[http://us.mc1618.mail.yahoo.com/mc/compose?to=andrew.mason53 at
gmail.com](http://us.mc1618.mail.yahoo.com/mc/compose?to=andrew.mason53@gmail.com)>
wrote:

Dan'l Danehy-Oakes wrote:

On Wed, Jun 22, 2011 at 1:09 PM, <antonio at
gmail.com<[http://us.mc1618.mail.yahoo.com/mc/compose?to=antonio at gmail.com](http://us.mc1618.mail.yahoo.com/mc/compose?to=antonio@gmail.com)>>
wrote:

Ha. The Book of the Long Sun is so much better!

I agree. But is it better if you haven't read "Short Sun?" (I
think

it is anyway, but I haven't experienced it in that order.)

You read _Short Sun_ first? Was that not a rather puzzling experience?

Lane Haygood — 05 Jul 2011, 22:48 · in reply to Dan'l Danehy-Oakes

Yeah, those are their new books, not the best all-time list. A best list with Ms. Merciel on it should still be suspect. I liked her first novel, but it was not brilliant and indulged too many common tropes.

Sent from my iPhone

On Jul 5, 2011, at 5:42 PM, "Dan'l Danehy-Oakes" <danldo at gmail.com> wrote:
It's clearly a list based on what's currently new on the stands. Given that, it isn't a bad list.

On Tue, Jul 5, 2011 at 3:31 PM, Jordon Flato <jordonflatourth at gmail.com> wrote:
Let me rephrase that 'many' to 'any'.

On Tue, Jul 5, 2011 at 3:31 PM, Jordon Flato <jordonflatourth at gmail.com> wrote:
Well, they picked their list. Not having read many of them, I can't comment, but of course I think it's ridiculous to not include New Sun.

<http://www.npr.org/2011/06/30/137003853/mind-bending-sci-fi-books-for-a-fantastical-summer>

On Sun, Jun 26, 2011 at 6:42 AM, Daniel Petersen <danielottojackpetersen at gmail.com> wrote:
You're probably right, Marc. But being plunged into all that mystery through the wonders of Short Sun is still quite exciting and inviting. I sometimes feel people on this board are far more into solving little (and huge) puzzles than they are into a sense of wonder, awe, magic, thrill, humanity, divinity, great writing, and so on in Gene Wolfe. I know the puzzles are integral to his art - but I just don't feel like the other aspects get much air time.

DOJP

On Fri, Jun 24, 2011 at 11:02 PM, Marc Aramini <marcaramini at yahoo.com> wrote:
You could read Long Sun before New or Short Sun, but starting at Short Sun just ruins so many little cool things, like the whole "I caught the ball, I won the game" thing at the end of On Blue's Water, Horn talking about "his" dancing toy, things that undeniably let you know there is something of Silk running around in that narrator.
I like the published order, but Long and New should both be read before Short. If you don't have a thorough understanding of the positive outlook of Silk and his "out of character" suicidal impulse

Short Sun could never make full sense.

--- On Thu, 6/23/11, Daniel Petersen <danielottojackpetersen at gmail.com> wrote:

From: Daniel Petersen <danielottojackpetersen at gmail.com>
Subject: Re: (urth) NPR taking suggestions for The Best Science Fiction and
To: "The Urth Mailing List" <urth at lists.urth.net>
Date: Thursday, June 23, 2011, 9:31 AM

You know, I actually did read On Blue's Waters, then stopped and went back and read Long Sun before then re-reading Blue and the rest of Short Sun. It was indeed a very, very strange experience - but hugely enticing. Unfortunately it took away some of the mystery I think I would have encountered in reading Long Sun if I had had no or little clue what was coming.

I think John Clute wondered in a review whether jumping right into Wolfe at Blue might be the best way. I've always wondered the same.

DOJP

On Thu, Jun 23, 2011 at 3:58 PM, Andrew Mason <andrew.mason53 at gmail.com> wrote:
Dan'l Danehy-Oakes wrote:

On Wed, Jun 22, 2011 at 1:09 PM, <antonio at gmail.com> wrote:

Ha. The Book of the Long Sun is so much better!

I agree. But is it better if you haven't read "Short Sun?" (I *think* it is anyway, but I haven't experienced it in that order.)

You read _Short Sun_ first? Was that not a rather puzzling experience?

Nick Lee — 06 Jul 2011, 15:11 · follows Lane Haygood

Jordon Flato wrote:

Well, they picked their list. Not having read many of them, I can't comment, but of course I think it's ridiculous to not include New Sun.

<http://www.npr.org/2011/06/30/137003853/mind-bending-sci-fi-books-for-a-fantastical-summer>

It's no surprise you haven't read any of those books. They're new books (all from 2011) NPR is suggesting we read this summer. It's not the "Best Of" List.

Jordon Flato — 06 Jul 2011, 15:48 · in reply to Nick Lee

Yes. Yesterday I ate the requisite amount of crow

On Jul 6, 2011 8:12 AM, "Nick Lee" <starwaterstrain at gmail.com> wrote:

Jordon Flato wrote:

Well, they picked their list. Not having read many of them, I can't comment, but of course I think it's ridiculous to not include New Sun.

<http://www.npr.org/2011/06/30/137003853/mind-bending-sci-fi-books-for-a-fantastical-summer>

It's no surprise you haven't read any of those books. They're new books (all from 2011) NPR is suggesting we read this summer. It's not the "Best Of" List.

Lane Haygood — 06 Jul 2011, 15:57 · in reply to Jordon Flato

If you want, I may still have some hot coals from the 4th. I don't know what slow-smoked mesquite crow tastes like, but as a Texan, I firmly believe barbecue improves all meat dishes.

Sent from my iPhone

On Jul 6, 2011, at 10:48 AM, Jordon Flato <jordonflatourth at gmail.com> wrote:

Yes. Yesterday I ate the requisite amount of crow

On Jul 6, 2011 8:12 AM, "Nick Lee" <starwaterstrain at gmail.com> wrote:

Jordon Flato wrote:

Well, they picked their list. Not having read many of them, I can't comment, but of course I think it's ridiculous to not include New Sun.

<http://www.npr.org/2011/06/30/137003853/mind-bending-sci-fi-books-for-a-fantastical-summer>

It's no surprise you haven't read any of those books. They're new books (all from 2011) NPR is suggesting we read this summer. It's not the "Best Of" List.

Stuart Hamm — 06 Jul 2011, 15:58 · in reply to Nick Lee

Cut their funding!!!

? ??

--- On Wed, 7/6/11, Nick Lee <starwaterstrain at gmail.com> wrote:

From: Nick Lee <starwaterstrain at gmail.com>

Subject: (urth) NPR taking suggestions for The Best Science Fiction and To: urth at lists.urth.net

Date: Wednesday, July 6, 2011, 8:11 AM

?Jordon Flato wrote:

Well, they picked their list. ?Not having read many of them, I can't comment, but of course I think it's ridiculous to not include New Sun.

<http://www.npr.org/2011/06/30/137003853/mind-bending-sci-fi-books-for-a-fantastical-summer>

It's no surprise you haven't read any of those books. They're new books (all from 2011) NPR is suggesting we read this summer. It's not the "Best Of" List.

-----Inline Attachment Follows-----

Jordon Flato — 06 Jul 2011, 16:39 · in reply to Stuart Hamm

@stu: Imao. Indeed.

Lane: I believe crow, like revenge is best served cold

On Jul 6, 2011 8:58 AM, "Stuart Hamm" <hammstu at sbcglobal.net> wrote:

Cut their funding!!!

--- On *Wed, 7/6/11, Nick Lee <starwaterstrain at gmail.com>* wrote:

From: Nick Lee <starwaterstrain at gmail.com>
Subject: (urth) NPR taking suggestions for The Best Science Fiction and
To: urth at lists.urth.net
Date: Wednesday, July 6, 2011, 8:11 AM

Jordon Flato wrote:

Well, they picked their list. Not having read many of them, I can't...

-----Inline Attachment Follows-----

Urth Mailing List
To post, write urth at urth....

Jerry Friedman — 30 Jul 2011, 16:44 · in reply to Lane Haygood

Apologies if this has been posted before, but some here will enjoy this video of a puppet show by Philippe Genty. I recommend not reading the full description before watching it.

I tried to decide whether it was Wolfean or anti-Wolfean, and settled on the former.

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SphHaiW7fzg&feature=share>

Jerry Friedman

Stuart Hamm — 02 Aug 2011, 09:03 · in reply to Jerry Friedman

IMHO it seems to be saying that man cannot exist without God which sounds pretty Wolfean to me...but I am extremely jetlagged...

? ??

--- On Sat, 7/30/11, Jerry Friedman <jerry_friedman at yahoo.com> wrote:

From: Jerry Friedman <jerry_friedman at yahoo.com>
Subject: (urth) Puppet video
To: "The Urth Mailing List" <urth at lists.urth.net>
Date: Saturday, July 30, 2011, 9:44 AM

Apologies if this has been posted before, but some here will enjoy this video of a puppet show by Philippe Genty. I recommend not reading the full description before watching it.

I tried to decide whether it was Wolfean or anti-Wolfean, and settled on the former.

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SphHaiW7fzg&feature=share>

Jerry Friedman

-----Inline Attachment Follows-----