

Horns abilities

The Urth list — 40 messages, 7 voices, 26 Oct 2011

<https://urth.darkrealm.vip/thread/urth/6085>

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.

larry miller — 26 Oct 2011, 11:40

Can anyone tell me why Horn is able to get inside and change the stories being told in In Greens Jungles?

António Pedro Marques — 26 Oct 2011, 11:54 · in reply to larry miller

larry miller wrote (26-10-2011 12:40):

Can anyone tell me why Horn is able to get inside and change the stories being told in In Greens Jungles?

I must be losing it - I knew the answer to this question and I can't recall it.

Also, does anyone remeber the part where dream Fava wants to know where the kitchen is? I also knew perfectly why she did - and can't recall it.

James Wynn — 26 Oct 2011, 13:23 · in reply to larry miller

Dream travel is time travel. Remember Pike's ghost?

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 26, 2011, at 6:40 AM, larry miller <biglar1984 at gmail.com> wrote:
Can anyone tell me why Horn is able to get inside and change the stories being told in In Greens Jungles?

antonio at gmail.com — 26 Oct 2011, 13:35 · in reply to James Wynn

I don't think that, even if it were true, has anything to do with it.

No dia 2011/10/26, ?s 14:23, James Wynn <crushtv at gmail.com> escreveu:

Dream travel is time travel. Remember Pike's ghost?

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 26, 2011, at 6:40 AM, larry miller <biglar1984 at gmail.com> wrote:

Can anyone tell me why Horn is able to get inside and change the stories being told in In Greens Jungles?

Marc Aramini — 26 Oct 2011, 14:56 · in reply to James Wynn

--- On Wed, 10/26/11, James Wynn <crushtv at gmail.com> wrote:
From: James Wynn <crushtv at gmail.com>

Subject: Re: (urth) Horns abilities
To: "The Urth Mailing List" <urth at lists.urth.net>
Date: Wednesday, October 26, 2011, 6:23 AM
Dream travel is time travel. Remember
Pike's ghost?

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 26, 2011, at 6:40 AM, larry miller <biglar1984 at gmail.com>
wrote:

Can anyone tell me why Horn is able to get inside and
change the
stories being told in In Greens Jungles?

My position, too. For sure. and I rather like the little doll in the dreams as mucor teaming up
with fava spirit (or whoever is dead).

Dream travel is definitely time travel.

Daniel Petersen — 26 Oct 2011, 15:04 · in reply to Marc Aramini

What's the deal with it being semi-physical? Is it 'out of body' even though you can physically
influence stuff in the place you 'go' to? It's one of the weirdest things I've ever seen (because
it's not as simple as time travel on one hand or visions on the other, etc.). And Wolfe's
introduction and development of it narratively (especially in In Green's Jungles) is one of the
most jaw-dropping, mind-bending experiences I've had in reading.

-DOJP

On Wed, Oct 26, 2011 at 3:56 PM, Marc Aramini <marcaramini at yahoo.com> wrote:

--- On Wed, 10/26/11, James Wynn <crushtv at gmail.com> wrote:

From: James Wynn <crushtv at gmail.com>
Subject: Re: (urth) Horns abilities
To: "The Urth Mailing List" <urth at lists.urth.net>
Date: Wednesday, October 26, 2011, 6:23 AM
Dream travel is time travel. Remember
Pike's ghost?

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 26, 2011, at 6:40 AM, larry miller <biglar1984 at gmail.com>
wrote:

Can anyone tell me why Horn is able to get inside and
change the
stories being told in In Greens Jungles?

My position, too. For sure. and I rather like the little doll in the
dreams as mucor teaming up with fava spirit (or whoever is dead).

Dream travel is definitely time travel.

António Pedro Marques — 26 Oct 2011, 15:09 · in reply to Marc Aramini

Marc Aramini wrote (26-10-2011 15:56):

--- On Wed, 10/26/11, James Wynn<crushtv at gmail.com> wrote:

From: James Wynn<crushtv at gmail.com>
Subject: Re: (urth) Horns abilities
To: "The Urth Mailing List"<urth at lists.urth.net>
Date: Wednesday, October 26, 2011, 6:23 AM
Dream travel is time travel. Remember
Pike's ghost?

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 26, 2011, at 6:40 AM, larry miller<biglar1984 at gmail.com>
wrote:

Can anyone tell me why Horn is able to get inside and
change the
stories being told in In Greens Jungles?

My position, too. For sure. and I rather like the little doll in the dreams as mucor teaming up with fava
spirit (or whoever is dead).

Dream travel is definitely time travel.

It can't be 'definitely' since there's no consensus, but *even if it were*, how does dream travel
account for Incanto inserting himself into the stories while they're being told, *to the
knowledge* of the storytellers?

Marc Aramini — 26 Oct 2011, 15:12 · in reply to António Pedro Marques

--- On Wed, 10/26/11, Ant?nio Pedro Marques <antonio at gmail.com> wrote:

From: Ant?nio Pedro Marques <antonio at gmail.com>
Subject: Re: (urth) Horns abilities
To: "The Urth Mailing List" <urth at lists.urth.net>
Date: Wednesday, October 26, 2011, 8:09 AM
Marc Aramini wrote (26-10-2011
15:56):

--- On Wed, 10/26/11, James Wynn<crushtv at gmail.com>?
wrote:

From: James Wynn<crushtv at gmail.com>
Subject: Re: (urth) Horns abilities
To: "The Urth Mailing List"<urth at lists.urth.net>
Date: Wednesday, October 26, 2011, 6:23 AM
Dream travel is time travel. Remember
Pike's ghost?

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 26, 2011, at 6:40 AM, larry miller<biglar1984 at gmail.com>
wrote:

Can anyone tell me why Horn is able to get
inside and
change the
stories being told in In Greens Jungles?

My position, too. For sure. and I rather
like the little doll in the dreams as mucor teaming up with
fava spirit (or whoever is dead).

Dream travel is definitely time travel.

It can't be 'definitely' since there's no consensus, but
even if it were,
how does dream travel account for Incanto inserting himself
into the stories
while they're being told, *to the knowledge* of the
storytellers?

Marc Aramini — 26 Oct 2011, 15:13 · in reply to António Pedro Marques

--- On Wed, 10/26/11, Ant?nio Pedro Marques <antonio at gmail.com> wrote:
From: Ant?nio Pedro Marques <antonio at gmail.com>
Subject: Re: (urth) Horns abilities
To: "The Urth Mailing List" <urth at lists.urth.net>
Date: Wednesday, October 26, 2011, 8:09 AM
Marc Aramini wrote (26-10-2011
15:56):

--- On Wed, 10/26/11, James Wynn<crushtv at gmail.com>?
wrote:

From: James Wynn<crushtv at gmail.com>
Subject: Re: (urth) Horns abilities
To: "The Urth Mailing List"<urth at lists.urth.net>
Date: Wednesday, October 26, 2011, 6:23 AM
Dream travel is time travel. Remember
Pike's ghost?

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 26, 2011, at 6:40 AM, larry miller<biglar1984 at gmail.com>
wrote:

Can anyone tell me why Horn is able to get
inside and
change the
stories being told in In Greens Jungles?

My position, too. For sure. and I rather
like the little doll in the dreams as mucor teaming up with
fava spirit (or whoever is dead).

Dream travel is definitely time travel.

It can't be 'definitely' since there's no consensus, but
even if it were,
how does dream travel account for Incanto inserting himself
into the stories
while they're being told, *to the knowledge* of the
storytellers?

Antônio Pedro Marques — 26 Oct 2011, 15:15 · in reply to Marc Aramini

Marc Aramini wrote (26-10-2011 16:12):

--- On Wed, 10/26/11, Ant?nio Pedro Marques<antonio at gmail.com> wrote:

From: Ant?nio Pedro Marques<antonio at gmail.com>
Subject: Re: (urth) Horns abilities
To: "The Urth Mailing List"<urth at lists.urth.net>
Date: Wednesday, October 26, 2011, 8:09 AM
Marc Aramini wrote (26-10-2011 15:56):

--- On Wed, 10/26/11, James Wynn<crushtv at gmail.com> wrote:

From: James Wynn<crushtv at gmail.com>
Subject: Re: (urth) Horns abilities
To: "The Urth Mailing List"<urth at lists.urth.net>
Date: Wednesday, October 26, 2011, 6:23 AM
Dream travel is time travel. Remember Pike's ghost?

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 26, 2011, at 6:40 AM, larry miller<biglar1984 at gmail.com> wrote:

Can anyone tell me why Horn is able to get inside and change the stories being told in In Greens Jungles?

My position, too. For sure. and I rather like the little doll in the dreams as mucor teaming up with fava spirit (or whoever is dead).

Dream travel is definitely time travel.

It can't be 'definitely' since there's no consensus, but *even if it were*, how does dream travel account for Incanto inserting himself into the stories while they're being told, *to the knowledge* of the storytellers?

Bill and Ted stuff, he hears the story and makes a decision to leave the trash can where it can fall in a few minutes or later that night.

You'll have to elaborate.

Antônio Pedro Marques — 26 Oct 2011, 15:16 · in reply to Marc Aramini

Marc Aramini wrote (26-10-2011 16:13):

--- On Wed, 10/26/11, Ant?nio Pedro Marques<antonio at gmail.com> wrote:

From: Ant?nio Pedro Marques<antonio at gmail.com>
Subject: Re: (urth) Horns abilities
To: "The Urth Mailing List"<urth at lists.urth.net>
Date: Wednesday, October 26, 2011, 8:09 AM
Marc Aramini wrote (26-10-2011

15:56):

--- On Wed, 10/26/11, James Wynn<crushtv at gmail.com> wrote:

From: James Wynn<crushtv at gmail.com>
Subject: Re: (urth) Horns abilities
To: "The Urth Mailing List"<urth at lists.urth.net>
Date: Wednesday, October 26, 2011, 6:23 AM
Dream travel is time travel. Remember
Pike's ghost?

Sent from my iPhone

On Oct 26, 2011, at 6:40 AM, larry miller<biglar1984 at gmail.com> wrote:

Can anyone tell me why Horn is able to get inside and change the stories being told in In Greens Jungles?

My position, too. For sure. and I rather like the little doll in the dreams as mucor teaming up with fava spirit (or whoever is dead).

Dream travel is definitely time travel.

It can't be 'definitely' since there's no consensus, but *even if it were*, how does dream travel account for Incanto inserting himself into the stories while they're being told, *to the knowledge* of the storytellers?

consensus doesn't matter for definitely. I hate to say it but it's true. The earth is definitely not entirely flat whether we all agree or not. I am definitely not bald even if you think I am or might be.

I chose the word 'consensus' precisely because it doesn't mean 'unanimity'.

Marc Aramini — 26 Oct 2011, 15:21 · in reply to António Pedro Marques

--- On Wed, 10/26/11, Ant?nio Pedro Marques <antonio at gmail.com> wrote:

I chose the word 'consensus' precisely because it doesn't mean 'unanimity'.

In Bill and Ted, a garbage nonsense movie, their ability to influence the course of events is absurdly "ghost in the machine" type stuff. They need help out of a tight spot so they simple say stuff like, "Let's not forget to provide for that eventuality and aid ourselves later by coming back in time and fixing it." Then, they are instantly aided.

The system of cause and effect is reversed and undermined, and I think the same thing is occurring in the Wolfe story. And I'm telling you it's definitely time travel related in one fashion whether anyone on earth except one or three other men agree with me or not, that's all there is to it. A woman knows the child is hers, a man has faith that it is. That's all I want to say on it.

James Wynn — 26 Oct 2011, 15:30 · in reply to António Pedro Marques

Dream travel is definitely time travel.

It can't be 'definitely' since there's no consensus, but
even if it were,
how does dream travel account for Incanto inserting himself
into the stories
while they're being told, *to the knowledge* of the
storytellers?

consensus doesn't matter for definitely. I hate to say it but it's
true. The earth is definitely not entirely flat whether we all agree
or not. I am definitely not bald even if you think I am or might be.

I chose the word 'consensus' precisely because it doesn't mean
'unanimity'.

In the 14th century, the Earth definitely revolved around the Sun even if only Copernicus said
so.

There is simply no other reasonable explanation, given the context, for Pike's sparkly
disapperating ghost and the astral flying Oreb Silk also meets upstairs at a time when Oreb's
wing is damaged. Combine that with Rajan appearing in the grandmother's tale, and the
timelines not matching for when Horn left, Hide left, Hoof left, and the ages of Sinew's sons --
well, dream-travel is time travel.

J.

Daniel Petersen — 26 Oct 2011, 15:51 · in reply to James Wynn

'There is simply no other reasonable explanation, given the context, for Pike's sparkly
disapperating ghost'

Does 'reasonable' here = naturalistic? Are we not allowing for any 'real' (traditionally construed
- i.e. spirits of the dead) ghosts in Wolfe's cycle? (Or is there something about the context you
mention that requires a non-supernatural account in this particular case?)

-DOJP

James Wynn — 26 Oct 2011, 15:56 · in reply to Daniel Petersen

On 10/26/2011 10:51 AM, Daniel Petersen wrote:
'There is simply no other reasonable explanation, given the context,
for Pike's sparkly disapperating ghost'

Does 'reasonable' here = naturalistic? Are we not allowing for any
'real' (traditionally construed - i.e. spirits of the dead) ghosts in
Wolfe's cycle? (Or is there something about the context you mention
that requires a non-supernatural account in this particular case?)
-DOJP

Not give the subsequent appearance of astral Oreb.

Otherwise, I'd accept the appearance as a Gothic-style ghost, although a weird one. When such
ghosts appear they don't typically wave like a tourist at Disneyland. Nor disappear like James T.
Kirk being beamed up.

J.

James Wynn — 26 Oct 2011, 15:57 · in reply to Daniel Petersen

> On Oct 26, 2011, at 6:40 AM, larry miller <biglar1984 at gmail.com
<mailto:biglar1984 at gmail.com>>

> wrote:

> > Can anyone tell me why Horn is able to get inside and

> change the

> > stories being told in In Greens Jungles?

> > _____

> From: James Wynn <crushtv at gmail.com <mailto:crushtv at gmail.com>>

> Subject: Re: (urth) Horns abilities

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

<mailto:urth at lists.urth.net>>

> Date: Wednesday, October 26, 2011, 6:23 AM

> Dream travel is time travel. Remember

> Pike's ghost?

Marc Aramini wrote:

My position, too. For sure. and I rather like the little doll in
the dreams as mucor teaming up with fava spirit (or whoever is
dead). Dream travel is definitely time travel.

On 10/26/2011 10:04 AM, Daniel Petersen wrote:

What's the deal with it being semi-physical? Is it 'out of body' even
though you can physically influence stuff in the place you 'go' to?

It's one of the weirdest things I've ever seen (because it's not as
simple as time travel on one hand or visions on the other, etc.). And
Wolfe's introduction and development of it narratively (especially in
In Green's Jungles) is one of the most jaw-dropping, mind-bending
experiences I've had in reading.

-DOJP

They are disembodied spirits (ghosts, if you will) with bodies fashioned from "dream-stuff". Thus
they can die in dream-travel and their bodies remain. Their bodies that they left, are not killed
in that case, but are left senseless and souless. If your sleeping body dies in dream-travel,

"Do you recall how, when you were hardly more than a boy, I taught you the art by which we
flesh sons from dream stuff?" [...] "For though he did not know why, being of the stuff of dreams
he was drawn to her; and she, whose eyes held starlight, to him." Chapter 17, Claw of the
Conciliator

Daniel Petersen — 26 Oct 2011, 16:01 · in reply to James Wynn

Great, thanks for that clarification. My evidential assessment of your position will have to await
my re-read of Long Sun, but I now see the analytic validity of your view. It seems a fair enough
line of reasoning.

-DOJP

On Wed, Oct 26, 2011 at 4:56 PM, James Wynn <crushtv at gmail.com> wrote:

On 10/26/2011 10:51 AM, Daniel Petersen wrote:

'There is simply no other reasonable explanation, given the context, for
Pike's sparkly disappearing ghost'

Does 'reasonable' here = naturalistic? Are we not allowing for any 'real'
(traditionally construed - i.e. spirits of the dead) ghosts in Wolfe's

cycle? (Or is there something about the context you mention that requires a non-supernatural account in this particular case?)

-DOJP

Not give the subsequent appearance of astral Oreb.

Otherwise, I'd accept the appearance as a Gothic-style ghost, although a weird one. When such ghosts appear they don't typically wave like a tourist at Disneyland. Nor disappear like James T. Kirk being beamed up.

J.

_____*_*_____

Daniel Petersen — 26 Oct 2011, 16:13 · in reply to James Wynn

*They are disembodied spirits (ghosts, if you will) with bodies fashioned from "dream-stuff". Thus they can die in dream-travel and their bodies remain. Their bodies that they left, are not killed in that case, but are left senseless and souless. If your sleeping body dies in dream-travel,

"Do you recall how, when you were hardly more than a boy, I taught you the art by which we flesh sons from dream stuff?" [...] "For though he did not know why, being of the stuff of dreams he was drawn to her; and she, whose eyes held starlight, to him." Chapter 17, Claw of the Conciliator*

Great connections with the quotes from Claw! It still looks slightly more complicated and mysterious than just this though. For example, Horn can form a sword from dream stuff apparently and then actually cut physical things on Green with it. It's one thing for a ghost to throw plates that break. But it's another for the ghost to form a dream-plate or spirit-plate and the plate manages to leave a shiner on the eye of the person hit by it. (Even though eventually no other evidence of the plate's existence will remain.)

-DOJP

On Wed, Oct 26, 2011 at 4:57 PM, James Wynn <crushtv at gmail.com> wrote:

On Oct 26, 2011, at 6:40 AM, larry miller <biglar1984 at gmail.com> wrote:

Can anyone tell me why Horn is able to get inside and change the stories being told in In Greens Jungles?

From: James Wynn <crushtv at gmail.com>
Subject: Re: (urth) Horns abilities

António Pedro Marques — 26 Oct 2011, 16:22 · in reply to Marc Aramini

Marc Aramini wrote (26-10-2011 16:21):

--- On Wed, 10/26/11, Ant?nio Pedro Marques<antonio at gmail.com> wrote:

I chose the word 'consensus' precisely because it doesn't mean 'unanimity'.

In Bill and Ted, a garbage nonsense movie, their ability to influence the course of events is absurdly "ghost in the machine" type stuff. They

need help out of a tight spot so they simply say stuff like, "Let's not forget to provide for that eventuality and aid ourselves later by coming back in time and fixing it." Then, they are instantly aided.

That still doesn't explain the scene at the dinner table. Should Incanto 'dream travel' into the original setting of stories at some point (either before, during, or after they're being told) (a thing for which there isn't any evidence at all), the storytellers wouldn't be able to tell he had done so.

The system of cause and effect is reversed and undermined, and I think the same thing is occurring in the Wolfe story. And I'm telling you it's definitely time travel related in one fashion whether anyone on earth except one or three other men agree with me or not, that's all there is to it. A woman knows the child is hers, a man has faith that it is. That's all I want to say on it.

There are two separate issues here:

- whether it is definite for you
- whether it is consensual

Yes, it may be definite for you; however, for you to say it is definite, not qualified explicitly or by context, and not expect others to complain, it also has to be consensual.

António Pedro Marques — 26 Oct 2011, 16:28 · in reply to James Wynn

James Wynn wrote (26-10-2011 16:30):

Dream travel is definitely time travel.

It can't be 'definitely' since there's no consensus, but
even if it were,
how does dream travel account for Incanto inserting himself
into the stories
while they're being told, *to the knowledge* of the
storytellers?

consensus doesn't matter for definitely. I hate to say it but it's true.
The earth is definitely not entirely flat whether we all agree or not. I
am definitely not bald even if you think I am or might be.

I chose the word 'consensus' precisely because it doesn't mean 'unanimity'.

In the 14th century, the Earth definitely revolved around the Sun even if
only Copernicus said so.

There is simply no other reasonable explanation, given the context, for
Pike's sparkly disappearing ghost and the astral flying Oreb Silk also
meets upstairs at a time when Oreb's wing is damaged.
Combine that with Rajan appearing in the grandmother's tale, and the
timelines not matching for when Horn left, Hide left, Hoof left, and the
ages of Sinew's sons -- well, dream-travel is time travel.

I've already assumed for the sake of discussion that time travel is available to Incanto. I still don't see how it allows him to manipulate the stories. Yes, it may explain his presence in the grandmother's (but then again, that's about the most convincing evidence for time travel, so if it can have a different explanation then there goes the evidence), but not the others, nor the fact that they notice they're being manipulated.

Dan'l Danehy-Oakes — 26 Oct 2011, 16:28 · in reply to António Pedro Marques

Ant?nio Pedro Marques wrote:

Should Incanto

'dream travel' into the original setting of stories at some point (either before, during, or after they're being told) (a thing for which there isn't any evidence at all), the storytellers wouldn't be able to tell he had done so.

Ummmmm.

It seems to me that Wolfe is deliberately posing a dilemma about memory (and time-travel) with Incanto's dream-travel. When he changes something in someone's past, they remember it both the "new" way and the "old" way. Now, if he "really" changed the past, they should remember it "only" the "new" way -- the "old" way now always never happened. But if he doesn't, then what is he changing? "Only" the memories of the person telling the story? Yet, the changes seem to have "real" consequences; and, again, if he really _changed_ their memories, they should not remember the pre-change version. Or should they?

I believe that the point here is that this is something that can _only_ happen in a text...and a text of a particular kind (Postmodern SF) at that.

Dan'I Danehy-Oakes

Ant?nio Pedro Marques — 26 Oct 2011, 16:39 · in reply to Dan'I Danehy-Oakes

Dan'I Danehy-Oakes wrote (26-10-2011 17:28):

Ant?nio Pedro Marques wrote:

Should Incanto

'dream travel' into the original setting of stories at some point (either before, during, or after they're being told) (a thing for which there isn't any evidence at all), the storytellers wouldn't be able to tell he had done so.

Ummmmm.

It seems to me that Wolfe is deliberately posing a dilemma about memory (and time-travel) with Incanto's dream-travel. When he changes something in someone's past, they remember it both the "new" way and the "old" way. Now, if he "really" changed the past, they should remember it "only" the "new" way -- the "old" way now always never happened. But if he doesn't, then what is he changing? "Only" the memories of the person telling the story? Yet, the changes seem to have "real" consequences; and, again, if he really _changed_ their memories, they should not remember the pre-change version. Or should they?

I believe that the point here is that this is something that can _only_ happen in a text...and a text of a particular kind (Postmodern SF) at that.

Let's be economical. They're telling stories. The stories set off as biographical, but there's no reason they must remain accurate. Just because they insert some character into a story they're telling which started off as biographical, it doesn't follow that they think the character really existed in their lives. If I tell some story about my childhood and at some point put Kirsten Dunst in it, it doesn't follow that I suddenly think Kirsten Dunst was part of my childhood.

Daniel Petersen — 26 Oct 2011, 16:40 · in reply to Dan'I Danehy-Oakes

*I believe that the point here is that this is something that can
only happen in a text...and a text of a particular kind (Postmodern SF) at that.

Dan'l Danehy-Oakes*

I suspect with Catholic supernatural realists like Wolfe, R. A. Lafferty, and Tim Powers, you have to be careful not to limit super-temporal or super-physical phenomena to the text only. I bet they think 'real' (extralinguistic) life is at least as weird as the weirdest text ever written and probably more so. You never know when a theological theme may be lurking near (among other sorts). As Tolkien famously remarked: 'It does not do to leave a live [theological] dragon **out of your calculations, if you live near him.'

-DOJP

Dan'l Danehy-Oakes — 26 Oct 2011, 16:42 · in reply to António Pedro Marques

Ant?nio Pedro Marques wrote:

Let's be economical. They're telling stories. The stories set off as biographical, but there's no reason they must remain accurate. Just because they insert some character into a story they're telling which started off as biographical, it doesn't follow that they think the characater really existed in their lives. If I tell some story about my childhood and at some point put Kirsten Dunst in it, it doesn't follow that I suddenly think Kirsten Dunst was part of my childhood.

But if you tell a story about your childhood, and _someone else_ causes you to put Kirsten Dunst into it, and afterwards you remember Kirsten Dunst being a part of it ... well, that's a different kettle-o'-fish entirely.

Dan'l Danehy-Oakes

Dan'l Danehy-Oakes — 26 Oct 2011, 16:45 · in reply to Daniel Petersen

On Wed, Oct 26, 2011 at 9:40 AM, Daniel Petersen

<danielottojackpetersen at gmail.com> wrote:

I suspect with Catholic supernatural realists like Wolfe, R. A. Lafferty, and Tim Powers, you have to be careful not to limit super-temporal or super-physical phenomena to the text only. I bet they think 'real' (extralinguistic) life is at least as weird as the weirdest text ever written and probably more so. You never know when a theological theme may be lurking near (among other sorts). As Tolkien famously remarked: 'It does not do to leave a live [theological] dragon out of your calculations, if you live near him.'

Well, a fair point here. But in a story that is so much about the telling of stories, something of the nature of storytelling seems to be part of the story.

I agree with what you think Wolfe etc. think -- that is, I think that reality is not only queerer than we think, it's queerer than we are capable of thinking (or writing) about. But I _also_ think that there are some things that are artifacts of writing and are possible only in texts (though I mean much more by "write" and "text" than you probably think: as Frere Derrida says, we are never outside of the text).

Dan'l Danehy-Oakes

António Pedro Marques — 26 Oct 2011, 16:47 · in reply to Dan'l Danehy-Oakes

Dan'l Danehy-Oakes wrote (26-10-2011 17:42):

Ant?nio Pedro Marques wrote:

Let's be economical. They're telling stories. The stories set off as biographical, but there's no reason they must remain accurate. Just because they insert some character into a story they're telling which started off as biographical, it doesn't follow that they think the character really existed in their lives. If I tell some story about my childhood and at some point put Kirsten Dunst in it, it doesn't follow that I suddenly think Kirsten Dunst was part of my childhood.

But if you tell a story about your childhood, and _someone else_ causes you to put Kirsten Dunst into it, and afterwards you remember Kirsten Dunst being a part of it ... well, that's a different kettle-o'-fish entirely.

Yes, but we're missing the 'afterwards you remember Kirsten Dunst being a part of it' part. It may be there, but I don't remember it.

Daniel Petersen — 26 Oct 2011, 16:56 · in reply to Dan'l Danehy-Oakes

*On Wed, Oct 26, 2011 at 5:45 PM, Dan'l Danehy-Oakes <danldo at gmail.com> wrote:

...something of the nature of storytelling seems to be part of the story*

Oh yes, definitely. The supernatural realism and concern with stories and storytelling are not at all mutually exclusive - in fact, they're pretty much guaranteed to be inextricably bound together for Wolfe.

...reality is not only queerer than we think, it's queerer than we are capable of thinking (or writing) about. But I _also_ think that there are some things that are artifacts of writing and are possible only in texts (though I mean much more by "write" and "text" than you probably think: as Frere Derrida says, we are never outside of the text).

I won't pretend to completely understand the metaphysical view you're alluding to without a lengthy discussion over some pints, but I think I'm sympathetic to one degree or another. The Catholic writers (and other non-reductionist writers) aren't committed to a view of reality that knows no difference between text and world. It's just that we are best to bet there's usually an open door of possibility for even the wildest phenomena of the text to be extra-textual phenomena too.

-DOJP

Dan'l Danehy-Oakes — 26 Oct 2011, 17:05 · in reply to Daniel Petersen

Daniel Petersen wrote:

The Catholic writers (and other non-reductionist writers) aren't committed to a view of reality that knows no difference between text and world.

Remember that for us (I too am an adult convert to Catholicism, among other things) the wor(l)d was spoken -- is in itself a kind of text. The Word of God was made flesh, and indeed has its point-of-origin in some sense in the flesh; it is always already _incarnate_ (i.e., not merely spoken but written). The spoken word of God is the Act of Creation: Let there be <foo> and there was <foo> .

It's just that we are best to bet there's usually an open door of possibility for even the wildest phenomena

of the text to be extra-textual phenomena too.

What I am saying is that there _are_ no extra-textual phenomena: all phenomena are in some sense textual. I think that to understand what Wolfe is doing here we must understand not only the textuality of the text but the _radical_ textuality of the "internal" reality of his stories.

Also, Wolfe messes with unreliable narrators. Now, when a narrator inside a story told by an unreliable narrator tells a story, is that story (and that narrator) reliable? Why or why not? What _is_ there for us to interpret, but the text and its intertextuality?

Dan'l Danehy-Oakes

Marc Aramini — 26 Oct 2011, 17:20 · in reply to António Pedro Marques

--- On Wed, 10/26/11, Ant?nio Pedro Marques <antonio at gmail.com> wrote:

There are two separate issues here:

- whether it is definite for you
- whether it is consensual

Yes, it may be definite for you; however, for you to say it is definite, not qualified explicitly or by context, and not expect others to complain, it also has to be consensual.

I don't expect consensus anymore (it's not useful at all when discussing Wolfe), but I do believe in absolute truth. Complaints are simply not relevant in this particular case, for a lot of reasons, not necessarily explicit but neither entirely non-contextual. I would like to bury it there.

Complaining and gnashing of teeth cannot unmake reality, unless Silk is meddling in these posts.

Daniel Petersen — 26 Oct 2011, 17:29 · in reply to Dan'l Danehy-Oakes

I too am an adult convert to Catholicism, among other things

You've converted as an adult to other religions as well? Heh, heh, just jokin'.

*the wor(l)d was spoken -- is in itself a kind of text.

The Word of God was made flesh, and indeed has its point-of-origin in some sense in the flesh; it is always already _incarnate_ (i.e., not merely spoken but written). The spoken word of God is the Act of Creation*

Well, I admit I didn't expect you to go there, but, yeah, if we're talking about a Logos-cosmos when we say things like 'the world is text' or what have you, then I'm right there with you. That's the metaphysics I think Wolfe brings to his craft - and the craft is richer for it in my opinion.

(Incidentally, I accept such a worldview as well, though not myself RC - a lowly Proddy I'm afraid - we can't seem to make any great authors of our own so we are ever the barnacles on the great RC writers - though I'm proud to steal a ride from such legendary vessels as Chesterton, Wolfe, O'Connor, Percy, Lafferty, etc.)

*I think that to understand what

Wolfe is doing here we must understand not only the textuality of the text but the _radical_ textuality of the "internal" reality of his stories.*

Don't think I understand this bit.

*What _is_ there

for us to interpret, but the text and its intertextuality?*

I'm not sure Wolfe ever gets so far down inside a narratological rat's nest that he or we can never emerge. From interviews I'd say he definitely envisions us going all the way through the labyrinth and out again, bewildered and humbled, yes, but also wiser and nobler. We readers have a hard time trusting him about this and even wonder if it's just one more lie, I think. But I have to say, without any thought as to whether I ever understand even a small percent of the intertextual mysteries he delivers, I do trust his face-value claim that he's not just trying to irretrievably confuse his readers. (I'm not saying this because I think you, Dan'l, mistrust Wolfe's claim - I don't know one way or the other. It just occurs to me in thinking of being potentially locked only into his 'internal' text.)

I guess I mean that I don't think unreliability is the last word in Wolfe, even though he has made such extensive use of it.

-DOJP

Dan'l Danehy-Oakes — 26 Oct 2011, 18:09 · in reply to Daniel Petersen

Daniel Petersen wrote:

I too am an adult convert to Catholicism, among other things

You've converted as an adult to other religions as well? Heh, heh, just jokin'.

Other philosophies, to be sure.

Well, I admit I didn't expect you to go there, but, yeah, if we're talking about a Logos-cosmos when we say things like 'the world is text' or what have you, then I'm right there with you. That's the metaphysics I think Wolfe brings to his craft - and the craft is richer for it in my opinion.

I agree.

(Incidentally, I accept such a worldview as well, though not myself RC - a lowly Proddy I'm afraid - we can't seem to make any great authors of our own so we are ever the barnacles on the great RC writers - though I'm proud to steal a ride from such legendary vessels as Chesterton, Wolfe, O'Connor, Percy, Lafferty, etc.)

Oh, but! You have such giants as LaHaye and Jenkins!

(Ducking and running...)

Seriously, there are some pretty darn good Protestant writers, starting with Lewis and Williams (though they're both pretty high-church, in Williams's case so high it's basically Catholic Lite).

I think that to understand what

Wolfe is doing here we must understand not only the textuality of the text but the _radical_ textuality of the "internal" reality of his

stories.

Don't think I understand this bit.

What I am saying is that inside the text there is nothing but more text. If there is anything "extra-textual," it is what we bring to the text. ("Behind our efforts, let there be found our efforts.") The text is composed of signifiers, which (can) signify only because they are part of the web (textus) of other signifiers that constitutes the text. As above, so below: the text is fractally textual, when you dig down into it you find the structure of the larger text, repeated to infinity (or as close to infinity as a human creator can manage).

What is there
for us to interpret, but the text and its intertextuality?

I'm not sure Wolfe ever gets so far down inside a narratological rat's nest
that he or we can never emerge.

What would it mean to "emerge"? To emerge from Wolfe's text is merely to return to the larger textus of "reality," of which we are signifying nodes ... but then, so is Wolfe's text, it is embedded in the larger textus which allows it to signify.

From interviews I'd say he definitely
envisions us going all the way through the labyrinth and out again,
bewildered and humbled, yes, but also wiser and nobler. We readers have a
hard time trusting him about this and even wonder if it's just one more lie,

I think Wolfe is a very tricky writer, but honest in his way. Even his unreliable narrators have their reliability -- once you decrypt

why they are hiding you can decode what is hidden. But Wolfe is sometimes too tricky for his own good and it can be hard to figure out all the "why"s.

I think. But I have to say, without any thought as to whether I ever
understand even a small percent of the intertextual mysteries he delivers, I
do trust his face-value claim that he's not just trying to irretrievably
confuse his readers. (I'm not saying this because I think you, Dan'I,
mistrust Wolfe's claim - I don't know one way or the other. It just occurs
to me in thinking of being potentially locked only into his 'internal'
text.)

I do indeed trust Wolfe's claim, but distrust his ability to deliver on it. I don't think he deliberately creates insoluble puzzles, but I suspect he becomes frustrated with our inability to find what, to him, is so obvious. There's a passage in Campbell and Robinson's "Skeleton Key to Finnegans Wake" where they say that Joyce is driven to his obscurity because he is desperately trying to tell us something too obvious for clarity, or something like that. I think that Wolfe is in his way as obscure, and as brilliant, as Joyce -- and far less impressed with his own cleverness than Joyce was.

I guess I mean that I don't think unreliability is the last word in Wolfe,
even though he has made such extensive use of it.

I don't know if there can ever be a "last word" in any text as rich as the Solar labyrinth, but I agree that, if there were, it would not be unreliability. Wolfe is striving for clarity.

Dan'I Danehy-Oakes

James Wynn — 26 Oct 2011, 18:15 · in reply to António Pedro Marques

On 10/26/2011 11:28 AM, Ant?nio Pedro Marques wrote:
I've already assumed for the sake of discussion that time travel is
available to Incanto. I still don't see how it allows him to
manipulate the stories. Yes, it may explain his presence in the

grandmother's (but then again, that's about the most convincing evidence for time travel, so if it can have a different explanation then there goes the evidence), but not the others, nor the fact that they notice they're being manipulated.

Which other stories are being manipulated? Analyzing them in detail might be revealing.

IMO, the grandmother's tale is merely confirmation for what is already revealed by the presence of the astral Oreb and (hence) the Rajan in "Lake of the Long Sun".

J.

Daniel Petersen — 26 Oct 2011, 18:37 · in reply to Dan'I Danehy-Oakes

*Oh, but! You have such giants as LaHaye and Jenkins!

(Ducking and running...)*

I laid myself bare and you took full advantage. As soon as I recover from this dirty below the belt winding I shall thrash you soundly if I may but find a way... (I was laughing aloud truth be told.) Yes, the high churchman Lewis and Williams are great and I'll happily claim them for my 'camp' (the fine Cordwainer Smith fits here too I believe). Of course, with Bunyan and Milton we have some of the BEST EVER writers on our team. Something just seemed to go drastically wrong after the 17th century.

Good thoughts on the rest. I'll have to ponder it all. Especially some idea of 'emerging' from Wolfe's text - a sense of 'completion' or having journeyed *somewhere* during the immersion into his narratives. I think there must be something like this going on - no matter how otherwise ever-open his texts remain. (Probably something similar to going from Briah 'up' to the 'higher' universe (I forget the name - starts with 'Y?') - the journey's FAR from over, but you're definitely NOT where you started.

And I agree with you that Wolfe is probably sometimes too tricky for his own good - I trust his intentions but not necessarily his ability to deliver

- yes. Good connection to Joyce studies too.

-DOJP

On Wed, Oct 26, 2011 at 7:09 PM, Dan'I Danehy-Oakes <danldo at gmail.com> wrote:
Daniel Petersen wrote:

I too am an adult convert to Catholicism, among other things

You've converted as an adult to other religions as well? Heh, heh, just jokin'.

Other philosophies, to be sure.

Well, I admit I didn't expect you to go there, but, yeah, if we're talking about a Logos-cosmos when we say things like 'the world is text' or what have you, then I'm right there with you. That's the metaphysics I think Wolfe brings to his craft - and the craft is richer for it in my opinion.

I agree.

(Incidentally, I accept such a worldview as well, though not myself RC -
a

lowly Proddy I'm afraid - we can't seem to make any great authors of our own

so we are ever the barnacles on the great RC writers - though I'm proud to

steal a ride from such legendary vessels as Chesterton, Wolfe, O'Connor, Percy, Lafferty, etc.)

Oh, but! You have such giants as LaHaye and Jenkins!

(Ducking and running...)

Seriously, there are some pretty darn good Protestant writers, starting with Lewis and Williams (though they're both pretty high-church, in Williams's case so high it's basically Catholic Lite).

I think that to understand what

Wolfe is doing here we must understand not only the textuality of the text but the _radical_ textuality of the "internal" reality of his stories.

Don't think I understand this bit.

What I am saying is that inside the text there is nothing but more text. If there is anything "extra-textual," it is what _we_ bring to the text. ("Behind our efforts, let there be found our efforts.") The text is composed of signifiers, which (can) signify only because they are part of the web (_textus_) of other signifiers that constitutes the text. As above, so below: the text is fractally textual, when you dig down into it you find the structure of the larger text, repeated to infinity (or as close to infinity as a human creator can manage).

What _is_ there

for us to interpret, but the text and its intertextuality?

I'm not sure Wolfe ever gets so far down inside a narratological rat's nest

that he or we can never emerge.

What would it mean to "emerge"? To emerge from Wolfe's text is merely to return to the larger textus of "reality," of which we are signifying nodes ... but then, so is Wolfe's text, it is embedded in the larger textus which allows it to signify.

From interviews I'd say he definitely envisions us going all the way through the labyrinth and out again, bewildered and humbled, yes, but also wiser and nobler. We readers have a hard time trusting him about this and even wonder if it's just one more lie,

I think Wolfe is a very tricky writer, but honest in his way. Even his unreliable narrators have their reliability -- once you decrypt _why_ they are hiding you can decode _what_ is hidden. But Wolfe is sometimes too tricky for his own good and it can be hard to figure out all the "why"s.

I think. But I have to say, without any thought as to whether I ever understand even a small percent of the intertextual mysteries he delivers, I

do trust his face-value claim that he's not just trying to irretrievably confuse his readers. (I'm not saying this because I think you, Dan'I, mistrust Wolfe's claim - I don't know one way or the other. It just

occurs

to me in thinking of being potentially locked only into his 'internal' text.)

I do indeed trust Wolfe's claim, but distrust his ability to _deliver_ on it. I don't think he deliberately creates insoluble puzzles, but I suspect he becomes frustrated with our inability to find what, to him, is so obvious. There's a passage in Campbell and Robinson's "Skeleton Key to Finnegans Wake" where they say that Joyce is driven to his obscurity because he is desperately trying to tell us something too obvious for clarity, or something like that. I think that Wolfe is in his way as obscure, and as brilliant, as Joyce -- and _far_ less impressed with his own cleverness than Joyce was.

I guess I mean that I don't think unreliability is the last word in Wolfe, even though he has made such extensive use of it.

I don't know if there can ever be a "last word" in any text as rich as the Solar labyrinth, but I agree that, if there were, it would not be unreliability. Wolfe is striving for clarity.

--

Dan'l Danehy-Oakes

Dan'l Danehy-Oakes — 26 Oct 2011, 18:44 · in reply to Daniel Petersen

Oh, I am so _embarrassed_ not to have thought of Cordwainer Smith...

On Wed, Oct 26, 2011 at 11:37 AM, Daniel Petersen
<danielottojackpetersen at gmail.com> wrote:
Oh, but! You have such giants as LaHaye and Jenkins!

(Ducking and running...)

I laid myself bare and you took full advantage. As soon as I recover from this dirty below the belt winding I shall thrash you soundly if I may but find a way... (I was laughing aloud truth be told.)? Yes, the high churchman Lewis and Williams are great and I'll happily claim them for my 'camp' (the fine Cordwainer Smith fits here too I believe). Of course, with Bunyan and Milton we have some of the BEST EVER writers on our team. Something just seemed to go drastically wrong after the 17th century.

Good thoughts on the rest. I'll have to ponder it all. Especially some idea of 'emerging' from Wolfe's text - a sense of 'completion' or having journeyed somewhere during the immersion into his narratives. I think there must be something like this going on - no matter how otherwise ever-open his texts remain. (Probably something similar to going from Bria'h 'up' to the 'higher' universe (I forget the name - starts with 'Y'?) - the journey's FAR from over, but you're definitely NOT where you started.

And I agree with you that Wolfe is probably sometimes too tricky for his own good - I trust his intentions but not necessarily his ability to deliver - yes. Good connection to Joyce studies too.

-DOJP

On Wed, Oct 26, 2011 at 7:09 PM, Dan'l Danehy-Oakes <danlido at gmail.com> wrote:

Daniel Petersen wrote:

I too am an adult convert to Catholicism, among other things

You've converted as an adult to other religions as well? Heh, heh, just jokin'.

Other philosophies, to be sure.

Well, I admit I didn't expect you to go there, but, yeah, if we're talking about a Logos-cosmos when we say things like 'the world is text' or what have you, then I'm right there with you. That's the metaphysics I think Wolfe brings to his craft - and the craft is richer for it in my opinion.

I agree.

(Incidentally, I accept such a worldview as well, though not myself RC - a lowly Proddy I'm afraid - we can't seem to make any great authors of our own so we are ever the barnacles on the great RC writers - though I'm proud to steal a ride from such legendary vessels as Chesterton, Wolfe, O'Connor, Percy, Lafferty, etc.)

Oh, but! You have such giants as LaHaye and Jenkins!

(Ducking and running...)

Seriously, there are some pretty darn good Protestant writers, starting with Lewis and Williams (though they're both pretty high-church, in Williams's case so high it's basically Catholic Lite).

I think that to understand what Wolfe is doing here we must understand not only the textuality of the text but the _radical_ textuality of the "internal" reality of his stories.

Don't think I understand this bit.

What I am saying is that inside the text there is nothing but more text. If there is anything "extra-textual," it is what _we_ bring to the text. ("Behind our efforts, let there be found our efforts.") The text is composed of signifiers, which (can) signify only because they are part of the web (_textus_) of other signifiers that constitutes the text. As above, so below: the text is fractally textual, when you dig down into it you find the structure of the larger text, repeated to infinity (or as close to infinity as a human creator can manage).

What _is_ there for us to interpret, but the text and its intertextuality?

I'm not sure Wolfe ever gets so far down inside a narratological rat's

nest
that he or we can never emerge.

What would it mean to "emerge"? To emerge from Wolfe's text is merely to return to the larger textus of "reality," of which we are signifying nodes ... but then, so is Wolfe's text, it is embedded in the larger textus which allows it to signify.

From interviews I'd say he definitely envisions us going all the way through the labyrinth and out again, bewildered and humbled, yes, but also wiser and nobler. We readers have a hard time trusting him about this and even wonder if it's just one more lie,

I think Wolfe is a very tricky writer, but honest in his way. Even his unreliable narrators have their reliability -- once you decrypt _why_ they are hiding you can decode _what_ is hidden. But Wolfe is sometimes too tricky for his own good and it can be hard to figure out all the "why"s.

I think. But I have to say, without any thought as to whether I ever understand even a small percent of the intertextual mysteries he delivers, I do trust his face-value claim that he's not just trying to irretrievably confuse his readers. (I'm not saying this because I think you, Dan'I, mistrust Wolfe's claim - I don't know one way or the other. It just occurs to me in thinking of being potentially locked only into his 'internal' text.)

I do indeed trust Wolfe's claim, but distrust his ability to _deliver_ on it. I don't think he deliberately creates insoluble puzzles, but I suspect he becomes frustrated with our inability to find what, to him, is so obvious. There's a passage in Campbell and Robinson's "Skeleton Key to Finnegans Wake" where they say that Joyce is driven to his obscurity because he is desperately trying to tell us something too obvious for clarity, or something like that. I think that Wolfe is in his way as obscure, and as brilliant, as Joyce -- and _far_ less impressed with his own cleverness than Joyce was.

I guess I mean that I don't think unreliability is the last word in Wolfe, even though he has made such extensive use of it.

I don't know if there can ever be a "last word" in any text as rich as the Solar labyrinth, but I agree that, if there were, it would not be unreliability. Wolfe is striving for clarity.

--

Dan'I Danehy-Oakes

James Wynn — 26 Oct 2011, 19:12 · in reply to Daniel Petersen

(Incidentally, I accept such a worldview as well, though not myself RC - a lowly Proddy I'm afraid - we can't seem to make any great authors of our own so we are ever the barnacles on the great RC writers - though I'm proud to steal a ride from such legendary vessels as Chesterton, Wolfe, O'Connor, Percy, Lafferty, etc.)

CS Lewis, Charles Williams, George MacDonald, John Bunyan.

Although, one does sense that Protestants prefer non-fiction. But they still represent.

J.

Daniel Petersen — 26 Oct 2011, 19:49 · in reply to James Wynn

George MacD! How could I neglect to mention one of my all-time faves. Well, thanks all for reminding me that Proddys do represent! (Although it seems to have been a suspiciously long while - anything since Smith in the 50s? Walter Wangerin's Book of the Dun Cow from the late 70s is excellent and he's a very good writer - but he didn't really pan out overall I think.) [Don't any of you *dare* mention that Legislation-cephalus fellow.]

-DOJP

On Wed, Oct 26, 2011 at 8:12 PM, James Wynn <crushtv at gmail.com> wrote:

(Incidentally, I accept such a worldview as well, though not myself RC - a lowly Proddy I'm afraid - we can't seem to make any great authors of our own so we are ever the barnacles on the great RC writers - though I'm proud to steal a ride from such legendary vessels as Chesterton, Wolfe, O'Connor, Percy, Lafferty, etc.)

CS Lewis, Charles Williams, George MacDonald, John Bunyan.

Although, one does sense that Protestants prefer non-fiction. But they still represent.

J.

**

Dan'l Danehy-Oakes — 26 Oct 2011, 20:11 · in reply to Daniel Petersen

Oh, and. Madeleine L'Engle and Susan Cooper (both Anglican/Episcopal), Connie Willis and Dr Seuss (Lutheran), Steven King and Jack Williamson (Methodist), and Orson Scott Card if you want to count Mormons as a kind of Protestants.

On Wed, Oct 26, 2011 at 12:49 PM, Daniel Petersen <danielottojackpetersen at gmail.com> wrote:

George MacD!? How could I neglect to mention one of my all-time faves. Well, thanks all for reminding me that Proddys do represent!? (Although it seems to have been a suspiciously long while - anything since Smith in the 50s? Walter Wangerin's Book of the Dun Cow from the late 70s is excellent and he's a very good writer - but he didn't really pan out overall I think.)? [Don't any of you dare mention that Legislation-cephalus fellow.]

-DOJP

On Wed, Oct 26, 2011 at 8:12 PM, James Wynn <crushtv at gmail.com> wrote:

(Incidentally, I accept such a worldview as well, though not myself RC - a lowly Proddy I'm afraid - we can't seem to make any great authors of our own so we are ever the barnacles on the great RC writers - though I'm proud to steal a ride from such legendary vessels as Chesterton, Wolfe, O'Connor, Percy, Lafferty, etc.)

CS Lewis, Charles Williams, George MacDonald, John Bunyan.

Although, one does sense that Protestants prefer non-fiction. But they still represent.

J.

James Wynn — 26 Oct 2011, 20:42 · in reply to Dan'l Danehy-Oakes

On 10/26/2011 3:11 PM, Dan'l Danehy-Oakes wrote:
Orson Scott Card if you want to count Mormons as a kind of Protestants.

They, at least, think they are. And they definitely share in the Evangelical culture.

J.

Gerry Quinn — 27 Oct 2011, 12:55 · in reply to Dan'l Danehy-Oakes

From: Dan'l Danehy-Oakes

It seems to me that Wolfe is deliberately posing a dilemma about memory (and time-travel) with Incanto's dream-travel. When he changes something in someone's past, they remember it both the "new" way and the "old" way. Now, if he "really" changed the past, they should remember it "only" the "new" way -- the "old" way now always never happened. But if he doesn't, then what is he changing? "Only" the memories of the person telling the story? Yet, the changes seem to have "real" consequences; and, again, if he really _changed_ their memories, they should not remember the pre-change version. Or should they?

I'm staying out of this until I've re-read Short Sun, then I'll come up with naturalistic explanations if I can!

I will note, however, that Master Ash interacts with Severian, even though he comes from one of multiple futures. How well that ties in with time-travelling hierodules etc. is a question for another day.

- Gerry Quinn

Gerry Quinn — 27 Oct 2011, 12:58 · in reply to António Pedro Marques

From: António Pedro Marques

Dan'l Danehy-Oakes wrote (26-10-2011 17:42):

But if you tell a story about your childhood, and _someone else_ causes you to put Kirsten Dunst into it, and afterwards you remember Kirsten Dunst being a part of it ... well, that's a different kettle-o'-fish entirely.

Yes, but we're missing the 'afterwards you remember Kirsten Dunst being a part of it' part. It may be there, but I don't remember it.

Of course such things can happen in real life: see "recovered memory syndrome".

- Gerry Quinn