

The Lupiverse(es)

The Urth list — 3 messages, 3 voices, 16 Mar 2012

<https://urth.darkrealm.vip/thread/urth/6183>

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

Lee Berman — 16 Mar 2012, 00:42

Craig Brewer: I tend to agree with you. After all, an author can say what he attempted to do. He can't always claim that he was successful or in as much control as he thought.

Heh, yep. Reminds me of David and my discussions on author as demiurge. You can create everything in a world but you can't control the free will of the residents/audience.

After all, Milton came up earlier: people love PL because they think it's a profoundly Christian work AND because they think it's secretly subversive of that.

Hm, I think Wolfe's work resembles this. SF is a genre which has been a historic breeding ground for atheistic thought. Good portions of it have been devoted to explaining away religious beliefs and God's creation using science. Wolfe's work might be called profoundly SF (he has certainly collected enough SF awards) but I think he uses his work to secretly subvert SF by explaining it away with religion.

That overstates it of course. Wolfe seems to want science and religion to coexist in some sort of simultaneous harmony. But in a literary world populated by Dr. Cranes, that could be seen as a form of subversion.

If Wolfe said on his deathbed that it was all a clever front for a revival of Confucianism, it would affect more than just my interpretation, but also how I chose, decoded, etc., what actually happened in the story itself.

Thanks for this answer. It seems like a response which required some self-contemplation and is a realistic (as opposed to idealistic) prediction of your reaction to my hypothetical scenario.

Craig Brewer — 16 Mar 2012, 01:06 · in reply to Lee Berman

Can we change the subject? How about this: whoever's going to the dinner, ask him if anything magical ever really happened in The Sorcerer's House, or if it was all just a fancy epistolary con.

(I'm so jealous of you people...I have to be at, not even *in*, a wedding for my wife's friend. Sometimes marriage isn't quite worth it...)

David Stockhoff — 16 Mar 2012, 01:39 · in reply to Lee Berman

On 3/15/2012 8:42 PM, Lee Berman wrote:
After all, Milton came up earlier: people love PL because they think it's a profoundly

Christian work AND because they think it's secretly subversive of that.

Hm, I think Wolfe's work resembles this. SF is a genre which has been a historic breeding ground for atheistic thought. Good portions of it have been devoted to explaining away religious beliefs and God's creation using science. Wolfe's work might be called profoundly SF (he has certainly collected enough SF awards) but I think he uses his work to secretly subvert SF by explaining it away with religion.

That overstates it of course. Wolfe seems to want science and religion to coexist in some sort of simultaneous harmony. But in a literary world populated by Dr. Cranes, that could be seen as a form of subversion.

Possibly. It's true that many of the Golden Age SF writers were Jewish. But look at how many fantasy writers were overtly Christian.

Perhaps there is more of an argument to be made that Wolfe subverts SF by bringing fantasy into it.