

Confusing passage

The Urth list — 7 messages, 5 voices, 18 Sep 2012

<https://urth.darkrealm.vip/thread/urth/6290>

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 — 18 Sep 2012, 03:06

From On Blue's Waters, Ch. 5 section 6:

Even Hoof and Horn [sic], who must just be entering young manhood now will someday be as old as Marrow and Patera Remora.....in fifty years, Horn and Hide [sic] may well be dead....These words, which I pen with so little thought- or hope- or expectation- may possibly endure long beyond that, endure for two centuries or even three...

I am confused by this. I could guess the first [sic] is a way of forshadowing that Horn's self-identity will come into question later. But what about the second [sic]? Is Hide's identity also to come into question? Or does the second [sic] also refer to Horn in the clause?

FWIW, I found the final sentence interesting in comparison with Gene Wolfe's answer in the Lawrence Person interview which was done shortly after Short Sun was written:

LP: Final question! Homer, of course, is one of those writers whose work is remembered, at least in his case, thousands of years after his death. How well do you think your own work will be remembered?

GW: Oh Lord! (long pause) Goodness sake. (pause) This is really, really a mean question that you're asking.....Uh, I don't know. Two or three hundred years, possibly. It's very hard to answer that without being either falsely modest or braggadocios. I would guess, a couple, three hundred years. That's only a guess.

<http://home.roadrunner.com/~lperson1/wolfe.html>

Gerry Quinn — 18 Sep 2012, 10:27 · in reply to Lee Berman

From: Lee Berman

From On Blue's Waters, Ch. 5 section 6:

Even Hoof and Horn [sic], who must just be entering young manhood now will someday be as old as Marrow and Patera Remora.....in fifty years, Horn and Hide [sic] may well be dead....These words, which I pen with so little thought- or hope- or expectation- may possibly endure long beyond that, endure for two centuries or even three...

I am confused by this. I could guess the first [sic] is a way of forshadowing that Horn's self-identity will come into question later. But what about the second [sic]? Is Hide's identity also to come into question? Or does the second [sic] also refer to Horn in the clause?

I say typo. It makes no sense as written, and the names are easily confusable. Reading the passage, I didn't notice it, so it's not implausible that author and proof-readers didn't either.
- Gerry Quinn

Sergei SOLOVIEV — 18 Sep 2012, 10:33 · in reply to Gerry Quinn

To my mind, [sic] corresponds to both names in both cases, and attracts the attention to the fact that the narrator knows the names Hoof and Hide, but may substitute Horn for each almost indifferently - so the identity that is questioned is rather the identity of the narrator. My impression was that it is stylistically nicely done.

Sergei Soloviev

Gerry Quinn wrote:

From: Lee Berman <mailto:severiansola at hotmail.com>

From On Blue's Waters, Ch. 5 section 6:

Even Hoof and Horn [sic], who must just be entering young manhood now will someday be as old as Marrow and Patera Remora.....in fifty years,

Horn and Hide [sic] may well be dead....These words, which I pen with so little thought- or hope- or expectation- may possibly endure long beyond that, endure for two centuries or even three...

I am confused by this. I could guess the first [sic] is a way of forshadowing that Horn's self-identity will come into question later. But what about the second [sic]? Is Hide's identity also to come into question? Or does the second [sic] also refer to Horn in the clause?

I say typo. It makes no sense as written, and the names are easily confusable. Reading the passage, I didn't notice it, so it's not implausible that author and proof-readers didn't either.

- Gerry Quinn

David Stockhoff — 18 Sep 2012, 12:31 · in reply to Sergei SOLOVIEV

Right---the two [sic]s are in the text. Lee didn't put them there. Horn's editors (Nettle?) did, because they were confused too.

On 9/18/2012 6:33 AM, Sergei SOLOVIEV wrote:

To my mind, [sic] corresponds to both names in both cases, and attracts the attention to the fact that the narrator knows the names Hoof and Hide, but may substitute Horn for each almost indifferently - so the identity that is questioned is rather the identity of the narrator. My impression was that it is stylistically nicely done.

Sergei Soloviev

Gerry Quinn wrote:

From: Lee Berman <mailto:severiansola at hotmail.com>

From On Blue's Waters, Ch. 5 section 6:

Even Hoof and Horn [sic], who must just be entering young manhood now
will someday be as old as Marrow and Patera Remora.....in fifty years,
Horn and Hide [sic] may well be dead....These words, which I pen with
so little thought- or hope- or expectation- may possibly endure long
beyond that, endure for two centuries or even three...

I am confused by this. I could guess the first [sic] is a way of
forshadowing that Horn's self-identity will come into question later.
But what about the second [sic]? Is Hide's identity also to come into
question? Or does the second [sic] also refer to Horn in the clause?

I say typo. It makes no sense as written, and the names are easily
confusable. Reading the passage, I didn't notice it, so it's not
implausible that author and proof-readers didn't either.

- Gerry Quinn

Marc Aramini — 18 Sep 2012, 15:02 · in reply to Gerry Quinn

No, Silk's personality is coming through here in Horn, confusing Hoof for his feelings for "Horn".
The [sic] is the narrators, daisy et al, putting that that is how Horn wrote it.

--- On Tue, 9/18/12, Gerry Quinn <gerry at bindweed.com> wrote:

From: Gerry Quinn <gerry at bindweed.com>
Subject: Re: (urth) Confusing passage
To: "The Urth Mailing List" <urth at lists.urth.net>
Date: Tuesday, September 18, 2012, 3:27 AM

From: Lee Berman

From On Blue's Waters, Ch. 5 section 6:

??? Even Hoof and Horn [sic], who must just be entering young manhood now
??? will someday be as old as Marrow and Patera Remora.....in fifty years,
??? Horn and Hide [sic] may well be dead....These words, which I pen with
??? so little thought- or hope- or expectation- may possibly endure long
??? beyond that, endure for two centuries or even three...

I am confused by this. I could guess the first [sic] is a way of
forshadowing that Horn's self-identity will come into question later.
But what about the second [sic]? Is Hide's identity also to come into
question? Or does the second [sic] also refer to Horn in the clause?

I say typo. It makes no sense as written, and the names are easily confusable. Reading the

passage, I didn't notice it, so it's not implausible that author and proof-readers didn't either.

- Gerry Quinn

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

Gerry Quinn — 18 Sep 2012, 16:29 · in reply to Marc Aramini

From: Marc Aramini

No, Silk's personality is coming through here in Horn, confusing Hoof for his feelings for "Horn". The [sic] is the narrators, daisy et al, putting that that is how Horn wrote it.

Yes, that explanation makes sense. I hadn't realised the 'sic' was in the text.

- Gerry Quinn

Lee Berman — 18 Sep 2012, 17:03 · follows Gerry Quinn

Marc Aramini: No, Silk's personality is coming through here in Horn, confusing Hoof for his feelings for "Horn".

Thanks Gerry, Sergei and David for helpful comments on this passage. I agree with Gerry that Marc really hits the nail on the head with the post above. Silk has paternal feelings for Horn. Horn has paternal feelings for Hoof and Hide. The feelings/names get confused in SilkHorn. This can nicely explain both [sic]s.