

Fan fic Fooey? Fooey

The Whorl list — 5 messages, 4 voices, 20 Jun 2001

<https://urth.darkrealm.vip/thread/whorl/1455>

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.

Adam Stephanides — 20 Jun 2001, 21:46

Dan'l Danehy-Oakes wrote:

Okay, I'm not a libel lawyer, but there's a `_reason_` for all those "no resemblance to any person living or dead" disclaimers you read in the front of books, and there's no way any of those Nsync fans could claim that their fictional characters bore no resemblance to the real bandmembers. Oy, whatever.

Just as a digression, I've always wondered whether those really do any good. A lot of books with such disclaimers contain charaters whose "resemblance to persons living or dead" is more than coincidental; and in the one case I've heard of in which an author was sued for libel and lost for her portrayal of a fictional character, I'd bet that the disclaimer was there.

If there were Lupine slash, I'd lay odds that the most popular relationship would be Horn/Krait.

Duh. Should of thought of that one myself. Or maybe Silk/Horn, though it would be hard to locate that in the received chronology... Maybe Jolenta/Dorcas...

I thought of that last one, but m/m seems to be a lot more popular than f/f.

But functionally, I would argue that the sections are fiction, and should be read as fiction, with a protagonist who is distinct from Narr, but based on the editors' view of Narr.

Functionally, I would disagree strongly. By interspersing their reconstructions with the Narr's manuscript, I feel that they've implicitly claimed for it a status of equivalent facticity, to which it is not entitled. Which drags me back to the Gospel According to Luke... but I'll let that one swing.

Okay, "functionally" was not a very good choice of word (I'm not sure now why I used it). I agree that the narrators implicitly claim for their third-person sections equivalent facticity to the Narr's manuscript (or more so, since it's third-person, and occasionally shows us stuff the Narr apparently did not witness). What I was trying to say was that once we realize that the third-person sections do not have this status, the best way for us, the readers, to regard them is as a fiction.

Whether or not you want to say the editors are lying depends upon how loosely you're willing to let them apply the term "re-created."

(To return to the Biblical analogy for a second, I note that contemporary scholars are reluctant to say that the authors of apocryphal texts, or texts in the Bible believed not to be by their supposed authors, were lying or committing fraud in claiming false authorship. They usually take the stand that this was a convention of the time, to sign some holy person's name to your text as a way of claiming authority for it. To go even further afield, it occurs to me to wonder if there is any evidence that people of the time saw things that way--that the attributed author

was merely a convention, making no claim about the real author.)

--Adam

*This is WHORL, for discussion of Gene Wolfe's Book of the Long Sun.

Kevin J. Maroney — 21 Jun 2001, 11:36 · follows Adam Stephanides

At 09:46 PM 6/20/01 -0500, Adam wrote:

To go even further afield,

it occurs to me to wonder if there is any evidence that people of the time saw things that way--that the attributed author was merely a convention, making no claim about the real author.)

In my classical readings, I've come across references to pseudipigraphia which are outside of the Jewish and Christian traditions--much later works attributed to Virgil and suchlike. Heck, think of Plato--he wrote dozens of books which put his own thoughts in the mouth of Sophocles.

Wombat, a.k.a. Kevin Maroney kmaroney at ungames.com
Kitchen Staff Supervisor, New York Review of Science Fiction
<http://www.nyrsf.com>

*This is WHORL, for discussion of Gene Wolfe's Book of the Long Sun.

Dan'l Danehy-Oakes — 21 Jun 2001, 09:19 · follows Kevin J. Maroney

In my classical readings, I've come across references to pseudipigraphia which are outside of the Jewish and Christian traditions--much later works attributed to Virgil and suchlike.

Yep. And the idea persists in the Christian tradition well beyond the time of the apostles: an excellent example being a set of works which were probably by a Syrian monk in the 5th or 6th century, but widely accepted for a long time as the work of Dionysius the Areopagite (a guy who Paul converted in Acts), and were so important in the development of theology that they're still in circulation (as the "work of Pseudo-Dionysius").

Heck, think of Plato--he wrote dozens of books which put his own thoughts in the mouth of Sophocles.

No. No way I'm touching this one. Uh-uh.

--Dan'l

*This is WHORL, for discussion of Gene Wolfe's Book of the Long Sun.

Jerry Friedman — 21 Jun 2001, 09:49 · follows Dan'l Danehy-Oakes

--- Dan'l Danehy-Oakes <ddanehy at siebel.com> wrote:

...

Heck, think of Plato--he wrote dozens of books which put his own thoughts in the mouth of Sophocles.

No. No way I'm touching this one. Uh-uh.

You could at least say "Socrates" safely.

Jerry Friedman

Adam Stephanides — 21 Jun 2001, 11:31 · follows Jerry Friedman

on 6/21/01 10:36 AM, Kevin J. Maroney at kmaroney at ungames.com wrote:
In my classical readings, I've come across references to pseudipigraphia
which are outside of the Jewish and Christian traditions--much later works
attributed to Virgil and suchlike.

I'm sure there are; but my question applies to these too. Did people of the time regard these attributions as merely a convention? Or were they fooled into thinking they were reading works by the real Virgil? Or, whether or not they were fooled, did they believe that the author meant them to think that these works were written by the real Virgil?

Heck, think of Plato--he wrote dozens of
books which put his own thoughts in the mouth of Sophocles.

You mean Socrates, obviously.

*This is WHORL, for discussion of Gene Wolfe's Book of the Long Sun.