

---

---

# C O S M O P O L I S

---

---

Number 15

April–May, 2001

---

---

## THE GIFT VOLUME

*a special VIE preview.*

---

### C O U P d e G R A C E and Other Stories

The *VIE* is planning to publish a preview book, to include some great, rare and favorite Vance shorts. We will use this book to promote Jack Vance and the *VIE* at the international book fair in Frankfurt this fall. It is conceived as an introduction to Jack Vance for those who have never read him. Presented in *VIE* format, it will speak our conviction that Vance is a writer to be taken seriously. The Gift Volume will contain the following seven texts: *Flutic*, *The Coup de Grace*, *Green Magic*, *The Murthe*, *Alfred's Arc*, *The Moon Moth*, *Dodkin's Job*. It will be printed and bound in the same style as

the Reader's Edition. It is not a part of the *VIE* book set, but includes stories from three different *VIE* volumes. It will be delivered in the fall of 2001. This preview is also a way for us to oil our production wheels.

Price: \$25, plus a shipping fee of \$8 or less. There is a 10% discount on any order of 2 or more books. See all the details, and order your copies at: <http://www.vanceintegral.com/GiftVolume/> Orders will be accepted for a limited time only, so don't dawdle. Updates about the Gift Volume will be posted.

#### Contents

- |    |  |
|----|--|
| 1  | Proofing Update and<br>HONOR ROLL<br>Steve Shreman |
| 4  | Downpayments<br>Bob Lacovara                       |
| 4  | Project Report<br>Paul Rhoads                      |
| 6  | VIE Volunteer Ombudsman<br>Hans van der Veeke      |
| 6  | Post-Proofing Guidelines<br>Chris Corley           |
| 10 | VIE Lending Library<br>Suan Yong                   |
| 12 | VIE Illustrations<br>Paul Rhoads                   |
| 13 | TI for <i>Book of Dreams</i><br>Patrick Dusoulier  |
| 17 | Sci-Fi Re-Redux<br>Paul Rhoads                     |
| 18 | The Cosmopolis Literary<br>Supplement              |
| 18 | Jane Austin and Jack Vance<br>Paul Rhoads          |
| 21 | Letter—Pro Paul Auster<br>Bill Sherman             |

---

### Proofreading Update

With the publication of the list above, the phase of the *VIE* known as PreProofing comes to an end. We now have reasonably clean texts of each of the works of Jack Vance; the ongoing efforts of the Double Digitization and TechnoProofing teams will make them even cleaner, and the Textual Integrity work now in progress will ensure that the work of this remarkable and unique writer will see print in as close to the form he intended as possible.

I know I speak for all of *VIE* management when I express gratitude for the many thousands of hours of dedicated labor by this group of over a hundred volunteers. Many of them have already gone on to other duties: DD, Techno, TI, PostProofing, Composition. Every one has made a lasting contribution to the *VIE*. For myself, it has been a unique pleasure to work with these fellow admirers of Jack Vance. I've said it before and I'll say it again: in 34 years as a software developer, I've worked in any number of collaborative projects. No other has been as collegial, as gratifying and as successful as the *VIE*.

I want to say special thanks to the Proofreader Support Team of Chris Corley, Dave Kennedy and Patrick Dusoulier. Numerous proofreaders, upon completing a first assignment under the guidance of these master proofers, have expressed the degree to which their job was made easier and more pleasant by being able to draw upon such a reservoir of experience and expertise. Thanks are also due to Suan Yong, whose mastery of arcane and diabolical software systems permits him to produce statistics and reports on just about anything I can think of—the honor roll below is just the latest example.

Really, I should express thanks to everybody in *VIE* management. There is not a one of them who hasn't found some way to help me do a better job. If I mention John Schwab and Tim Stretton specifically, it is only because I have had the most interaction with them; they have therefore saved me from messing up more often than anyone else. And my gratitude to Paul Rhoads, who remains the source of the vision of the *VIE*, cannot be expressed in words, at least not by anyone whose gifts with the language are not a significant fraction of Jack Vance's own.

*Steve Sherman*

Proofreading Team Lead\*

\* Editor's note: Steve has worked himself out of a job as the PreProofing team lead, and now is a principal editor with the TI team, as well as the Monkey team lead.

## HONOR ROLL: THE PROOFREADERS

### *A Practical Man's Guide*

Brian Bieniowski  
Arjan Bokx  
Kimmo Eriksson

### *Abercrombie Station*

Patrick Dusoulier  
Lawrence McKay Jr  
Turlough O'Connor

### *The Absent Minded Professor*

Carl Goldman  
Stéphane Leibovitsch  
Thomas Rydbeck

### *Alfred's Ark*

Foppe Brolsma  
Patrick Hudson  
R C Lacovara  
Paul Rhoads

### *The Anome*

Steve Sherman  
Suan Yong

### *Araminta Station*

Michel Bazin  
Richard Chandler  
John Schwab

### *The Asutra*

Linnéa Anglemark  
Chris McCormick  
Tim Stretton

### *The Augmented Agent*

Helmut Hlavacs  
George Logan  
Jeffrey Ruszczczyk

### *Bad Ronald*

David Kennedy  
Gabriel Stein

### *Big Planet*

Michel Bazin  
Jody Kelly  
Steve Sherman

### *Bird Island*

David Kennedy  
Hans van der Veeke  
Douglas Wilson

### *The Blue World*

Patrick Dusoulier  
David Mead  
Steve Sherman

### *The Book of Dreams*

Ronald Chernich  
Lawrence McKay Jr  
Dave Worden

### *The Brave Free Men*

Mike Barrett  
Chris Coulter  
Greg Reddick

### *Cat Island*

Chris McCormick

### *The Chasch*

Ronald Chernich  
David Kennedy  
Lee Lewis  
Tonio Loewald

### *Chateau d'If*

Erik Arendse  
Arjan Bokx  
Joel Hedlund

### *Cholwell's Chickens*

Patrick Dusoulier  
David Kennedy  
Bob Moody

### *Clarges*

Ronald Chernich  
Rob Friefeld  
Suan Yong

### *Coup de Grâce*

Peter Ikin  
Thomas Lindgren  
David Reitsema

### *Crusade to Maxus*

Peter Bayley  
Craig Heartwell  
Steve Sherman

### *Cugel the Clever*

Chris Budgen

### *D.P.*

Arjan Bokx  
Andrew Edlin  
Per Sundfeldt

### *The Dark Ocean*

Evert Jan de Groot  
Antonio Duarte III  
Rob Gerrand  
Steve Sherman

### *Dead Ahead*

Damien Jones  
R C Lacovara

### *The Deadly Isles*

Michel Bazin  
Jody Kelly  
David Kennedy

### *The Devil On Salvation Bluff*

Jasper Groen  
Helmut Hlavacs  
Joe Ormond

### *The Dirdir*

David Kennedy  
Stéphane Leibovitsch

### *Dodkin's Job*

John Chalmers  
Chris McCormick  
Hans van der Veeke

### *The Dogtown Tourist Agency and Freitzke's Turn*

Mike Barrett  
Till Noever  
Suan Yong

### *Dover Spargill's Ghastly Floater*

Kurt Harriman

### *The Domains of Koryphon*

Michel Bazin  
David Kennedy  
Steve Sherman

### *The Dragon Masters*

Ronald Chernich  
Evert Jan de Groot  
Patrick Dusoulier  
Bob Moody  
Steve Sherman

### *Dream Castle*

Rob Friefeld  
David Reitsema  
Paul Wedderien

### *Ecce and Old Earth*

Ronald Chernich  
Till Noever  
Steve Sherman

### *Emphyrio*

Peter Bayley  
David Kennedy  
Richard Linton  
Steve Sherman  
Suan Yong

### *The Enchanted Princess*

Jasper Groen  
Lee Lewis  
David White

### *The Face*

Rob Friefeld  
Brent Heustess  
Tim Stretton  
Dave Worden

### *The Flesh Mask*

Paul Rhoads  
Koen Vyverman

### *Four Hundred Blackbirds*

Lisa Brown  
David Gorbet

### *The Fox Valley Murders*

Deborah Cohen  
Rob Friefeld  
Steve Sherman  
Suan Yong

### *The Genesee Slough Murders*

Hans van der Veeke

### *The God and the Temple Robber*

Richard Behrens  
R C Lacovara

### *Gold and Iron*

R C Lacovara  
Jeffrey Ruszczczyk  
Steve Sherman  
Gan Uesli Starling

### *Green Magic*

Alan Bird

### *The Green Pearl*

John Robinson, Jr.  
Steve Sherman  
Dirk Jan Verlinde

### *Hard Luck Diggings*

Patrick Dusoulier  
Craig Heartwell  
Patrick van Efferen

### *The House Lords*

Linda Escher  
R C Lacovara  
Mike Schilling

<i>The House on Lily Street</i>	<i>Masquerade on Dicantropus</i>	<i>The Pleasant Grove Murders</i>	<i>Sulweri's Planet</i>
David Kennedy	Arjan Bokx	Michel Bazin	Michel Bazin
Lee Lewis	Owen Davidson	Christian Corley	Christian Corley
Paul Rhoads	Joel Hedlund	Till Noever	Dave Peters
Hans van der Veeke	<i>Mazirian the Magician</i>	<i>The Pnume</i>	<i>Telek</i>
<i>The Houses of Iszm</i>	Richard Behrens	Richard Develyn	Per Kjellberg
Damien Jones	<i>Meet Miss Universe</i>	Till Noever	John McDonough
Jody Kelly	Rob Friefeld	Steve Sherman	Dirk-Jan van der Duim
David Reitsema	Matt Picone	<i>Ports of Call</i>	<i>Three Legged Joe</i>
<i>The Howling Bounders</i>	John Robinson Jr	Patrick Dusoulier	Patrick Dusoulier
Ronald Chernich	<i>Men of The Ten Books</i>	R C Lacovara	Damien Jones
Linda Escher	Jeremy Cavaterra	<i>The Potters of Firsik</i>	R C Lacovara
Willem Timmer	Joel Hedlund	Carl Goldman	Menno van der Leden
<i>The Insufferable Red-headed Daughter of Commander Tynnot, O.T.E.</i>	R C Lacovara	<i>Rumfuddle</i>	<i>Throy</i>
Lori Hanley	<i>The Men Return</i>	John Foley	Michel Bazin
Thomas Lindgren	Paul Rhoads	<i>Sabotage on Sulfur Planet</i>	Deborah Cohen
<i>The Killing Machine</i>	Hans van der Veeke	Lisa Brown	Suan Yong
Lee Lewis	<i>The Miracle Workers</i>	Deborah Cohen	<i>To B or Not to C or to D</i>
Steve Sherman	Evert Jan de Groot	Christopher Reid	Christian Corley
Tim Stretton	David Kennedy	<i>Sail 25</i>	Patrick Dusoulier
<i>The King of Thieves</i>	Betty Mayfield	Fred Ford	Andrew Edlin
Ronald Chernich	<i>The Mitr</i>	John Jenkins	<i>Trullion: Alastor 2262</i>
Wayne Henry	John Kleeman	Steve Sherman	Foppe Brolsma
Gabriel Stein	Axel Roschinski	<i>Sanatoris Short-cut</i>	David Kennedy
<i>The Kokod Warriors</i>	Hans van der Veeke	Patrick Dusoulier	John Robinson Jr
Ronald Chernich	<i>The Moon Moth</i>	Patrick Dymond	<i>Ullward's Retreat</i>
Carl Goldman	Carl Goldman	Andrew Edlin	Derek Benson
David Reitsema	John Kleeman	<i>The Secret</i>	Graziano Carlon
<i>The Kragen</i>	R C Lacovara	Wayne Henry	David Kennedy
Michel Bazin	Stéphane Leibovitsch	John McDonough	The Unspeakable McInch
Christian Corley	<i>The Narrow Land</i>	Joe Ormond	Patrick Dusoulier
Andrew Edlin	Peter Ikin	<i>Seven Exits from Bocz</i>	Andrew Edlin
<i>The Languages of Pao</i>	Per Kjellberg	Brian Bieniowski	Martin Green
Erik Arendse	<i>The New Prime</i>	Rob Friefeld	Paul Rhoads
Rob Friefeld	Betty Mayfield	John McDonough	Per Sundfeldt
<i>The Last Castle</i>	Thomas Rydbeck	<i>Shape-Up</i>	<i>Vandals of the Void</i>
Lyman Leong	<i>Night Lamp</i>	Lisa Brown	Carl Goldman
Joel Riedesel	R C Lacovara	Christian Corley	Fernando Maldonado
Robin Rouch	Steve Sherman	Richard Platt	<i>The View from Chickweed's Window</i>
A Daniel Stedman	<i>Noise</i>	<i>Sjambak</i>	Michel Bazin
<i>Madouc</i>	Helmut Hlavacs	R C Lacovara	R C Lacovara
David Kennedy	Ralph Jas	Steve Sherman	Turlough O'Connor
John Schwab	<i>Nopalgarth</i>	<i>Son of the Tree</i>	Dave Worden
Steve Sherman	Evert Jan de Groot	John Chalmers	<i>The Visitors</i>
<i>The Magnificent Showboats of the Lower Vissel River, Lune XXIII South, Big Planet</i>	Stuart Hammond	John McDonough	Sean Butcher
Christian Corley	John McDonough	Till Noever	Stéphane Leibovitsch
Richard Linton	<i>The Palace of Love</i>	Lyall Simmons	<i>The Wannek</i>
Till Noever	Deborah Cohen	<i>Spa of the Stars</i>	Arjan Bokx
<i>The Man from Zodiac</i>	Rob Gerrand	Steve Sherman	Dorian Gray
Sean Butcher	Dirk Jan Verlinde	<i>Space Opera</i>	Jeffrey Ruszczyk
Dirk Jan Verlinde	<i>Parapsyche</i>	Linnéa Anglemark	<i>When the Five Moons Rise</i>
<i>The Man in the Cage</i>	Patrick Dusoulier	Till Noever	Arjan Bokx
Erik Arendse	Carl Goldman	Gabriel Stein	Damien Jones
Rob Gerrand	Gan Uesli Starling	<i>The Star King</i>	Stéphane Leibovitsch
David Kennedy	<i>Phalid's Fate</i>	Michel Bazin	Lyall Simmons
David White	Joe Bergeron	Deborah Cohen	<i>Where Hesperus Falls</i>
<i>Marune: Alastor 233</i>	Arjan Bokx	Rob Gerrand	Joel Hedlund
Evert Jan de Groot	Carl Goldman	David Mead	Steve Sherman
Patrick Dusoulier	<i>The Phantom Milkman</i>	<i>Strange People, Queer Notions</i>	Richard White
David Kennedy	Andrew Edlin	Patrick Dymond	<i>The World Between</i>
Gabriel Stein	John Velonis	Lori Hanley	Arjan Bokx
<i>Maske: Thæry</i>	<i>Plagian Siphon</i>	Dave Worden	Jon Hunt
Jeffrey Ruszczyk	Brian Bieniowski	<i>The Sub-standard Sardines</i>	<i>The World-Thinker</i>
Steve Sherman	Quentin Rakestraw	Stéphane Leibovitsch	Rob Friefeld
Suan Yong	Joel Riedesel and Robin Rouch	John Robinson Jr	Per Kjellberg
	<i>Planet of the Black Dust</i>	Steve Sherman	Lyall Simmons
	Patrick Dusoulier	<i>Suldrun's Garden</i>	
	Fred Ford	Peter Bayley	
	Peter Ikin	Christian Corley	

Please inform Suan of any errors or oversights.

## Down Payments

Down payments for the Reader's Editions and Deluxe Editions have appeared from most of our "verbal" subscribers. However, if you haven't sent your down payment for your reserved set, don't wait much longer, especially if you hope to receive one of the first 200 sets of the signed and numbered editions. After our 60 day deadline expires on June 7, any verbal subscriptions for which we don't have a deposit will be assigned to the first of the subscribers numbered 201 and up who have paid the down payment.

Of the methods of payment requested, PayPal has proved to be popular and reliable. A few persons have had unusual difficulties. As a result, we are now willing to accept Western Union Money Orders. Please note, however, that to do this you must first contact [subscribe@vanceintegral.com](mailto:subscribe@vanceintegral.com) and notify us so that we may send you address information. Also note that Western Union Money Orders are different from Western Union Wire Transfers. We accept the former, but not the latter. Wire Transfers necessitate a physical visit to a Western Union office near San Francisco, which is a difficulty for us.

We send acknowledgement of receipt within a week. If you haven't received an acknowledgment, don't panic! There is only one person working the receipts, and he does have a day job. If the second week arrives without notice, drop a note to [subscribe@vanceintegral.com](mailto:subscribe@vanceintegral.com) and someone will have a look at the situation. PayPal users have had fastest response, Western Union users experience various delays due to the way in which we finally receive funds.

In a few cases, people have sent us bank drafts. Our bank has honored these, but imposed a stiff processing fee. It was for that reason that we originally stipulated our preferred methods of payment. If you have sent a bank draft, we have credited you with the money which the bank actually gave us plus \$8. The \$8 is the fee collected by PayPal, which the VIE absorbs as a cost. Since we do this for PayPal users, we are willing to accept this much cost towards any other user, to be fair. However, this may not cover the fees imposed by our bank on foreign bank drafts.

As a typical example, one subscriber sent us a bank draft for \$350. We were credited with \$332. After allowance for our collection cost of \$8.00, we credited this subscriber with \$340, and consider his down payment to be effective in securing his numbered slot.

However, when it comes time to make final payment, we will ask this person for the remaining \$10. You can see here that the bank processing fee has "eaten" \$10 of the subscriber's money.

From time to time, someone recommends that we take credit cards. This is rather more of a problem than you might imagine, and comes with collection costs similar to PayPal. We do not expect to take credit cards either for down payments or final payments.

Please try to use one of the recommended methods of payment, which minimizes costs for all of us.

*Bob Lacovara*

---

## Project Report

As of this writing, the project news is as follows. Five texts have made it through TI review, with more on the way. Wyst has been Composed and has, at last, been tossed into the maw of the Post-Proofing (PP) grinder. Damien Jones has been saddled with the "Imp" team, in addition to his DDJ duties. Suan Yong has created the post of VIE WORK FLOW ENFORCER (caveat!).

There were tooting pains with the TI review process. The problems involved ways and means of processing different categories of endnotes, file naming dilemmas, and such-like niggings. Our procedures are now stabilizing, and work is beginning to flow smoothly.

Composition of Wyst was delayed because, finally dealing with a real text, there were new formatting issues to resolve and final font polishing to do. This caused delay, but both format and fonts are now in fine fettle, and the great PP machine, fed this fodder, is at last huffing forward. Early results are in, and Chris reports that things are working well and looking good. I have not checked the exact numbers and timetables, but we are a bit behind schedule with PP. This can be made up, assuming workflow from the TI wallahs, and DD, is maintained at a correct level. Speaking of which, I recently learned from Richard Chandler (head DD Dog), that we have *only 11 brave and lonely DD scanners at work!* This is a discouraging fact. The importance of DD cannot be over-emphasized. If you want to strike a great blow for the VIE, plug in your scanner, fire up your OCR program, and: *VOLUNTEER FOR DOUBLE DIGITIZATION!* You wont have a moment of free time for weeks to come! But how much TV can you really watch in one life?

People may be interested to know that we currently

have two sets of security checks. To explain these you must first understand what the "Imp team" is. The TI-wallahs propose correct VIE readings. TI-review accepts these propositions. The Imps then 'implement' them. The way this is done is that two different Imps implement the same text from the same instructions. The resultant texts are then compared to wash out lacunae or superfluties. This compare is the first security check. This resultant text, which is normally Composition ready, is then subject to a further check, against the most highly reliable 'raw' file, the "monkey file" (the raw text merged with the results of DD). This check reveals any errors or lacunae which have crept in, between the basic raw text, and final TI-output. Three such checks have thus far been performed. In one case there were several errors, in the two others; none. We can not be sure yet, but the source of such error seems to be problems of electronic file manipulation. A false mouse-move, a false keystroke, and a text is infected with nonsense! At each step of VIE text work such errors must be guarded against. Use a minimum of automated procedures; de-activate 'drag and drop'; push buttons and shuffle your mouse with care and due reflection!

As for TI-review: TI management, and Norma Vance, are now working intensively together. Long conversations concerning particular commas, or variant vancian spellings, have primed us to understand our duties, now that we are putting them into practice. The results of TI are exciting. The reviewed texts, now in true vancian form, are more finely etched, more robust, more surprising. To mention some minor examples of what you will see in VIE texts, we have no fear of Jack's way of punctuating: '!' and '?' used as half-stops; '!' used as a question mark; the vancian colon. But this is the least of it. Look out for restored words and even whole passages! It is the TI-wallahs who are doing the basic work involved, which is long, meticulous, and complex.

Which brings me to the subject of VIE credits. The current plan is that each VIE volume will have two sets of credits: management credits (the same in each volume) and, more prominently, volume based work credits. All volunteers who completed a job on the text(s) of a volume will be mentioned in that volume for each job they did. This mention will fall under one of four rubrics: DIGITIZATION ('Centaur's', 'Amazon's', 'DD scanners', 'OCR-ers', and 'Jockeys', Special formatting and other such jobs, including Composition) PROOFERS (Pre-Proofers, Techno Proofers, Post-Proofers) TEXT RESTORATION (TI-wallahs)

Requests to be 'not mentioned' in these credits will be frowned upon. They are not only about honoring work done, but about designating the guilty if errors are found to have infiltrated! Here are the management credits, in their present form: *Editor-in-Chief*: Paul Rhoads. *Managing Editor*: John A. D. Foley. *Principal Managers*: B. C. Lacovara, John Schwab, Suan Hsi Yong. *Managers*: Joel Anderson, Mike Berro, Debbie Cohen, Joel Hedlund, Andreas Irle, Bob Nelson, John Vance, Hans van der Veeke, Ed Winskill. *Textual Editor-in-Chief*: Alun Hughes. *Principal Editors*: Patrick Dusoulrier, Steve Sherman, Tim Stretton. *Project Editors*: Richard Chandler, Ronald A. Chernich, Christian J. Corley, Ian Davies, Damien G. Jones, David A. Kennedy, John Robinson, Koen Vyverman. *Consulting Editor*: Norma Vance. *Special Mention*: Nick Gevers, Johan Van Gijsegem, David Rose.

There will certainly be shuffling of this list, and managers are still debating how they want their names spelled. Damien Jones has written me several letters, each more shrill and rhetorically extravagant than the last, demanding use of the full set of his middle names. These are: 'Wannamaker Steppington Frobisher'. But mention of a 'Damien Wannamaker Steppington Frobisher Jones' would make the VIE a laughing stock and permanent joke in the annals of publication. Damien's petitions have therefore been rejected, in favor of a simple and much more dignified: 'G.'. Damien will just have to live with this. As for titles, Ron doesn't care to be designated a mere 'Project Editor', and has stated his preference for: 'Chief Cat Wrangler for Techno-Cats'. This silly suggestion has also been tucked away in the circular file, as I am sure everyone, excluding Ron, agrees it should be! But, since the squeaky wheel does get the grease, we have up-graded Ron to 'Ronald A.', and he will just have to be content with that. Naturally this concession generated internecine jealousies, and to pacify these before the flaming began, we had to give Dave Kennedy equal treatment; so he, too, has been up-graded to 'David A.'. John Foley, being a more exalted personage, managed to wangle not only an 'A.' but a 'D.' as well. Such are the privileges of place! I have tried to set an example of humility by not demanding an 'A.'. I have also refrained from requesting that the traditional suffix, 'issimo', be tacked onto my title, but in the end, who knows? I may not be able to resist the temptation. . . Join the fray! Tell Suan how you want *your* name to appear in the VIE credits.

Among other changes to look for: assuming he pulls off the Post-Proofing job (most massive of all VIE tasks!) Chris Corley may suffer promotion into one of the "Principal" categories. Post-Proofing sub-team heads as well, will find themselves listed in management credits as 'Project Editors'. Above all, the addenda

volume will contain a narrative description of the exact and real contribution of each person, including all non-management volunteers. The special mention category is for managers who are no longer with the project, but whose help was crucial. Credit and thanks are the only coin in which we can pay our volunteers, and I am therefore doubly concerned that it be handled correctly. I am particularly interested in people for whom a VIE credit can be CV enhancing in the real world. Within the boundaries of what has been decided, I will do all I can to this end.

By the time this is published, Suan (a.k.a. *Lares*, god of the VIE hearth) will already have begun *enforcing* VIE job flow. As we move into Composition and PP work, John (*Hercules*) Schwab's *Commissar* work turned out to be insufficient, since it covers us only from DD and Techno, up to TI-review. The latter job continues, but we also need each text followed right up to the point of production-ready pdf. with all the trimmings. Suan has been delegated full powers in this regard, and consequently we all are all now subject to his orders, and required to reveal full facts of job progress upon demand! The VIE project may be compared to a trireme entering battle. The rowers are the volunteers, while that naked, sweating, be-turbanned personage of huge belly, beating a drum and driving us up to *ramming speed*, is Suan. Deadlines are now part of your VIE work environment. It is a great adventure, but it can only happen if we play the game the way it must be played. Thanks to all!

*Paul Rhoads*

---

## A Word from the Volunteer Ombudsman

My name is Hans van der Veeke, I live in the Netherlands and I have been helping out with the VIE for almost a year now. I have done proofreading, Techno-proofing and Jockeying.

But the VIE, up until now, has had no central volunteer coordination, and several people, myself included, have falling between the organizational cracks, and have thus not been able to contribute as much to VIE work as we would have liked. I have therefore accepted the post of Volunteer Coordinator, or Ombudsman, a job I've been working at for several weeks.

Most you have already had an email from me. A lot of you even responded to it. Many thanks for that. I am trying to determine the availability of each volunteer, and also what kind of work each one can, and would like to, do. It is a help, naturally, if you respond to my e-mail! Tell me that you are not available (for the moment) or (better still) that you are available for a job! In the latter case I will put you in touch with the appropriate team-leader. Of course you are welcome to initiate contact with me. Don't hesitate!

I am also responsible for the 'Who we are' pages. If you are not on the site, or want to up-date your information; contact me.

Last, but not least, I want to tell you that there is a great need for people to help with Double Digitizing. Do you own a scanner and/or OCR software? We can use your help! Or put another way: *we need your help!*

*Hans van der Veeke*

[j.j.c.van.der.veeke@gasunie.nl](mailto:j.j.c.van.der.veeke@gasunie.nl)

---

## Guidelines for VIE Post- Proofing Subteam Manager

Post-Proofing, with DD, is the most labor-intensive and logistically complicated aspect of the VIE. The 44 VIE books will contain approximately 4.5 million words, and Post-Proofing is charged with carrying out 10 proofreadings of each volume. Coordination of this amount of effort will depend critically upon the work of the Post-Proofing Subteam Managers.

VIE Post-Proofing is guided by two principles: accuracy, and expedited completion of work. These goals conflict since some accuracy must be sacrificed on the altar of expediency. This dilemma is overcome by redundancy; the more people that review a book, the more errors will be discovered and corrected.

There is a sense of urgency for each volume; the only way that the VIE will be published on schedule is for Post-Proofing to achieve a quick turnaround on all volumes that are provided by Composition. Accordingly, all Post-Proofing assignments will have deadlines that will be clearly communicated to the volunteers.

### *Post-Proofing Subteams*

Each subteam will consist of ten or more volunteers and a Manager. The composition of a team will be some-

what fluid as people join and drop out, as workloads change, and as the Subteam Manager learns about the capabilities of individual volunteers.

Subteams will, ideally, be divided along roughly geographic boundaries: Europe, Asia-Pacific, North America. This is not an immutable rule; it is simply the preferred procedure. If an Asia-Pacific subteam needs another member and none are available from that geographic region, an assignment will be made from the whole available volunteer pool.

Each Post-Proofing Subteam will be responsible for proofing some number of the 44 VIE volumes. How the volumes are divided among the teams depends on the schedule of volume production by Composition, and past performance and readiness of individual subteams. As teams are assembled, the Subteam Manager will contact volunteers in his or her zone; a list of volunteers will be provided by the Post-Proofing Manager. The Subteam Manager must maintain regular contact with the subteam members at all times, both before and during jobs.

The goal for Post-Proofing is for ten or more volunteers to proof each volume. If some volunteers wish to work only on shorter texts (individual stories) a volume may be split up among a larger team. The goal is: ten reads for all parts of the volume, in a given time, and Subteam managers will have scope to accomplish this as they see fit, with the help of the Post-Proofing Manager.

#### *Post-Proofing Workflow*

Here are the steps for Post-Proofing a VIE volume (details provided in subsequent sections):

- A) VIE Volume PDF file delivered to Post-Proofing Manager
- B) VIE Volume assigned to Post-Proofing Subteam Manager
- C) Subteam Manager (with help from the PP-Manager) selects subteam members for post-proofing of the volume
- D) PDF, or hardcopy, is delivered to the subteam readers for the volume with a clearly communicated deadline.
- E) Subteam Manager notifies Suan Yong (VIE Work Commissar) that the assignment has been made.
- F) Subteam readers read the text, mark errata, and deliver them to their Subteam Manager
- G) Subteam manager collates reader input, filtering out non-useful comments.
- H) Filtered input is delivered to Post-Proofing Manager for review and delivery to Composition

- I) Subteam Manager notifies VIE Work Commissar that the assignment has been completed.

Critical to the success of PP is effective and timely communication between the Subteam Manager and team members, and between the Subteam Manager and the Post-Proofing Manager.

#### *a) PDF Delivery to Post-Proofing Manager*

The PDF file for each volume will be delivered by Composition to the Post-Proofing Manager. Post Proofers must have software for reading PDF documents (available free at <http://www.adobe.com/products/acrobat/readstep.html>); otherwise, some arrangement must be made to deliver the document in hardcopy to the volunteer. We have software that can cope with mail servers who do not accept large down-loads (pdf.s broken into pieces and sent separately, and automatically reassembled.)

#### *b) Assignment of Volume to Subteam Manager*

The Post-Proofing Manager will make the assignment of a volume to one of the subteams. Choice of subteam will depend on availability, rhythm, subteam work history, etc.. The goal of volume assignment is "maximum force application" and expedited work.

#### *c) Selection of Subteam Members for Post-Proofing*

The Subteam Manager must chose, in his pool of available volunteers, who will work. This is a decision based on the relationship developed by the Subteam Manager with these volunteers. (Most prospective Post-Proofing volunteers will have completed at least one assignment of some sort for the VIE.) The most important criterion is the willingness of the volunteer to commit to a deadline for completion of the assignment.

#### *d) Delivery of Document to Subteam Members*

The preferred method for delivering the document to the subteam is in PDF format via e-mail. For various reasons, some team members may wish to receive the document in hardcopy format, thus the creation of subteams according to geography. Subteam managers must work out delivery details with each volunteer. We must be flexible with regard to delivery methods, thus subteam managers must be prepared to send the document as hardcopy by regular mail. (Document Security: the VIE is authorized to use Jack Vance's copyrighted material in order to produce the Vance Integral Edition. However,

use of his work, in any format, outside the bounds of the VIE, is unauthorized and unacceptable. All VIE files should be transmitted directly, and only, from a VIE manager or designated team leader to the volunteer. As a “designated team leader,” each Post-Proofing Subteam Leader must take care to transmit VIE material only to subteam members, and to transmit collated errata only to the Post-Proofing Manager. Sharing VIE material, even among known VIE volunteers, is not allowed.)

*e) Notification of Assignment to VIE Work Commissar*

Suan Yong, VIE Work Commissar, is tracking all VIE assignments, by text and by volunteer. Part of the reason for this is to ensure that everyone gets credit for their work. When a Post-Proofing assignment is completed, the names of the Subteam volunteers, the Subteam Manager, and the file proofed, should be sent to Suan ([suan@cs.wisc.edu](mailto:suan@cs.wisc.edu)).

*f) Post-Proofing by Subteam Members*

This is the substance of Post-Proofing: proofreading in the classic sense. Readers should look for errors in presentation, including (but not necessarily limited to): typos, consistency of formatting of: page numbers, footnotes and the placement of footnote symbols (asterisks, daggers, and the like); missing quotation marks; placement of punctuation within or outside of quotation marks; correct left and right margins, typographical bloopers.

Reader feedback may be provided either as red-line markups of hardcopy or as a separate electronic text file. Red-line markups should be made in legible handwriting, using clear comments. A separate list of all pages containing red-line markups must be maintained by the proofer and provided to the Subteam Manager along with the redline markup. Only pages with comments should be submitted to the Subteam Manager.

Suggested format for electronic Errata notes:

PP-QUERY 269: 123/27; my house, Jaro said./my house,” Jaro said.

COMMENT 269; missing close quote

In this example, the number “269” is the Volunteer VIE ID#, “123” is the page number on which the error occurs, and 27 is the line on which the error occurs (it is easy to create a template for quickly finding line numbers!). The text as it appears in the document precedes the slash; the suggested change follows the slash. The “COMMENT” is free-form entry for notes pertinent to the query.

Post-Proofers are encouraged to find errors, but should refrain from flagging every conceivable oddity or inconsistency! It is common for the TI team to address five hundred or more endnotes for a novel-length work; Post-Proofing will fail if the volume of comments approaches that generated by Pre-Proofing and TI. Post-Proofing volunteers should have confidence that the Textual Integrity (TI) team has done its work well. For example, Jack Vance often uses variant spellings for words, even to the point of spelling words differently in the same story (or even in the same sentence!); “color” and “colour” are both used in *Madouc*, for example. This sort of question will have already been addressed by the TI team before it reaches Post-Proofing. Basically, text going into PP are “correct”.

No list could enumerate all categories of errors, or of things to ignore, but here are some guidelines:

*Things to Ignore*

Unconventional punctuation—Jack Vance often uses punctuation that seems odd even to the JV connoisseur. Punctuation is examined very carefully during TI. Reader who just can’t resist commenting on odd punctuation must make sure that it is very odd indeed, both in the context of the passage itself, and in the context of Vance’s work as a whole, otherwise the volume of feedback could grow without bound. Some acceptable punctuations are: >!< or >?< used as a comma. >! . . . < and etc.. Strings of adjectives without separating commas, dependent and independent clauses not surrounded by commas, or with a comma only at one end. Quotations proceeded sometimes by one sort of punctuation, sometimes by another. > . . . < followed sometimes by a new sentence, sometimes not.

Unconventional grammar. Remember this VIE by-word: *Jack Vance is his own grammar rulebook.*

Inconsistent spellings.

Textual inconsistencies (sometimes an ‘uncle’, sometimes a ‘grandfather’).

*Things to Note*

Double Quotes—all spoken passages should have an open quote and a corresponding close quote. Caveat: if a spoken passage continues across one or more paragraph breaks, all included paragraphs have an open quote but only the last paragraph of the spoken passage should have a close quote.

Single Quotes—words within spoken passages that are intended to be set off from normal text should be enclosed in single quotes, as shown in the following pas-



sage from *Night Lamp*: “We are ‘Non-orgs’ . . .” The same rule applies to spoken passages that themselves contain quotes from third parties. Again from *Night Lamp*: “According to Baron Bodissey: ‘Only losers cry out for fair play.’”

*Quotes and punctuation*—with rare exception, paired single quotes that set off words or phrases do not include punctuation within the quotes. Again from *Night Lamp*: “I heard the boy give his name as ‘Jaro’, and nothing more.” Note that the comma is outside the quotes surrounding the name Jaro. Also note that this does not apply to double quotes enclosing spoken passages, which should appear according to standard usage.

*Speeches with dashes*—throughout Vance, when speeches are broken with dashes, the dashes are inside the quotation, as follows: “I deplore non-standard punctuation—” he dug a finger into his nose and inspected the yield “—but as a VIE volunteer I realize I must live with it.” The incorrect form would be: “I deplore odd punctuation”—he dug . . . etc.

Footnote designators—symbols for designating footnotes, such as asterisks and daggers, should immediately follow the text referenced by the footnote even in cases where the word or phrase is followed by punctuation. Not all cases will be unequivocally clear. Consider the following from *Night Lamp*: “The region was remote; the early explorers were pirates, fugitives and fringers\*, followed by miscellaneous settlers . . .” The asterisk precedes, rather than follows, the comma because the footnote deals with the definition of the word “fringers”. If the footnote refers to the entire sentence, the footnote symbol should follow the period terminating the sentence, as in this case (again from *Night Lamp*): “. . . three bronze statues a hundred feet tall stood facing away from each other, arms raised in gestures whose purport had long been forgotten.\*” The footnote refers to the entire sentence, rather than to the word “forgotten”, thus the asterisk follows the period.

Any inconsistency or error in formatting—some examples: footnotes with first line indented, others with first line not indented; instances of footnotes with periods and without periods; section or chapter numbers appearing both with and without periods, or with different font sizes; missing or skipped section numbers; missing page numbers; em-dashes or hyphens with a space to either side.

Misspellings—*be very careful here!!* Vance uses many alternate spellings, sometimes mixing multiple spellings of the same word in a text. If you think you have found

a misspelled word, verify it against the best dictionary you can find before you flag it as a misspelling.

#### *g) Collation of Reader Feedback*

Subteam Manager will collate proofer feedback and produce a unified set of proofing marks for the Composition team. Each Subteam Manager is allowed leeway in the format of their proffer’s feedback; some readers may prefer to use hardcopy, with notes in red pen; others may wish to read the document on-screen, noting discrepancies in a separate text file (with unambiguously marked location of each discrepancy, as in the suggested format above). Other acceptable approaches may materialize. Likewise, each Subteam manager may provide feedback to the Post-Proofing Manager in either red-line hardcopy or in an electronic text.

Much feedback may be worthless, and the Subteam manager must separate the wheat from the chaff. But how can the subteam managers distinguish between an error and (for example) a Vancianism? Most textual type questions raised by Post-Proofing will have been addressed by TI, and Subteam managers will have the v-text Word.doc with the authoritative TI notes. Subteam managers will gain experience by carrying out their Post-Proofing duties and the difference between wheat and chaff will be progressively more apparent. The Post-Proofing Manager will be available to help with any questions. If there is doubt about a comment, it is better to pass it along.

#### *h) Filtered Input Delivered to Post-Proofing Manager for Review*

The entire set of feedback from all readers, compiled into a single document is delivered to the Post-Proofing Manager for review. It will consist of a set of comments upon, and/or proposed changes to, the PDF, with an argument accompanying each. This document may be an electronic file, sent via e-mail, or a hardcopy markup, delivered by surface mail.

Subteam Managers will develop familiarity with both the texts, and the style of TI decisions. The arguments accompanying PP comments and propositions should serve to quickly orient the Post-Proofing Manager with respect to the problem. The Post-Proofing Manager will review all errata, discussing them with the Subteam Manager if needed. Errata that survive review will be sent to Composition by the Post-Proofing Manager.

#### *i) Notification of Assignment Completion to VIE Work Commissar*

The VIE Work Commissar (Suan) should be notified that the assignment has been completed. The names of

those who proofed and returned their work within the deadline, will also be provided, to ensure that credit is correctly distributed.

#### *Post-Proofing Schedule*

The proposed publication date for the VIE is late 2002. The 44 VIE volumes must therefore complete post-proofing roughly by August 2002, about 14 months from now. Post Proofing must be accomplished at the rate of about Three volumes per month or, assuming we set up 5 teams, about .6 jobs per month per team. In fact PP will depend on the rhythm of Composition, which itself depends on the rhythm of TI, which, again, is dependent on DD. The VIE job is ambitious, but doable, with good scheduling and good management of each volume.

Post-Proofing must therefore adhere to a schedule. The proposed average rate at which readers must work is, we estimate, 20 pages per day, or approximately one hour of work per day, during the period of the job. Volunteer performance will be tracked by management, a policy must be communicated to all volunteers. Management will exploit this information ruthlessly to the end of producing the VIE to the highest standards, and on time! Honors will be bestowed on star workers! We have found that even proofers who find few typos, often find typos other proofers do not. Therefore, even 'weak' proofers are considered highly valuable for PP.

Whether or not all volunteers have completed their assignment, collation of feedback must begin on schedule, using all feedback submitted by the deadline. Even unfinished jobs should be submitted so that no work is wasted. In the case of uncompleted jobs, work credit will be granted on a discretionary basis by the Post-Proofing Manager, on the recommendation of the Subteam manager.

*Chris Corley, Post-Proofing Manager*

---

## The VIE Lending Library

### *and Sundry Updates*

#### *Scanners and Texts Needed*

The VIE has found the double-digitization (DD) exercise to be most invaluable—in fact, indispensable. Unfortunately, a lack of volunteers and resources has made this step a bottleneck in VIE work progress. I wish to make another plea for people who have a scanner and

OCR software to volunteer to digitize some texts. Send e-mail to [volunteer@vanceintegral.com](mailto:volunteer@vanceintegral.com) if you can help.

There is another aspect of the DD problem that needs to be addressed: many diligent scanning volunteers have already exhausted their collection of texts, and are willing to scan further texts mailed to them. To address this, we are establishing the *VIE LENDING LIBRARY*, and hope to find many people willing to contribute.

Below is a list of texts that still need to be digitized for DD. If you own any of these texts, and are willing to (1) send them to another VIE volunteer for digitization, and (2) let them be potentially bent out of shape by a scanner, please e-mail me ([suan@cs.wisc.edu](mailto:suan@cs.wisc.edu)), with the list of texts you're willing to lend. Include also your geographical location. The texts will be returned to you upon completion of the job.

A Practical Man's Guide, Space Science Fiction: Aug. 1957  
Anome (The Faceless Man), Ace or Dell  
Assault on a City, Universe 4: Popular Library 1974  
Asutra, Ace or Dell  
Augmented Agent (I-CA-BEM), Amazing: Oct. 1961  
Augmented Agent, U-M 1986  
The Man from Zodiac  
Plagian Siphon (The Planet Machine)  
Three Legged Joe  
Bad Ronald, U-M 1982  
Best of Jack Vance, Pocket 1976  
Ullward's Retreat  
Big Planet, U-M 1978  
Bird Isle (Isle of Peril), U-M 1988  
Blue World, Del Ray 1966  
The Brains of Earth (Nopalgarth), Ace 1966  
Brave Free Men, Ace or Dell  
Cat Island, The Light from a Lone Star (NESFA)  
Chateau D'If, U-M 1990  
Complete Magnus Ridolph, U-M 1984  
Hard Luck Diggings  
Sanatoris Short-cut  
Crusade to Maxus, U-M 1986  
Cugel's Saga, UK Grafton/Panther  
D.P., Avon Science Fiction and Fantasy Reader: Apr. 1953  
Dark Side of the Moon, U-M 1986 or NEL  
The Absent Minded Professor (First Star I See Tonight)  
Alfred's Ark (NEL)  
Dover Spargill's Ghastly Floater  
The Enchanted Princess (The Dreamer)  
The House Lords  
Parapsyche (NEL)  
Phalid's Fate  
The Phantom Milkman  
The Planet of Black Dust

Sulwen's Planet (NEL)  
 Deadly Isles, Bobbs-Merrill 1969  
 Dirdir, Ace 1969  
 Eight Fantasms and Magics, Collier 1970  
 Noise  
 Telek  
 Eyes of the Overworld, UK Grafton/Panther 1985  
 Fox Valley Murders, Bobbs-Merrill 1966  
 Future Tense, Ballantine 1964 or Pocket  
 Dodkin's Job  
 Dust of Far Suns (Sail 25)  
 Galactic Effectuator, Underwood-Miller 1979  
 Gray Prince, Tor 1992  
 Green Magic, U-M 1979  
 The Narrow Land  
 The Secret  
 Green Pearl (Lyonesse II), U-M 1985  
 Houses of Iszm, Ace 1964  
 Killing Machine, Berkley 1964  
 Languages of Pao, U-M  
 Lost Moons, U-M 1982  
 Four Hundred Blackbirds  
 The Potters of Firsk  
 Sabotage on Sulfur Planet  
 Seven Exits from Bocz  
 Man in the Cage, U-M 1983  
 Many Worlds of Magnus Ridolph, Daw 1980  
 The Howling Bounders  
 The King of Thieves  
 The Kokod Warriors  
 Spa of the Stars  
 The Sub-standard Sardines  
 To B or Not to C or to D (Cosmic Hotfoot)  
 The Unspeakable McInch  
 Marune, U-M 1984  
 Maske: Thaery, Berkley 1976  
 Monsters in Orbit, Ace or Dobson 1965  
 Abercrombie Station  
 Cholwell's Chickens  
 Palace of Love, Berkley 1967  
 Pleasant Grove Murders, Bobbs-Merrill 1967  
 Pnume, Ace 1970  
 Servants of the Wankh, Ace 1969  
 Shape-Up, Cosmos Science Fiction, Nov. 1953  
 Sjambak, Worlds of If, Jul. 1953  
 Slaves of the Klau (Gold and Iron), U-M 1980  
 Son of the Tree, Ace 1964  
 Space Opera, Ace Double 1964  
 Star King, Daw 1978  
 Suldrun's Garden (Lyonesse I), Berkley 1983  
 Take My Face (The Flesh Mask), U-M 1988  
 Temple of Han, Planet Stories, Jul. 1951  
 To Live Forever, Ballantine 1976  
 Trullion, Ballantine 1973

Ultimate Quest (Dead Ahead), Super Science Stories, Sep. 1950  
 Vandals of the Void, Gregg 1979  
 View from Chickweed, Underwood-Miller 1979  
 Visitors (Winner Lose All), Galaxy, Dec. 1951  
 When the Five Moons Rise, U-M 1992  
 Men of The Ten Books  
 Where Hesperus Falls  
 World Between, Ace 1965  
 The Devil On Salvation Bluff  
 The New Prime (Brain of the Galaxy)  
 The World Between (Ecological Onslaught)

#### *Down Payment Deadline*

The deadline for the initial down payment has been officially set to *7 June, 2001*, which includes a brief grace period beyond the originally announced 60 days. After this date, subscriptions for which a down payment has not been received will be bumped to the end of the list, the final list of the "top 200" signed Readers' subscriptions will be published, and remaining open Deluxe spots will be offered to those on the waiting list.

Due to the busy lives of VIE volunteers, there may be a slight delay in the processing of payments. Please bear with us, and help us expedite this process by follow these instructions:

Submit your contact information via the following webform, if you have not already done so:

<http://www.vanceintegral.com/deposit/>

Please adhere to our list of acceptable methods of payment (for US residents, PayPal or personal check; for non-US residents, PayPal or International Money Order). We understand the complications involved in setting up a PayPal account, and the delays inherent in sending a money order by mail, but these are the tested methods that we can process without problems. We do not have the facility to accept wire transfers nor direct credit card payments.

If you encounter delays in sending your payment that may result in your missing the deadline, e-mail [subscribe@vanceintegral.com](mailto:subscribe@vanceintegral.com) and explain your circumstances. We may make special accommodations depending on circumstances, but do make all effort to meet the deadline.

Thanks for making the VIE a reality.

*Suan Yóng, Process Integrity Manager.*

## VIE Frontispieces

There will be 44 VIE volumes, and we hope to have a frontispiece for each. I do not yet know what medium will be used. Etching is my first choice, but they may be in ink, or even pencil. All will certainly begin as pencil sketches, and they will be created more or less in the order the volumes are composed, as, for example, this sketch for *Wyst*:



Everyone will recognize the scene: Jantiff flees Estiban on the Uncible river. The Arrabins, oblivious and indifferent, are occupied with their favorite pastime; riding the clattering man-ways in a collective trance, enjoying the spectacle of the colored apartment blocks, with their roof gardens, illuminated in the exceptional light of Dwan.

I have read *Wyst* several times, but I did not go back to the book to research this scene, and it may have mistakes. Was Jantiff carrying something as he ran? Was he wearing something particular? Am I forgetting general

indications concerning, for example, Arrabin dress? Am I correct in remembering that the apartment blocks have no windows? Do they all have roof gardens?

Possible mistakes apart, I like this moment in the narrative for illustrating *Wyst*. A major theme of the book is a critique of collectivism, and here the contrast between mass society and the individual is poetically dramatized. The man who is disturbed could be the one who maliciously trips Jantiff. Still, there might be a better idea.

I bring this up because I am eager to exploit the imaginations and critical faculties of my fellow VIE volunteers and subscribers; this project is basically a collaborative effort. I am sure I speak for all when I say that frontispieces should be as faithful to Vance, and as effective, as possible. But, aside from the actual business of drawing, the conception and veracity of each image is a big job, and I can use help. I have ideas, but others do as well. Though I have most of Vance ensconced in my memory, that memory is not perfect. I do not want to make mistakes of detail and I do not want to neglect anything. I would therefore like to be accompanied and sustained in this work by a group of interested helpers.

My approach to these illustrations will be absolutely straightforward. There will be no question of the clichés and styles associated with sci-fi, fantasy and mystery. On the other hand I have no objection at all to drawing space-ships, elves, or men in fedoras holding gats. What I want is to choose the ideal scene for each volume, keeping in mind the whole cycle of 44 illustrations, and represent it with as much fidelity, effectiveness and grace as I can. The sort of help I am after must come from people who:

- Know Vance up and down.
- Are interested in, and sensitive to, illustration and its problems.
- Have no pro sci-fi or fantasy prejudices, or love of pulp style illustration.
- Are sympathetic to an extemporaneous, poetic, and straight-forward approach.
- Are willing to scout around in the texts researching relevant details.

I would already have begun these illustrations, but I have been occupied with another project; 150 illustrations of the Old Testament, for the catechism class of John Foley (VIE Managing Editor). Recently I made the last of these drawings, and in consequence am free to

begin illustrating Vance.

An example of the sort of problem that is must be resolved is; while we certainly want to see a space ship somewhere, where, and which? The *Ettilia Gargantyr*? A *BT*?. The *Fantimic Flitterwing*? A *Magellanic Wanderer*? A *Gallypool Irwanforth*? Showing the first (in smoking ruins!) means not showing misty Rath Eileann or the Domus, or Serjeuz, to say nothing of a haudal match or a moonlit scene on Methlen. Showing the second deprives us of Thumbnail Gultch, Sailmaker's beach, the Esplanade of Avente, or even a view of Sea Province University at Remo, a place I find particularly compelling, to say nothing of Smade's Tavern, or Teehalt's planet. The third choice eliminates a scene with the walking fort—such as when it is lifted into the night sky as Gersen is captured—or perhaps a portrait of Alusz Iphigenia Eperje-Tokay in the setting of Interchange. In the fourth case we deprive ourselves of a view of Duskerl Bay or cape Junchion. In the fifth we lose the chance to explore Undle Square . . . (ah! such riches, such memories!). Consider that, for Tchai, and for Durdane, there will be but a single image! Such an embarrassment of riches, and such a poverty of means! It is a problem that is not simple. I do have definite ideas for some of the books, certain ones suggested by Jack himself. Finally, I will need help selecting the exact passages to serve as captions.

If you are interested in participating in this informal "frontispiece advisory group", drop me a line. (I also need help connecting with a used etching press in, or near, France!)

*Paul Rhoads*

---

## My First TI Experience

It all began in Chinon, early December last year, at the TI meeting in Paul and Genevieve's château. Wonderful friends, heady conversation, gorgeous food, lovely wine . . . You can redistribute the adjectives among the substantives as you will, they'll still apply, more or less. The culminating point for me was when Alun, Grand Priest of the TI Cult, delivered onto my trembling hands . . . the typescript of "Book of Dreams", with Jack's hand-written corrections, adjuncts, embellishments and suppressions, and said to me : "Go forth, Patrick, and multiply the TI endnotes"

Back in Paris, now sober, I just wondered how and

where to start, and what to do. This article is meant to describe what I finally came up with. I'm a strong believer in the sharing of experience, especially when it's a practical one . . .

*I need a strategy!*

Having Jack's Manuscript, with his hand-written corrections and all, I checked that almost all of those corrections were contained in my DAW 1981 edition, so there was a good chance that this MS had been used for the DAW edition. The logical and simple TI strategy then became to restore the digitized text to the MS, any variation from it being most likely to have been DAW's attempts at "improving Jack's writing" . . . I also determined that I would endnote everything: the proposals, with clear reference to the MS text, the changes made by DAW, and the "obvious" typos in the MS if there were any (and there were a few . . .)

*I need a methodology!*

Nothing spectacular, just common sense: I thought I'd familiarise myself with the MS first, and then start comparing the MS and DAW. So :

FIRST STAGE: I read the MS entirely, in normal mode, no comparison with anything, just to get a good feeling of it, get immersed in Jack's idiosyncratic punctuation and turns of phrases. Doing that, I also couldn't help finding a few typos in the MS itself, which I duly noted on a piece of paper.

SECOND STAGE: I started a full, complete, mind-numbing parallel read of DAW81 versus the MS, line by line, sentence by sentence. My wife looked at me in awe (or pity) for many an evening . . .

I made a choice, here. In correct logic, I should have proofed the digitized text versus the MS . But I had no printer at hand at the time, I wanted to save trees, just like Suan, and anyway I preferred reading from DAW rather than from another printed MS WORD document, simply because I just like holding a book . . .

I had blank sheets of paper beside me, and every time I found something different, I wrote down the MS page number + part of the text, and underneath the DAW page number + corresponding text. I included in those "differences" all the cases of MS hyphenated words having been de-hyphenated by DAW, and vice-versa (I found only 9 distinct cases of hyphenation). I eventually came up with 56 sheets of paper, crammed with notes in my crabby handwriting. I'm the only one who can read it, and sometimes I find it difficult . . .

*I need statistics!*

As I progressed, I started to realise that the number of differences was going to be considerable (in fact, I found 537 differences in all). I also began to see that many endnotes were similar and repetitive, and that I could probably put them in a rather limited number of "categories". I felt a craving to produce statistics, that is my nature, so during this second stage I gradually developed a series of "key sentences" to be incorporated in all the endnotes, enabling me to do statistical counts later on.

Here's the final set, used for TI-PROPOSAL or TI-COMMENT, categorizing the nature of the deviations that DAW has introduced, or just plain typos in the MS. I also show the corresponding numbers I found, and the percentages (if you're a compulsive number cruncher, you have to have percentages!):

Punctuation change in DAW 257 47,9 Modified word in DAW 101 18,8 Modified capitalization in DAW 38 7,1 Missing word in DAW 23 4,3 Modified sentence in DAW 23 4,3 Typo in DAW 23 4,3 Consistency adjustment 21 3,9 Typo in MS+DAW 13 2,4 Additional word in DAW 10 1,9 Break of line hyphen in DAW 9 1,7 DAW Americanization 6 1,1 Typographical change in DAW 6 1,1 Missing sentence in DAW 5 0,9 Not categorized 2 0,4 537 100,0

A number of those differences and typos had already been spotted by the proofers who had worked on the digitized text, without the benefit of having the typescript with them. . . . When I went through the actual endnoting, and reviewed their notes, I found 28 CHANGES. They were all legitimate and straightforward, except one, this exception simply because there was a more general issue they couldn't know about without the MS. I salute David Mead, the digitizer, Dave Kennedy, 1st Proofer, and Ron Chernich, a.k.a "The Vagrant Space Monitor"!

THIRD STAGE: I started the endnoting in the Word document, using the notes I'd made during the parallel read. In a first pass, I skipped anything having to do with hyphens, reserving this for later. At the same time, I checked my predecessors' endnotes. For those, here's how I operated:

—For QUERIES that led nowhere (i.e. because MS and digitized were OK), I just commented with a "Query closed", and why. For instance:

<he is patient, cunning and if the road is closed...>  
TEXT-QUERY 354; cunning/cunning,; should there be a comma after "cunning"? There is in the TOR edition.  
COMMENT 144; Prime Ref: "*The Book of Dreams*", DAW Jan 1981 [DAW81] has no comma. However ref: "*The*

*Demon Princes Volume 2*", ORB Oct 1997 [ORB97] does insert a comma as suggested.

TI-COMMENT 11; MS/2 has no comma. Query closed.

—For QUERIES that actually led somewhere (for instance leading to a restoration to MS), I end-noted a TI-PROPOSAL 11; Example:

<Gersen searched for files for references...>

TEXT-QUERY 354; for/the; should it be "searched the files for" rather than "searched for files for"? TOR edition has "searched in files for", which doesn't really sound right either.

COMMENT 144; "..searched for files for.." checked correct against DAW81, although ORB97 changes this to "..searched the files for.."

TI-PROPOSAL 11; for/the ; Restore to MS/14; congratulations to Dave for spotting this! Modified word in DAW.

—For CHANGES made by the proofer, and corresponding to the MS, or corresponding to a typo both in MS and DAW, and looking good too, I end-noted with a comment to indicate this was a "Legitimate CHANGE" (a "key-sentence"). For instance:

"Have you ever visited a charnay restaurant?"

TEXT-CHANGE 302; charney/charnay; I changed the spelling to conform to earlier usage, from "charney."

COMMENT 354; typo exists in the source.

COMMENT 144; ORB97 has the correction.

TI-COMMENT 11; MS/78 is OK, contains the correct <charnay>. Legitimate CHANGE. Typo in DAW.

For my own findings, in the immense majority of cases, the resulting TI-PROPOSAL was to do a straight restoration to MS, with no need for a specific argument in support.

In a number of cases, I flagged that the text should not be restored to MS, because there was either an "obvious" typo in the MS (such as "statment" for "statement"), or a punctuation that really cried out for not being retained. Very few of those (7, in fact).

*I need to discuss!*

In a number of cases, things were not so simple as that, and seemed to be worthy of TI discussion, I highlighted the words in a different colour, a sort of greenish pale blue, and added a specific line in the endnote, such as:

<"It's already set. But there's old Sun yonder.">

TI-PROPOSAL 11; old Sol/old Sun ; Restore to MS/84. Modified word in DAW.

TI-COMMENT 11; Raise as TI topic for discussion.

Consistency issue. Check "usage" in the Demon Princes for Sun/Sol. I'm pretty sure it's Sol.

But most of the time, at that stage, I would just enter a simple note:

TI-COMMENT 11; Raise as TI topic for discussion.

leaving for a further stage (the FOURTH ONE) to document why I thought it could be debated, the nature of the issue, and what I suggested, if I had anything to suggest. . . I gradually evolved a set of "key sentences" for the various TI-ISSUE categories that slowly emerged. Here they are, with the corresponding numbers and percentages:

Punctuation issue 24 30,8 Consistency issue 12 15,4  
Spelling issue 10 12,8 Grammatical issue 5 6,4 Strange  
expression 5 6,4 Singular/plural issue 4 5,1 Spelling of  
foreign words 4 5,1 Unknown word 4 5,1 Capitalization  
issue 3 3,8 Not categorized 3 3,8 Word in doubt issue 2  
2,6 Grammatical/logical issue 1 1,3 Unusual phrase 1 1,3  
78 100,0 In fact, some issues were repetitive, so the  
number of distinct cases is slightly less, but no matter . . .

#### *I need shortcuts!*

Of course, all this end-noting and key sentences was going to take long if I had to type everything, and I ran the risk of making typos in my key sentences, or modify them slightly, ruining my hopes of good stats! So I decided to speed up the process, to avoid working my fingers to the bone and to ensure consistency in my end-noting. I used the MS Word facility called "automatic correction" (at least, in French, it's "correction automatique") to create short-keys. For instance:

rtm = ; Restore to MS/  
pc = Punctuation change in DAW.  
mw = Missing word in DAW.  
msd = Modified sentence in DAW.  
etc.

and for the basic headers that I defined specifically for this TI job, I used :

tp = TI-PROPOSAL 11;  
tc = TI-CHANGE 11;  
tiu= TI-ISSUE 11;  
tco= TI-COMMENT 11;

So now, to enter an endnote, I just had to use a sort of shorthand transcription. Example:

TI-PROPOSAL ; It is possible/Is it possible ; restore to MS/81. Modified sentence in DAW.

- \* I highlight the minimum part of the text that's necessary (<It is possible>)
- \* Ctl C (to copy the text)

\* I highlight in YELLOW

\* Alt i, n, enter => gets me into the endnote creation

\* tc SPACE => TI-PROPOSAL 11;

\* Ctl V => TI-PROPOSAL 11; It is possible

\* / Ctl V => TI-PROPOSAL 11; It is possible/It is possible

\* I modify the right-hand side text => TI-PROPOSAL 11; It is possible/Is it possible

\* rtm /81 => TI-PROPOSAL 11; It is possible/Is it possible; Restore to MS/81.

Try it. After about 20 times, it becomes second nature, especially if you have defined short-keys that you feel most intuitively comfortable with. Of course, it's not specific to TI work, and I'm using this now for straight proofing too. Reason I didn't do this before is that I had never yet done a proofing requiring so many endnotes.

#### FOURTH STAGE:

In this final stage, I went through all the endnotes again, one by one (classic work for a proofing, anyway). Sheer numbers are depressing: there are 682 endnotes, this means almost 6 hours at the rate of 30 seconds per note. And some notes require much more than that.

=> I corrected bits and pieces (such as typos in my endnotes)

=> I raised some further TI issues,

=> and I suppressed others I had originally thought worthwhile . . . .

=> I dealt more specifically with the TI issues:

— completing them with detailed comments, and inserting a "key sentence" to categorise the "issue", as described earlier.

— checking that I had highlighted them correctly (i.e. greenish blue). I found this was a necessary check!

— I modified the TI-COMMENT 11 into TI-ISSUE 11;

— I then counted the number of "Raise as TI topic for discussion", and the number of TI-ISSUE . . . and found a difference: I had in fact overlooked two cases, which I then found easily and completed. It's exactly why I had devised this system, to double-check through redundancy. I'm a redundant anal-retentive!

#### *What about the hyphens?*

Ah yes, the hyphens . . . I built a spreadsheet to track the hyphenations and de-hyphenations, just for fun, and a bit more than just fun . . .

Initially, I filled it with all the hyphenated words found

by Koen in the VDAE. They went into two columns: first column = Jack's MS, second column = DAW, with a third column called "nature", initially filled as "kept".

For EACH case of a word hyphenated in the MS and de-hyphenated in DAW, I added an entry such as:

ape-like      ape like      dehyphenated

Automatically, the value 1 appeared in the column "dehyphenated" . . . for counting and number-crunching.

For EACH case of a word not hyphenated in MS, but hyphenated by DAW, I modified the already existing entry (by construction, there had to be one), I wrote "hyphenated" in the "nature" column, and a 1 appeared magically in the "hyphenated" column.

But that's not all. Every time I found a word dehyphenated by DAW, I checked that there were no occurrences left in the text where the hyphen would have been kept, to do a consistency check against DAW's modifications, or lack thereof.

Same consistency check was done, but the other way round, when DAW had hyphenated a non-hyphenated word in Jack's manuscript.

I also used the spreadsheet to check some form of inner consistency among categories of hyphenations or de-hyphenations, such as:

feed-lot feed lot de-hyphenated    feed-meadow feed meadow de-hyphenated    feed-train feed train de-hyphenated => DAW has been fully consistent, here.

half-excavated half excavated de-hyphenated    half-expected half expected de-hyphenated    half-frozen half-frozen kept => why did DAW leave "half-frozen" untouched, while modifying the two other cases? Well, just noting the fact, but I didn't do anything about it. Maybe we'll come back to this later, if and when we have the time and inclination . . . At least, it's there to play with if we need it!

Here's a summary of the hyphen situation :

	NUMBER	%
DE-HYPENATED BY DAW:	179	35,9
KEPT:	319	64,1
ORIGINAL DISTINCT HYPHENS IN MS:	498	100
WORDS HYPHENATED BY DAW:	9	

DAW de-hyphenated more than two-thirds of Jack's hypens. Aren't you glad you know this now?

*How long did all this take?*

Too long . . . My estimate is that I must have spent more than 80 hours to do all this . . .

A part of this time was wasted because the method-

ology and the categorisation process evolved while I was doing this job; it was the first time, after all. This means I had to go through the endnotes several times more just to modify, adapt and correct the categories . . . Next time (if there's a next time), I should go faster. In fact, I've already experienced this while doing the proofing of "Ports of Call".

I may also have spent an unnecessary long time on the hyphen/de-hyphen list, but I found it interesting and useful, if only as a help to focus on those words.

I estimate at about 30 hours the actual parallel read (and writing my notes on paper). That's about 10 pages of MS per hour. Again, I would have saved time if I had made a photocopy of the MS: I could have just circled the places, jotted down a very short comment, etc., probably bringing this down to 20 hours.

Overall, if I had to do it all over again (not right now, God forbid, I won't be able to re-read Book of Dreams for quite some time, I know it by heart, I feel almost nauseated!), it would probably take me 40-50 hours of work, not insignificant.

*And was it really worth it?*

Absolutely. You'll judge for yourself when you read the VIE edition: you will find that you're reading a different "Book of Dreams", fully Jack's now, not the one you know and which has been diluted by the publisher.

A first aspect that may not be spectacular at first is the restoration to Jack's original punctuation. You've seen that DAW made 257 punctuation changes: commas suppressed, commas added, semi-colons replaced by periods, colons replaced by double dashes, quotes suppressed . . . Just one change may not look like much, but as Tim Stretton remarked to me one day, the overall and accumulative effect is significant.

DAW has also "simplified" words, modified sentences, even suppressed parts of the original text . . . Oh, the amount of damage they did is immense, but now, when you read the VIE restoration, you will have some lovely surprises:

- you will know, at last, the answer to the riddle of "a coil of dark-green," (dark-green WHAT, generations of readers have exclaimed!). See DAW81 page 37.
- you will find out what Alice Wroke actually did wear page 108.
- you will discover what Sufrit had for tea, and how many times, when she arrived in Marmaduke's home after their travails and alarums.
- and what is really so wide about "Yetch bosers" ???



(page 86)

—and furthermore, what is the real definition of a “slarsh” ??? (page 94)

All this, and much more, will be yours to discover when the VIE comes out . . . So as far as I’m concerned, it was worth every single minute of the 4800 I spent on it!

*Patrick Dusoulier*

---

## Who Cares If Vance Is a Sci-Fi Author?

Neither Alexander Feht, nor Carl Goldman, if we can credit their statements in *Cosmopolis 14*! I hope more of you will share your thoughts on Vance, in *Cosmopolis*. But the Vance/sci-fi controversy is not closed by the intelligent and reassuring attitudes of Alexander and Carl. The problem, at bottom, is not even one of definitions—though, so far, that is the angle from which I have attacked it. It is really a question of how Vance is perceived, and by whom. There are two groups of people who care whether or not Vance is sci-fi. For those interested in promoting Vance it does no good to dismiss their opinions as incoherent or nuncupatory. These opinions exist; they are majority opinions; they must be coped with.

The first group is the defenders of sci-fi. It is the only opponent I have within reach, and thus it is the one I have been chasing after, attempting to cow with perfervid diatribes and harangues. The other group is those who disdain sci-fi. These are the people I really want to get at, but unfortunately for me not many of them, if any, read *Cosmopolis*. The former group are Vance readers; they are therefore my allies—in spite of the rough treatment I give them! The latter refuse to read Vance; they are thus my—and our—main problem.

These people, like the rest of us, are impressed by appearances. Whatever is urged in favor of Vance, they will still think: ‘But Vance is a sci-fi author, therefore he is without interest’. This is why I begin my ‘Vance is not a sci-fi author’ argument by agreeing with their negative assessment of sci-fi; I must demonstrate I am not trying to sell them sci-fi. This, naturally, is disturbing to some of my VIE friends. My agreement with the enemies of sci-fi, though essentially tactical, is neither disingenuous nor thoughtless. I have presented this negative view in detail, trying to show where I am in agree-

ment with it, and where I am not. My concern with the question ‘Is Vance a sci-fi author’, should be understood in this context.

I want to extend a special thanks to Alexander Feht for again gracing the pages of *Cosmopolis* with his vigorously expressed and powerful thoughts. His statement of what the VIE is, cannot be improved. It is gratifying to feel Alexander’s spiritual communion with the project. I am also—surprise!—gratified by his defense of, and favorable comments upon, my personal self. However, I am puzzled by some of his points. How is it that a person of Alexander’s superior understanding, who grew up and lived most of his life in that evil-empire where Vance’s work was censored—as he has informed us—can still be in agreement with the basic premises underlying the tyranny he survived? These premises are, of course, Materialism and Atheism. Alexander’s agreement with Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, Krushchev, Brezhnev, Andropov and Gorbachev on these points, are evidenced, respectively, by his admiration for Dawkins and his bald statement concerning the existential status of ‘The Man Upstairs’. Has Alexander escaped other aspects of Marxist doctrine, only to fail to liberate himself from its deeper ones?

If so, it may explain his failure to appreciate Jane Austin. Materialism and atheism provoke a coarsening of the spirit that is deadly to Art. This is because, in a materialist, atheistic world, Art comes to be understood in the Nietzschean mode, as human-generated ‘creativity’, ex-nihilo, without reference to “reality”. The latter comes to be understood as radically subjective. Only a real reality can carry us out of and beyond ourselves, which is why materialism and atheism lock us into ourselves, and dim our view of each other and the world, impoverishing our true creative capacities. In these circumstances our capacity to hear the Word of the Cosmos, our alertness to the Music of Creation, is enfeebled, because not exercised. We are too busy peering at our belly buttons, or the belly buttons of culturally-interesting-others. The result is the perversion of Art. Grace, harmony, charm, beauty; the gifts of careful observation and spiritual maturity are rejected. Emphasis is put on passion and individuality, and then perversion, and finally madness, with the consequent triumphs of vulgarity, violence and chaos, and the concomitant degradation of language. E.g.: the word ‘Art’ no longer means anything.

Alexander’s failure to appreciate Jane Austin also strikes me as odd because I think Vance has more in

common with her than with the writers he mentions (Dumas, Balzac, Hienlein, Rand, Orwell, Huxley, Lem, Dawkins—I am unfamiliar with Ardry). Like Jane Austin, Vance is a humorist, delicate, subtle and fine. Perhaps not always quite as delicate as Jane, but certainly closer to her, in general, than to Balzac and the others.

It might be argued by materialist and atheist Vance readers, who feel comforted in their views by certain passages in his work, that Vance defends a materialistic and atheistic point of view. As I have mentioned, I am preparing an essay on this subject. In the meanwhile I offer the following extract:

She turned to go back inside, but paused, and went listlessly out on the front lawn. The night was dark and clear; the stars glimmered, clean, remote, dispassionate . . . What was up there, among those far suns? If the spirits of the dead persisted, perhaps they might drift out there, out among the stars . . . Her skin crawled as she thought of Cathy. Pale, lonesome Cathy, wandering among those far black places . . .

*(The Flesh Mask)*

We recognize this as a typically vancian passage. It should be noted that Vance is here not discussing his own opinions, but describing the inner-state of one of his characters. Off hand I can think of no statement in any of his works where Vance pronounces opinions in his own name on any subject whatever. However, the above is a 'typically vancian' sentiment.

Personally, Vance may, or may not, be a materialist and an atheist. I happen to know he believes in ghosts, or would like to find proof of their existence. It is of course possible to be a materialist, and believe in ghosts. In Gurgieff's system, for example, the spirit world is understood as a material state, a notion that might appeal to Vance, and is perhaps related to the ideas explored in *Parapsyche*. Vance, while certainly not a regular church-goer, and while he has been known to make statements consonant with a materialist or atheist view, has also made statements inconsistent with them. Like many of us he is not a theorist by nature, and concerns himself with ultimates mostly from a subjective standpoint; such questions as: 'What will happen to me after I die?' reveal much in themselves.

Sensitive readers know that the invisible world is remarkably present to Vance. For this reason he will not be of great use to militant materialism and atheism. His work writhes with intimations of eternity, infinity and

immortality, as exemplified by the passage above. He discusses gods rather more frequently than one would expect from a convinced atheist, and does so with an attitude always refreshing in the modernist context.

Be all that as it may, I would like to give the last word to Alexander: *[Vance is] neither vulgar, corrupted, obsessed with sex, or self-righteous enough to be modern. He has taste and skill: two things most culturally incorrect in our society.*

*Paul Rhoads*

---

## The Cosmopolis Literary Supplement, No. 7

Till Noever continues *Tergan*, and Tim Stretton *The Zael Inheritance*, as those we know are waiting for their latest installations will be glad to hear. And Zack Fance has finally reappeared from Beyond. What happened to Mars? Visit the VIE download page today, and you may or may not find out—

<http://www.vie-tracking.com/cosmo/>



'Lamarck was one of the last to leave the Brabantia.'

---

## Jane Austin and Jack Vance

### Reflections on "Greatness" in Literature

What makes a work a masterpiece? What makes an artist great? We first learn of the greatness of something by hearing about it. This circumstance has rendered greatness suspect, suggesting as it does that it is a matter of convention, of reputation, with out any anchor in reality. In the Marxists view, what was "great" for kings

was determined by royal prejudice animated by desire for power; what was "great" for the bourgeoisie was, again, merely bourgeois prejudice animated by desire for money, and so fourth. Thus, for the sociologists, and the other crypto-Marxists who dominate current thinking on these things, what is "great" is a function of "culture". For deconstructionists "greatness" lacks even the illegitimate basis Marxists grudgingly accord it. However, though human beings need to learn in order to understand, though, in other words, greatness may not necessarily be self-evident; it is real and permanent. It is beyond prejudice and out of time (or "extemporaneous" as Alexander Fehd would say). Human access to given great works may be closed off; stone sculptures may be ground to dust by wind and rain; languages may die. The full power of Homer is available only to those who learn ancient Greek, and even for them certain nuances are lost in the corridors of Time.

But what, exactly, is greatness in Art? and in literature in particular? We have heard that great writers gives us "real" characters, who "develop". The "plot" must be . . . well, whatever it is supposed to be, and other elements are supposed to conform to certain standards. There is no getting around talk like this. It is natural for people to want to praise, and to recommend what they admire and love. But in the face of contrary opinions, of which there is never a lack, praise inevitably becomes argument, argument becomes analysis, and analysis must make distinctions and ground itself in standards. But analysis must not be rejected because of the wrangling arguments that occur around it. Passion and love is the beginning of critical thinking and analysis. They are also what provoke the wrangling, which is like lovers disputing the favors of their favorite. Love and passion motivate the desire to praise. They are also the key to the nature of greatness in art.

As Nicolas Poussin, the 17th century French painter, said (I paraphrase): "The purpose of art is delectation". When art is delectable—delightful, delicious, wonderful—we love it. What makes it delectable is a secondary question; let it only be lovable, and we love it! It is this capacity to inspire love which is the mark, *par excellence*, of greatness.

We must keep our attention focused on things, not words. There is 'love' and 'love!' 'Love' is a mere word, than can be used and abused by anyone. It is but a sign, supposed to designate a particular spiritual movement of the heart, and it is as easy to pilfer as any other word. The fools who 'love' Steven King, and the scoundrels who

'love' Umberto Eco, should be recognized for what they are, or their 'love' should be judged at its rightful value. The VIE project exists because Jack Vance writes delectable books. Since 'loving' Jack Vance gains no cultural kudos, we are almost certainly not scoundrels. But if he is only a second rate pop writer (though un-popular!), then we are fools. Of course all this is mere assertion. But all artistic criticism is a matter of assertion! Nothing, in the realm of the muses, can be settled as in mathematics and engineering. Here we can only point to the glorious mountains, and hope others will look that way. What counts is not the talk, it is the glory of the mountains. The talk is only to draw attention to the glory. It does not create the glory, and the glory subsists even if we grow dumb, or even blind.

All of the above to preface the following remark: I never thought of Vance as 'great' until the day it struck me I enjoy reading him every bit as much as I enjoy reading Jane Austin. From that moment these two artists have remained linked in my mind. In many ways they are different, but in one important respect they closely resemble each other: both are essentially comics. Comedy, to my way of thinking, is one of the greatest artistic qualities. Comedy is often vulgar or cynical, but not the comedy of Jane Austin and Jack Vance! One might call it comedy with tears. It has nothing of contempt. It sees human foibles but, a bit like God, seeing deeply; it understands, and understanding; it is merciful. The high comic view, more than the coldly analytical view, or the sympathetic and sentimental view, it closer to the true and whole view.

A thing is funny because it is in contradiction with itself. The proud man is ridiculous because what is a man that he should be proud? Most of the greatest artists all have a comic bent because comedy is the only way to look at the whole of what we are without despair. The *Flutic* episode in Cugel is a fiesta of vice and flaws from which Vance draws every last drop of comic blood: Cugel's miserable condition and unscrupulous efforts to gain advantage; the amiable rapacity of Master Twango; the bureaucratic spitefulness of Gark and Gookin; Weamish's crafty and hysterical triumph; Yelleg and Malser's surly persistence. It is alertness to the difference between virtue and vice, wisdom and foolishness, that comedy springs. Not all writers have such awareness, and it is not enough to mock at foolishness. Miss Bates, in Jane Austin's *Emma*, is in many ways a ridiculous person, and Jane Austin makes this clear. We laugh at Miss Bates. But when Emma Wodehouse makes a joke at

her expense, it is a cruel barb because it strikes through the silly skin to prick the good and honest heart. Thus it pricks us as well, not to mention Emma herself. Aunt Norris, in *Mansfield Park*, is both hateful and ridiculous. But though she makes others suffer, she is laughable, and ultimately pitiable, which is our final sentiment for her, in spite of all.

This kind of thing, I suppose, is what is meant by the "lit. crit." phrase: *making the characters real*. Jack Vance, like Jane Austin, puts us through unforgettable experiences in the company of unforgettable people. Jane Austin's works are considered *psychological novels* or *novels of manners* or *morals*, while Vance's are considered *adventures*. I think these designations are just, as far as they can usefully go. Tim Stretton, many months ago and for reasons I have now forgotten, had occasion to make the following comments on the subject of Emphyrio:

The tale is like most Vance tales, calmly told. There may be adventure, crime, maskings and unmaskings and revelations, but you are never out of breath. Vance may be laconic, but terseness is never there to make for a breakneck pace. His adventures never arouse the kind of passionate excitement that the average reader seeks in books like this. It also conforms to the rigors of Iris Murdoch's dictum that a novel should be about revelation, about the revelation of truth. Of course, Iris Murdoch demanded psychological revelations, revelations of a microsocial nature, not revelations about a made-up cosmos (made-up people are legit; made up societies, in mainstream fiction, are a no-no). And her own books do this very well. Vance does not engage in this kind of art.

In other words, though Vance's books are *adventures*—I would make the proviso that no other writer can generate as much suspense when he chooses—they share a calmer, more leisurely style with the psychological novel, as well as sharing some kind of relationship to truth, absent from the typical adventure novel. Vance can seem unconcerned with psychology, but it is enough to think of Gersen, Navarth or Violen Falushe, to be reminded of Vancian psychology. I think Jane Austin's deliberate engagement with Christian morality gives her books a psychological pertinence which is more diffuse in Vance, if just as present. But that is another subject. This much might be said: all Jane Austin's characters deliberately point us to how people should be; Vance's protagonists and villains only suggest such a thing, while his sec-

ondary characters simply illustrate different kinds of people in different circumstances.

Jane Austin's *Pride and Prejudice* begins with the description of a neighborhood. In this neighborhood are several families with eligible unmarried daughters, and into it a bachelor has just moved. The two first two sentences of this justly hyper-famous book are:

It is a truth universally recognized that a young man, of good fortune, must be in want of a wife. This truth is so well anchored in the minds of the surrounding families that it is assumed that the bachelor in question is the rightful property of one or another of their daughters.

*Mansfield Park* begins with several paragraphs giving the marital status of the Ward sisters, the protagonist's mother and two aunts. These marital circumstances turn out to be the essential environment of Fanny's story. As with Fanny, in Lizzy's story (*Pride and Prejudice*) the drama arises naturally, inevitably and necessarily from the opening. In the same way, the prologues of *Cadwal*, *The Domains of Koryphon*, *Trullion*, or other Vance stories, define an environment, as Tim points out, from which the stories arise. Despite this, Vance is not an 'experimental sociologist'. If he were such a beast, his work would be trivial. I would comment on Tim's phrase "*revelations about a made-up cosmos*", that the revelations Vance offers are not mere logical extension of a given invented reality. Vance's 'invented' realities are not, as in true science fiction, gratuitous. They are constructed, but their construction is not free-floating. It undergrids a drama that will reveal truths about the only reality that counts, the only reality that is real; reality itself. Vance does not deal in idle or gratuitous speculations, but in useful truths. The essential environment of Jane Austin's books—call it "the question of marriage"—is also not gratuitous. Her books may explicitly deal with the problem of marriage for women in the 18th century (of course they deal with much more than this!) and so have elements that belong exclusively to a certain time and place, but most of these elements are of universal application, and even of great importance to all people of all times. In Vance, while the particular socio-cultural circumstances he invents only mirror real societies at certain points, they are constructs designed specifically as skeletons of stories that treat questions of as much importance as marriage, questions as permanently valid and interesting. Without the particular circumstances that pertain on *Cadwal* for instance, Vance could not

explore the universal issues he explores there, in the powerful way he did. Vance is not uninterested in psychology, but he is even more interested, not in sociology exactly, but in *man in society*. I am reluctant about the term "sociology" because Vance's interest is more philosophical than sociological. I say this because, except in the case of *The Languages of Pao* or lighter works such as *The Dragon Masters* and *The Dogtown Tourist Agency*, his work is untainted by the scientism that dominates sociology. Vance, unlike Zola and many other modern writers, does not believe that man is a function of his environment, a sort of rat or bee. He believes in human liberty.

In the typical romance, the heroine, after various trials, ends up happily married. In the typical adventures, the hero, after great trials, attains his goal, whatever it may be—saving the universe for instance. But Jane Austin has so much more to tell us that, despite the superficial similarity, the gulf between the work of a Barbara Cartland, and hers, might be compared to the difference between a paper airplane and a Saturn V. In the same way, Vance's adventures, as compelling and enjoyable as they may be in themselves, are not about seducing and amusing the reader, though they do, but are frames for the particular moral tale he has to tell. *Huckleberry Finn*, though essentially an adventure, bares the same relation to, say, a *Hardy Boys* book as Jane Austin's novels bare to Barbara Cartland's. Vance's books are in the *Huckleberry Finn* category.

In *Winged Being Plucking a Fruit from the Tree of Life* (in: Jack Vance: Appreciations and a Bibliography) there is a lengthy argument that the milieu of Vance's stories is the essential environment of the soul. To say this another way: Vances' stories are about how we should use our freedom in the temporally, materially and spiritually limited circumstances in which we fatefully find ourselves.

Paul Rhoads

---

## Letter

Cosmopolis Editor:

I am writing in reference to the article "Reflections on Contemporary Literature, Part 1: Paul Auster, A Contemporary Great?", published in number 14 of Cosmopolis.

I am a new subscriber to the VIE project, and this was the first issue of Cosmopolis that I have received since making my down payment. While I had no preconcep-

tions about the publication, I was dismayed to see such an unpleasant, biased review of the work of Paul Auster, who happens to be (along with Vance) one of my favorite authors.

Of course there is nothing reprehensible about writing negative reviews. This is part of the process by which we weigh the merits of our creative artists. However, this article in particular seems to go well beyond the bounds of even-handed treatment.

If I may quote the first paragraph as an illustration:

"Someone I met the other day just lent me (or forced upon me) a book, published in 1992, annoyingly entitled *Leviathan*, and written by the celebrated Paul Auster. She held it up, asked me if I had read it, and when I admitted I had not, hollered in shock. She thrust the book at me, insisting upon its status of 'masterpiece' and exclaiming at the scandal of my innocence."

From this small overture to the rest of the article, the sane reader can tell immediately that our intrepid reviewer was looking for reasons to hate this book even before he turned the first page.

The book was "forced" upon him. It has an "annoying" title, which I happen to find much less irritating than Vance's opaque concoctions like "Marune" and "Durdane" and so on. Its proponent "howls in shock" and so on, implying that Auster's admirers are dogmatic, subverbal, myopic zealots. Auster is "celebrated", which, unless I am imagining things, betrays the author's resentment against Auster for achieving a certain amount of notoriety in literary circles whereas Vance's genius is neglected.

The rest of the article is a shameful exercise in Auster-bashing, characterized by a relentless inclusion of negative terms like "feeble" and "silly" and "scribble" and "wooden" and "formless". *Leviathan*, in my opinion, is none of the above.

Mr. Rhoads tries to prove Auster's inferiority by comparing examples of Auster's prose to Vance's. While I relish Vance's wonderfully baroque language, Auster's spare, clean sentences have a power wholly other. Auster is concerned with abstractions and psychology, not with making sure that we know what everyone's wearing and what color their eyes are.

Mr. Rhoads falls back on insults: "Fashionable trash! Dishonest, pretentious foolishness! An insult to the intelligent reader!" The only insult I feel is that I am expected to take this article seriously. Shouting pejorative remarks makes Mr. Rhoads seem like Gilgad and the other magicians in "Fader's Waft", all too eager to convict Rhialto of various crimes of which he was innocent,

only because they disliked him already.

Mr. Rhoads even has the nerve to call Auster “heavy-handed”, when this article itself is the most heavy-handed thing I’ve read in years.

Vance’s delicious sentences evoke worlds and people who are instantly familiar but immediately alien. Auster, by contrast, is talking about real people in the real world. His deadpan, measured tone gets out of the way so that the reader is staring interesting things in the face. In my limited experience, Vance’s language does not get out of the way, nor does it need to; it’s part of the fun.

No, I do not think that spare, plain language is automatically good either. For example, I can’t stand the work of Ernest Hemingway, who is also known for the simplicity of his prose. All I’m saying is that I find Auster’s work fascinating even though his language is not as florid or spectacular as Vance’s. It’s not trying to be. Different tools for different jobs.

Of course it is perfectly acceptable for two people to like Vance but disagree about Auster. I am not on a mission to attempt to convince Mr. Rhoads (or anyone else) to like Auster’s work. That’s a matter of taste. My only quarrel with Mr. Rhoads is with his manner. I would point out that if he wants people to take his opinions seriously, perhaps he should scale back a bit on the enthusiastic bile and rancorous sarcasm, cultivating instead a more reasoned, even tone. He might also want to spell filmmakers’ names correctly. He calls Auster “leftist” but then he spells Ronald Reagan’s name wrong. He misspells “Hobbes” too. What is one to think? (Although I concede that the spelling errors could be the work of the Cosmopolis staff.)

I am also disappointed that Cosmopolis would publish this article. Is the VIE organization so starved for news that we must fall back on this sort of thing? I see from the masthead at the end of Cosmopolis that Mr. Rhoads is the editor-in-chief of the VIE project. Perhaps this explains the publication of such a venomous article, but I hope not. One of the purposes of the VIE project is to try to get Jack Vance the recognition that he deserves as a serious author. This purpose is not served by publishing this sort of article; it would only lend credence to the idea that Vance’s work is best reserved for sci-fi flakes.

I read Cosmopolis for news about Vance and the progress of the VIE project. If I want book reviews I will look elsewhere. I look forward to subsequent installments of the “Reflections on Contemporary

Literature” series with trepidation and distaste.

Thank you for your time and attention.

*Bill Sherman*

(new VIE subscriber: bsherman@tiac.net)

Rhoads Replies:

Though I would prefer that everyone agreed with all my opinions—an ego-centric trait I share with the rest of the earth’s population—Mr. Sherman may rest assured that he was not “expected to take this article seriously”. The Editors of Cosmopolis, in all modesty, leave readers entirely free to react, as they think best, to any Cosmopolis article! It is true that, initially, we had hoped to charge our publication with a subliminal emanation obliging readers not only to take it seriously, but actually to approve each opinion it contained; but we failed to procure such an emanation, or even to learn a method for charging it into the publication. Thus we have fallen back, regretfully I admit, on a position of ‘tolerance’ by which we grudgingly recognize the intellectual independence of each reader.

As for spelling errors, I must humbly plead for indulgence. The fact is; I am a terrible speller—despite energetic use of ‘spell check’. It is a serious flaw, but what can I do? I simply have no idea whether words are correctly spelled or not, and looking them up is a tedious process for me because of incapacity to keep the order of the alphabet in my mind. I am obliged to sing and re-sing the ABC song to keep oriented. I have recourse to dictionaries nonetheless, but often my orthographical notions are so fantastical that I can never find a word, despite singing in different keys and modes, with both *vibrato* and *sustituto*. As a result I am the butt of cruel jokes among the VIE management staff, and I must endure the remarks of justifiably scandalized readers . . . who remind me of certain justifiably scandalized teachers of my not-regretted school days. So what can I do, beyond submitting to complaints and ridicule in a spirit of submissive apology? Some might suggest: “cease writing” . . . which would be nuncupatory.

Normally Cosmopolis is checked by several proof-readers, but these people are also busy doing VIE text work. In short; Cosmopolis is a volunteer publication, and though we try to attain “professional” standards, we reserve our main effort for the v-texts. The imperfections of Cosmopolis must be borne philosophically!

To address Mr. Sherman’s points; I did not excoriate Auster for failing to use a “baroque” style in the alleged

manner of Vance. Vance does not use such a style (baring passages from certain texts written in the 1940s). The word that best characterizes his style, is 'efficacious'; Auster's style, despite, or because, of his earnest efforts to use sentences of less than six words, is the opposite, and few of these sentences are coherent on their own. By contrast, here is the first sentence of *The Face*: 'Jehan Addels, after his meticulous habit, arrived ten minutes early to the place of rendezvous.' Or again, the first sentence of *The Palace of Love*: 'The longer Alusz Iphigenia traveled in the company of Kirth Gersen, the less certain she became that she understood his personality.' Or the first sentence of *The Star King*: 'Smade was a reticent man.' Hardly 'baroque', but each a story in itself! Now go look at any passage of Paul Auster . . . And if the spectacle of an incensed gnat hopping about near the ankle of an unheeding colossus troubles Mr. Sherman, he might consider trying a different, and larger, perspective.

Please keep your letters coming!

---

## Closing Word from the Editors:

Because of the volunteer nature of the VIE, *Cosmopolis* #15 has suffered an unfortunate delay. It has also not benefited from our usual proofreading passes, and thus will contain a greater crop of misspellings than usual. We hope that not only Bill Sherman, but all the rest of you as well, will manifest indulgence. More than this, we would appreciate someone willing to take on the duties of *Cosmopolis* editor! It is a big job, and requires a person who has character and lacks squeamishness. *Cosmopolis* is not only a *VIE workplace*, but an *open forum* for all members and observers of the project.

A LATE NOTE: the next issue of *Cosmopolis* will include sample pages from *Wyst: Alastor 1716*, the first book composed, now almost through Post-Proofing.

COSMOPOLIS SUBMISSIONS: when preparing articles for *Cosmopolis*, please refrain from fancy formatting. Send raw text. *Cosmopolis* uses Amiante. We therefore format everything in 18, 12, 10 and 8 points exclusively, and never use bold. If you wish special treatment for lists or what-have-you, please indicate this in an accompanying note or sketch, in-text, or out. This will simplify

work for our composers. If you cite book titles, these should be italicized, not underlined. Use the m-dash, not the n-dash, and without spaces. Use the ellipsis character, without surrounding spaces, in place of three periods. Please do not use the tab key when beginning paragraphs. For *Cosmopolis* #16, please submit articles to Paul Rhoads: [prhoads@club-internet.fr](mailto:prhoads@club-internet.fr)

---

## The Fine Print

### Contributions to *Cosmopolis*:

Letters to the editor or essays may be published in whole or in part, with or without attribution, at the discretion of *Cosmopolis*.

### *Cosmopolis* Delivery Options

Those who do not wish to receive *Cosmopolis* as an e-mail attachment may request "notification" only.

HTML versions of many past issues are available at the *VIE* website. The PDF versions of *Cosmopolis*, identical to those distributed via e-mail, are also available at the website: <http://www.vie-tracking.com/cosmo/>

If you wish to have the most current version of the free Adobe Acrobat Reader, follow this link:

<http://www.adobe.com/products/acrobat/readstep.html>



*Cosmopolis* is a publication of The Vance Integral Edition, Inc. All rights reserved. © 2001.