
Subject: Rereading

Posted by [mae](#) on Thu, 27 Jun 1985 20:39:39 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Article-I.D.: aplvax.120

Posted: Thu Jun 27 16:39:39 1985

Date-Received: Mon, 1-Jul-85 07:59:18 EDT

Distribution: net

Organization: JHU/Applied Physics Lab, Laurel, MD

Lines: 25

Xref: watmath net.books:2003 net.sf-lovers:8313

>From Lee Gold (barryg@sdcrdcf.UUCP):

> I typically let a book wait a week or two before rereading it . . .

Above is just one example of something that has been discussed a lot here lately- reading books a second time and how some are still exciting after 20 readings. I have one question for all of you on this -

HOW DO YOU HAVE TIME FOR THIS?????

The stack of books I have "to be read" fills the shelf in my nightstand and part of the storage space in the headboard of my bed. I try to keep up to date on the magazines I read but I'm usually about a month behind. My stack of sf fanzines to be read is probably a foot deep. I carry a book with me at all times (though I have better sense than to read while driving as has been complained about in net.auto) and am a reasonably fast reader, or at least I was back in school when such things were tested. There are books I've read more than once, such as Lord of the Rings, but usually with several years between readings. There are lots of books I would like to read again but there is too much I want to read for the first time. Have you taken speed reading or what? I guess my problem is I want to read EVERYTHING. (Just finished Flight of the Dragonfly - very good)

Mary Anne Espenshade

...!{allegro, seismo}!umcp-cs!aplvox!mae

Subject: Re: Rereading

Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Mon, 01 Jul 1985 14:21:09 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: mr@hou2h.UUCP (M.RINDSBERG)

Article-I.D.: hou2h.958

Posted: Mon Jul 1 10:21:09 1985

Date-Received: Tue, 2-Jul-85 05:26:24 EDT

References:

Organization: AT&T Bell Labs, Holmdel NJ

Lines: 32

Xref: watmath net.books:2004 net.sf-lovers:8322

> >From Lee Gold (barryg@sdcrcf.UUCP):

> > I typically let a book wait a week or two before rereading it . . .

>

> Above is just one example of something that has been discussed a lot
> here lately- reading books a second time and how some are still exciting
> after 20 readings. I have one question for all of you on this -

>

> HOW DO YOU HAVE TIME FOR THIS?????

>

> The stack of books I have "to be read" fills the shelf in my nightstand
> and part of the storage space in the headboard of my bed. I try to keep
> up to date on the magazines I read but I'm usually about a month behind.
> My stack of sf fanzines to be read is probably a foot deep. I carry a
> book with me at all times (though I have better sense than to read while
> driving as has been complained about in net.auto) and am a reasonably
> fast reader, or at least I was back in school when such things were
> tested. There are books I've read more than once, such as Lord of the
> Rings, but usually with several years between readings. There are lots
> of books I would like to read again but there is too much I want to read
> for the first time. Have you taken speed reading or what? I guess my
> problem is I want to read EVERYTHING. (Just finished Flight of the
> Dragonfly - very good)
> Mary Anne Espenshade

I reread my books about once every 3 years. When my "to be read" pile is empty, I go to the bookshelf and pick an interesting book which hasn't been read in at least two years and read it.

I read about 2 books a week during slow times when I am not busy, about one a week when I am busy and about 5 a week when I am on vacation.

Mark

..!hou2h!mr

Subject: Re: Rereading

Posted by [donn](#) on Mon, 08 Jul 1985 01:05:18 GMT

Article-I.D.: utah-gr.1502
Posted: Sun Jul 7 21:05:18 1985
Date-Received: Sat, 13-Jul-85 15:32:25 EDT
References:
Organization: University of Utah CS Dept
Lines: 39
Xref: watmath net.books:2028 net.sf-lovers:8631

From: mae@aplvox.UUCP (Mary Anne Espenshade)

... I have one question for all of you on this -

HOW DO YOU HAVE TIME FOR THIS?????

I don't. But I do it anyway...

It's just one of those things. I start thinking about a scene or a character from a book I really liked so I take it down from the shelf and before I realize it I'm halfway through. I've learned to stop worrying when this happens; I no longer put myself on a schedule that forces me through a pile of books at a rate I don't like. In fact I never read anything any more unless I'm in the mood for it -- there's no sense in making a duty out of something you enjoy.

There are added benefits to rereading, less important than having fun, but still worth considering. I often notice different things on a multiple reading -- for example, I might be confused or puzzled about some point in the plot of a book, and upon rereading it will suddenly become clear. Or there might be a clever touch or two that didn't register on a first pass. Some books seem to have the sort of architecture that won't permit you to read them in a single linear pass, whose events can't be analyzed unless you can see them in a different order. (Gene Wolfe's PEACE comes to mind...) Sometimes the structure of a book, hidden before, is beautifully and unexpectedly unveiled by a later rereading.

One day you'll happen to pull a book off the shelf and scan through it for something and maybe you won't really be paying attention and the pages are just flipping past but a word or a sentence will flash in your eye and you'll stop and stare and exclaim, 'What!? I don't remember anything like that!' And then you'll be hooked on rereading...

I don't have time to read netnews either,

Donn Seeley University of Utah CS Dept donn@utah-cs.arpa

Subject: Re: Rereading
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Wed, 10 Jul 1985 07:44:40 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: ccrrick@ucdavis.UUCP (Rick Heli)

Article-I.D.: ucdavis.348
Posted: Wed Jul 10 03:44:40 1985
Date-Received: Thu, 11-Jul-85 08:23:01 EDT
References:
Organization: University of California, Davis
Lines: 13
Xref: watmath net.books:2018 net.sf-lovers:8568

>
> One day you'll happen to pull a book off the shelf and scan through it
> for something and maybe you won't really be paying attention and the
> pages are just flipping past but a word or a sentence will flash in
> your eye and you'll stop and stare and exclaim, 'What!? I don't
> remember anything like that!' And then you'll be hooked on rereading...
>

Doesn't "scan" mean to read very closely or intently? Should "skim"
have been used here? Sorry, old pet peeve...

--

--rick heli
(... ucbvax!ucdavis!groucho!ccrrick)

Subject: Re: Rereading
Posted by [Anonymous](#) on Wed, 31 Jul 1985 16:29:47 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Originally posted by: slack@ittvax.ATC.ITT.UUCP (Tom Slack)

Article-I.D.: ittvax.450
Posted: Wed Jul 31 12:29:47 1985
Date-Received: Sat, 3-Aug-85 06:09:11 EDT

References:

Organization: ITT-ATC, Shelton Ct.

Lines: 42

Xref: watmath net.books:2091 net.sf-lovers:9192

> >

> > One day you'll happen to pull a book off the shelf and scan through it
> > for something and maybe you won't really be paying attention and the
> > pages are just flipping past but a word or a sentence will flash in
> > your eye and you'll stop and stare and exclaim, 'What!?' I don't
> > remember anything like that!' And then you'll be hooked on rereading...

> >

>

> Doesn't "scan" mean to read very closely or intently? Should "skim"
> have been used here? Sorry, old pet peeve...

> --

> --rick heli

> (... ucbvax!ucdavis!groucho!ccrrick)

No scan implies neither close attention nor inattention.

Rather it refers to the sequential nature of a method.

Thus to scan a horizon is to look intently at each thing
in particular on the horizon in sequence lest you miss something.

To scan a book implies that you are not
necessarily reading it but only sequentially perusing it.

A connotation is that you are looking for something.

Skimming a book by the way means that you are skipping things.

It has the connotation that you are picking
up enough information that you will either:

a) Not need to read a book.

b) Be able to read it with more comprehension when you do.

It could be used in the above entry instead of scan, but probably
should not because the person is looking for something, and
will stop if he finds it.

It is true however that another usage of the word scan is to look
intently on a small area: He scanned her face for a glimmer
of intelligence, but found none.

Scanning a book in this way would imply that one is looking only
at one page or at the cover. In view of the other definitions of
scan, this would be a poor word choice for that meaning.

Tom Slack

The above is my own uncollaborated opinion.
