

From: Shoko Miura

Thank you, Akiko, for a thorough and detailed reply on *TT* to my comments and questions. I now see that Hugh Person's death can be seen as indirectly caused by the ghosts in the imagistic form of flames and a "flamelet" suggesting Armande. I also think that without this interpretation, the story will lose its thematic unity (begun on page 1 which you quoted at the end of your reply). The "specter" in the sentence on the first page of *TT* is a key statement in that it speaks of the future as a mere "specter." If you turn the sentence around, we see that specters are equated with the future, which we mortals are not permitted to know. This is consistent with VN's view of time and its three parts—the past, imprisoned unless freed by memories, the present, a flash of "reality," and the dark, unknowable future. This view, according to Brian Boyd in his reply to my second batch of questions in this symposium, basically stayed the same throughout his life. Thus, your argument based on *TT* reinforces the view that VN was opposed to the idea of predeterminism. Ghosts, or imaginative suggestions of their presence, are VN's essential expression of his concept of time.

This symposium has been stimulating and enlightening, especially since I lacked knowledge of analytic philosophy, Popper and Wittgenstein and Currie. Thank you so much, Akiko, for your hard work in making it possible. I am also grateful to Brian Boyd, Zoran Kuzmanovich and Professor Tora Koyama for their generous contributions.

From: Akiko Nakata

Thank you very much, Shoko, for your stimulating response. As you interpret, we can consider that the ghost narrator allude—not only who they are but also—that they, specters, are equated with the future, and that is related to Nabokov's opposition to the idea of predeterminism.

Shoko, I deeply appreciate your generous contributions, too. Thanks to your energetic lead, we had spirited discussions.