

Meschia and Meschiane

The Urth list — 8 messages, 6 voices, 28 Mar 2002

<https://urth.darkrealm.vip/thread/urth/3101>

Exported from an unofficial mirror of a public mailing list. Copyright in each message remains with the person who wrote it. Email addresses are obscured as `user at host`, the form the original archive published. This file was rebuilt from parsed fields rather than retained headers, so it is faithful in content but not byte-exact.

maa32 — 28 Mar 2002, 06:12

I thought I'd just throw this out here at you guys. I believe I owe this information to Mantis, so thanks! We all agree that the play Eschatology and Genesis closely echoes what really goes on, with the first man and first woman getting dropped off to recolonize the planet or whatever, and the threat of flood and all that good stuff. The names Meschiane and Meschia are persian ... they spring to new life out of a golden tree instantaneously after that demon wench Jahi fools Mainyu into poisoning Gaya. Once again we have life simlutaneously springing into being from foliage after the poisoned Urth is reborn. (Opposing the story of Hyacinth from mythology, the closing quote of the book: flower springs from dead man).

People seem to be primarily arguing about the indentity of Blue as Urth - and I use the trees to justify it. Is it the trees that are one step too far for most people, or do most people agree that the trees can eat people and spit out copies sans Blue=Urth? Is it the actual hybridization between plant and human that is too hard to accept, or is it the idea of sentient trees? Whatever else I may have done, I have made a huge case for the carnivorous sentience of these trees, and I have tied them to the vanished people regardless of whether eating humans creates new neighbors. Does anyone want to argue that vital first step? Trees = or approximate primitive neighbors; vines = or approximate primitive inhumu.

Blattid said I should drop Blue=Urth. I'm not, but let's pretend for a second that I did. Where does my argument then go too far? As far as I can see, it's all tied together inextricably - just say Horn is in Babbie? My only mechanistic proof (I mean, how it was done) for that transfer is the presence of the huge tree at the end of On blue's Waters where Horn/Silk has a vision of being Babbie. This of course explains a lot about the narrative changes and Babbie's later behavior, as well as the changes in the narrator at this point.

I just don't see how I could back off from one position and keep anything at all of my theory. All the way back to "Seawrack is a spy"? (Nicely confirmed by GW, I might add.) Marc Aramini

Spectacled Bear — 28 Mar 2002, 13:24 · follows maa32

At 06:12 2002-03-28, Marc wrote:

...

People seem to be primarily arguing about the indentity of Blue as Urth - and I use the trees to justify it. Is it the trees that are one step too far for most people, or do most people agree that the trees can eat people and spit out copies sans Blue=Urth?

The ideas about trees are extremely interesting, even without believing that Blue is Urth. And the reason it seems unlikely that Blue is Urth is that you can see the one from the other, or at least see the Old Sun from Blue.

SBear.

Dan'l Danehy-Oakes — 28 Mar 2002, 16:47 · follows Spectacled Bear

We all agree that the play Eschatology and Genesis closely echoes what really goes on,

Modulo some meaning of the word "closely," I think we can all agree with this proposition, yes.

People seem to be primarily arguing about the indentity of Blue as Urth - and I use the trees to justify it.

That's where my credulity falls down and goes boom. I simply fail to see any connection from the trees to the "return to Urth" scenario. It is, as Cornelius Ryan might put it, a hypothesis too far.

Is it the trees that are one step too far for most people, or do most people agree that the trees can eat people and spit out copies sans Blue=Urth?

That some trees on Green are carnivorous seems beyond argument.

That some trees on Blue are carnivorous seems at least plausible.

Spitting out copies, I'm not so sure about, nor could I, if you held a gun to my head, believe any argument given thus far that the trees spawn the Neighbors.

Is it the actual hybridization between plant and human that is too hard to accept, or is it the idea of sentient trees?

Neither of these bothers me particularly. (BTW, there's an interesting quote in the Green Man passage of "Claw" that might be relevant here. I don't have my copy to hand, but it's something to the effect that "even if trees were to follow the one path in a million that leads to sentience, they would not have the form or mind of men.")

Whatever else I may have done, I have made a huge case for the carnivorous sentience of these trees, and I have tied them to the vanished people regardless of whether eating humans creates new neighbors. Does anyone want to argue that vital first step?

The only part of this I question is the sentience of the trees. Carnivorous, certainly; related to the Neighbors, absolutely.

Trees = or approximate primitive neighbors;
vines = or approximate primitive inhumu.

Again, I question this. I don't say "drop it" the way I do the "Blue = Urth" hypothesis, because I think it has merit and is worth pursuing. I simply don't think it's sufficiently established yet. But there aren't the kind of strong arguments _against_ it that there are for the "Blue = Urth" hypothesis, so its explanatory power is a prima facie argument for its plausibility, if not its probability.

Can I say this too many times? My point about the "Blue = Urth" hypothesis is that, in the presence of so much evidence against, you need a textual smoking gun to make the hypothesis even _plausible_. That doesn't apply to the whole "trees = neighbors, vines = inhumu" business, where the only real counterargument is Fava's story -- do I have her name right? -- about being a young inhumu swimming around in a Greenish river. What she describes doesn't _sound_ like a vine.

As far as I can see, it's all tied together inextricably - just say Horn is in Babbie? My only mechanistic proof (I mean, how it was done) for that transfer is the presence of the huge tree at the end of On blue's Waters where Horn/Silk has a vision of being Babbie.

That isn't proof; but it is a mechanism. (I'm also agnostic about your "Horn is in Babbie" theory.) I'm not clear on what this hypothesis seeks to explain or why it's necessary. It certainly seems to me that the Narr still "contains" Horn right up to the end (indeed, I'm not at all convinced by the arguments some make that the Narr is "only" Silk after his confession-crisis).

No, wait: I do recognize one thing it could explain: Marble's prophecy. It does not, however, explain the Narrator's comment on the prophecy, particularly since that comment is made before the vision of self-as-Babbie; I believe that comment implies that Marble's prophecy has come true in the Narrator's mind by that point.

This of course explains a lot about the narrative changes and Babbie's later behavior, as well as the changes in the narrator at this point.

What changes, specifically, are you referring to? How does the Narrator and the narrative in the second book differ from that Narrator in the first, and how is this explained by Horn being transferred to Babbie? Similarly, what changes in Babbie's behavior does it explain and how? (And why would the tree do this? - you have a mechanism, but it is a totally unmotivated mechanism as far as I can see.)

I just don't see how I could back off from one position and keep anything at all of my theory. All the way back to "Seawrack is a spy"? (Nicely confirmed by GW, I might add.)

How does any of it require Blue to be Urth? I simply do not get this.

Michael Straight — 28 Mar 2002, 17:08 · follows Dan'l Danehy-Oakes

On Thu, 28 Mar 2002, Dan'l Danehy-Oakes wrote:
That some trees on Green are carnivorous seems beyond argument.

I missed that detail. Do you have a reference?

The only part of this I question is the sentience of the trees.
Carnivorous, certainly; related to the Neighbors, absolutely.

By "related to the Neighbors" are you referring to the Narrator's ability to walk between them, or that they are both lifeforms of the same planet/ecosystem, or something else?

-Rostrum

Dan'l Danehy-Oakes — 28 Mar 2002, 19:49 · follows Michael Straight

I wrote:
That some trees on Green are carnivorous seems beyond argument.

And Rostrum queries:

I missed that detail. Do you have a reference?

Not right now -- I will be rereading the Short Sun in a couple of months & (if I remember!) will post this.

The only part of this I question is the sentience of the trees.
Carnivorous, certainly; related to the Neighbors, absolutely.

By "related to the Neighbors" are you referring to the Narrator's ability to walk between them, or that they are both lifeforms of the same planet/ecosystem, or something else?

Nothing so specific -- only that there seems to be some kind of association between the two. The Neighbors always seem to be seen in tree-y areas.

--Dan'l

Jerry Friedman — 28 Mar 2002, 20:18 · follows Dan'l Danehy-Oakes

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

...

As far as I can see, it's all tied together inextricably - just say Horn is in Babbie? My only mechanistic proof (I mean, how it was done) for that transfer is the presence of the huge tree at the end of On blue's Waters where Horn/Silk has a vision of being Babbie.

That isn't proof; but it is a mechanism. (I'm also agnostic about your "Horn is in Babbie" theory.) I'm not clear on what this hypothesis seeks to explain or why it's necessary. It certainly seems to me that the Narr still "contains" Horn right up to the end (indeed, I'm not at all convinced by the arguments some make that the Narr is "only" Silk after his confession-crisis).

No, wait: I do recognize one thing it could explain: Marble's prophecy. It does not, however, explain the Narrator's comment on the prophecy, particularly since that comment is made before the vision of self-as-Babbie; I believe that comment implies that Marble's prophecy has come true in the Narrator's mind by that point.

I believe the narrator says quite explicitly, shortly after recounting the prophecy, that he (as Horn) was riding a beast with three horns when he was died. As Marc says, a Wolfean prophecy can have two meanings, though.

Do we know that the unaltered Babbie has two horns, by the way? ...

Jerry Friedman

Jerry Friedman — 28 Mar 2002, 20:32 · follows Jerry Friedman

--- Spectacled Bear <spectacled.bear at pobox.com> wrote:

At 06:12 2002-03-28, Marc wrote:

...

People seem to be primarily arguing about the indentity of Blue as Urth - and

I use the trees to justify it. Is it the trees that are one step too far for

most people, or do most people agree that the trees can eat people and spit

out copies sans Blue=Urth?

Like Rostrum, I haven't noticed anything about the trees' eating people, although I do remember a strong hint of their sentience (when Horn sees through the dying Krait's eyes). As for spitting out copies--xylography?--I don't remember any hint of that.

The ideas about trees are extremely interesting, even without believing that Blue is Urth. And the reason it seems unlikely that Blue is Urth is that you can see the one from the other, or at least see the Old Sun from Blue.

I can see two possible explanations for this. One, which I saw suggested by Jeff Wilson, is that the _Whorl_ got back to Ushas by going through a space warp, which is still warping the path of the light from the Red Sun and sending it on a round trip. The space warp would have been placed in the _Whorl_'s path by the Hierodules or somebody, presumably to repopulate Ushas after the People Vanished. The difficulty is that you have to assume something with no evidence in order to save a theory that's already short of evidence.

The other is that Silkhorn is not being overly scrupulous with the truth, as part of his campaign to tempt Juganu into helping him and Oreb and Hoof travel astrally back to Urth. After all, how does Silkhorn know which star it is? The difficulty is that most of his dishonesty is suppressio veri and suggestio falsi; what he says about the red star would be pretty close to a direct lie.

Jerry Friedman

matthew.malthouse — 02 Apr 2002, 10:47 · follows Jerry Friedman

On 28/03/2002 16:47:47 Dan'I Danehy-Oakes wrote:
and before him Marc wrote

That some trees on Green are carnivorous seems beyond argument.

That some trees on Blue are carnivorous seems at least plausible.

Spitting out copies, I'm not so sure about, nor could I, if you held a gun to my head, believe any argument given thus far that the trees spawn the Neighbors.

Is it the actual hybridization between plant and human that is too hard to accept, or is it the idea of sentient trees?

Whatever else I may have done, I have made a huge case for the carnivorous sentience of these trees, and I have tied them to the vanished people regardless of whether eating humans creates new neighbors. Does anyone want to argue that vital first step?

The only part of this I question is the sentience of the trees. Carnivorous, certainly; related to the Neighbors, absolutely.

Trees = or approximate primitive neighbors;
vines = or approximate primitive inhumu.

Xenocide.

Matthew