

The Key to the Universe

The Urth list — 25 messages, 8 voices, 13 Aug 2010

<https://urth.darkrealm.vip/thread/urth/5710>

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.

Lee Berman — 13 Aug 2010, 17:37

Jeff Wilson-

I think Yesod *can be* cyclic. If it is a morally neutral and normally empty hyperspace that is given a spiritual character by the Hierarchy that dwells there now, when they move on the pocket of Briah-formed space around the machine-planet will dissipate or collapse, leaving a void for the next Gnah-fleeing refugees to discover and create their own Briah-formed pocket continuum to settle in.

This would explain why there are said to be multiple created worlds there, but we only see the one machine-planet with its envelope of air and simulated sun - the old, streaky stars may be little pinprick wormholes to other pocket continuums in Yesod, perhaps containing the remains of judgment planets for Briah

Jeff, in a previous post I wondered if hyperspace could have suns and planets. My understanding was that matter and energy don't really exist there (hence the meadow and brook of Madregot are not real, just metaphors to allow Severian to understand what he sees).

My conclusion was that Yesod cannot be hyperspace because it contains planets and suns and gravity, etc. You asked me for text citation of the Yesod planets and suns and I meant to get to that. But now it appears you have done this yourself. Happy I can scratch that off my to-do list! :-)

I still like to view Yesod as being the next universe in succession to Briah and as our own universe. What actually is the difference between a "simulated" sun and constructed planets and the "real" ones?

Using my model it means our Earth (and Jesus' Earth) was constructed by the hard-working holy angelic servants of The Increate that we see, not just by mindless physical forces. I feel this is in accord with Gene Wolfe's combined religious and scientific thinking and philosophy.

Ryan Dunn — 13 Aug 2010, 18:03 · in reply to Lee Berman

On Aug 13, 2010, at 1:37 PM, Lee Berman wrote:

My conclusion was that Yesod cannot be hyperspace because it contains planets and suns and gravity, etc. You asked me for text citation of the Yesod planets and suns and I meant to get to that. But now it appears you have done this yourself. Happy I can scratch that off my to-do list!

Was I the only one who, when first reading UotNS, thought that Yesod was simply a planet? He took off his necklace because he could breathe the air, etc.

...ryan

Jeff Wilson — 13 Aug 2010, 20:31 · in reply to Lee Berman

On 8/13/2010 12:37 PM, Lee Berman wrote:

Jeff, in a previous post I wondered if hyperspace could have suns and planets. My understanding was that matter and energy don't really exist there (hence the meadow and brook of Madregot are not real, just metaphors to allow Severian to understand what he sees).

My conclusion was that Yesod cannot be hyperspace because it contains planets and suns and gravity, etc. You asked me for text citation of the Yesod planets and suns and I meant to get to that. But now it appears you have done this yourself. Happy I can scratch that off my to-do list!
:-)

The problem is that my idea is that any planets or stars in Yesod are fakes, only constructs that simulate the appearance and useful features of the authentic ones in Briah, for the convenience of the Yesodis.

I still like to view Yesod as being the next universe in succession to Briah and as our own universe. What actually is the difference between a "simulated" sun and constructed planets and the "real" ones?

For one thing, Apheta remarks that they have no tides on the machine-planet. She attributes this to their lack of a moon, but it implies that their sun also fails to make tides, preventing it from being a massive star. It may even be that it's a luminous satellite circling the machine-planet, which is probably too large to rotate conventionally.

Using my model it means our Earth (and Jesus' Earth) was constructed by the hard-working holy angelic servants of The Increate that we see, not just by mindless physical forces. I feel this is in accord with Gene Wolfe's combined religious and scientific thinking and philosophy.

In that case, why bother with mindless forces at all?

I don't have a problem with the universe ultimately being of intelligent design, but I feel that people saying the intelligence *had* to intervene over time instead of making the universe self-building is presumptuous. I also find it more in character for a divinity who is supposed to have a personal relationship with every intelligent being to devote Their interventions to the people rather than the pile of rocks they live on.

Jeff Wilson - jwilson at io.com
IEEE Student Chapter Blog at
< <http://ieeetamut.org> >

Lee Berman — 13 Aug 2010, 20:53 · follows Jeff Wilson

Jeff Wilson: I don't have a problem with the universe ultimately being of intelligent design, but I feel that people saying the intelligence *had* to intervene over time instead of making the universe self-building is presumptuous. I also find it more in character for a divinity who is supposed to have a personal relationship with every intelligent being to devote Their interventions to the people rather than the pile of rocks they live on.

That is a nice and very humanistic philosophy, I think. I have no disagreement. But keep in mind I am not arguing for intelligent design, I am arguing that Gene Wolfe with his machine planet and (as you say) synthetic sun might be arguing for intelligent design of the universe, including the rocks.

This "synthetic" sun idea might even enhance the idea. Makes me think of a construction site

where they use temporary lighting during building in imitation of the permanent lighting that will one day illuminate the structure.

James Wynn — 13 Aug 2010, 21:49 · in reply to Jeff Wilson

On 8/13/2010 3:31 PM, Jeff Wilson wrote:

I don't have a problem with the universe ultimately being of intelligent design, but I feel that people saying the intelligence *had* to intervene over time instead of making the universe self-building is presumptuous. I also find it more in character for a divinity who is supposed to have a personal relationship with every intelligent being to devote Their interventions to the people rather than the pile of rocks they live on.

As I understand the theory of Intelligent Design, it posits that some natural and biological phenomena/processes are best understood and predicted if they are addressed with sciences such as engineering rather than natural selection. If I have understood it right, your perplexity is that you are applying metaphysical import to merely practical systems.

I mean, who knows what sort of things would interest an Intelligent Designer if such a person were located, and why would it matter? Even Richard Dawkins has accepted the concept of a personal Intelligent Designer as a non-problem so long as the designer were understood to be an alien race that developed according natural processes.

u+16b9

Jeff Wilson — 13 Aug 2010, 22:40 · in reply to James Wynn

On 8/13/2010 4:49 PM, James Wynn wrote:

I mean, who knows what sort of things would interest an Intelligent Designer if such a person were located, and why would it matter? Even Richard Dawkins has accepted the concept of a personal Intelligent Designer as a non-problem so long as the designer were understood to be an alien race that developed according natural processes.

That's begging the question, in the original sense. Somehow intelligence had arise for the first time in the universe, unless you have a steady state universe where intelligence has always existed. There is very strong support for the Big Bang, so the steady state model is not convincing locally.

There are some nested -inflationary schemes like Andrei Linde's (and also the Qabbala) where both can be true, as tiny bits of universe undergo local expansion into their own universe-scaled envelope, joined by a tiny bottleneck to the original, but the inflated scale and the bottleneck prevent meaningful access after the moment of sub-creation.

This still allows Wolfe to use a similar model in the BOTNS, since he has license to fudge the bottleneck into a black hole/white hole-sized opening, just like he fudges FTL and antigravity, giants and giant robots.

Jeff Wilson - jwilson at io.com
IEEE Student Chapter Blog at
< <http://ieeetamut.org> >

James Wynn — 13 Aug 2010, 23:26 · in reply to Jeff Wilson

On 8/13/2010 5:40 PM, wrote:

On 8/13/2010 4:49 PM, wrote:

James Wynn - I mean, who knows what sort of things would interest an Intelligent Designer if such a person were located, and why would it matter? Even Richard Dawkins has accepted the concept of a personal Intelligent Designer as a non-problem so long as the designer were understood to be an alien race that developed according natural processes.

Jeff Wilson - That's begging the question, in the original sense. Somehow intelligence had arise for the first time in the universe, unless you have a steady state universe where intelligence has always existed. There is very strong support for the Big Bang, so the steady state model is not convincing locally.

True. But, assuming one lived in an environment where all life was intelligently designed, questions about how an undefined intelligent life might have arisen naturally in an some unknown environment would be an entirely speculative question--beyond the realm of hard science. The principles of engineering would be the best path for understanding biology. Paleontology would be Architectural History.

u+16b9

Dan'l Danehy-Oakes — 14 Aug 2010, 00:57 · in reply to Jeff Wilson

On Fri, Aug 13, 2010 at 3:40 PM, Jeff Wilson <jwilson at io.com> wrote:
That's begging the question, in the original sense. Somehow intelligence had arise for the first time in the universe, unless you have a steady state universe where intelligence has always existed. There is very strong support for the Big Bang, so the steady state model is not convincing locally.

Of course, theism begs the question in an isomoprhic way; it ignores the question, "And where did God come from?"

Dan'l Danehy-Oakes

Jeff Wilson — 14 Aug 2010, 02:23 · in reply to James Wynn

On 8/13/2010 6:26 PM, James Wynn wrote:
On 8/13/2010 5:40 PM, wrote:
On 8/13/2010 4:49 PM, wrote:

James Wynn - I mean, who knows what sort of things would interest an Intelligent Designer if such a person were located, and why would it matter? Even Richard Dawkins has accepted the concept of a personal Intelligent Designer as a non-problem so long as the designer were understood to be an alien race that developed according natural processes.

Jeff Wilson - That's begging the question, in the original sense. Somehow intelligence had arise for the first time in the universe, unless you have a steady state universe where intelligence has always existed. There is very strong support for the Big Bang, so the steady state model is not convincing locally.

True. But, assuming one lived in an environment where all life was intelligently designed, questions about how an undefined intelligent life might have arisen naturally in an some unknown environment would be an entirely speculative question--beyond the realm of hard science. The principles of engineering would be the best path for understanding biology. Paleontology would be Architectural History.

I don't think this is necessarily the case, unless you include the possibility of radically variant physical laws that would prevent any kind of emergent, self-organizing behavior; a universe without spiral galaxies or snowflakes.

Jeff Wilson - jwilson at io.com
IEEE Student Chapter Blog at
< <http://ieeetamut.org> >

Jeff Wilson — 14 Aug 2010, 02:54 · in reply to Dan'I Danehy-Oakes

On 8/13/2010 7:57 PM, Dan'I Danehy-Oakes wrote:

On Fri, Aug 13, 2010 at 3:40 PM, Jeff Wilson<jwilson at io.com> wrote:

That's begging the question, in the original sense. Somehow intelligence had arise for the first time in the universe, unless you have a steady state universe where intelligence has always existed. There is very strong support for the Big Bang, so the steady state model is not convincing locally.

Of course, theism begs the question in an isomoprhic way; it ignores the question, "And where did God come from?"

That's about the only thing I can objectively answer about God, for the Judeo-Christian value of "God"; He must come from outside the observable, knowable domain of existence. I mean that not as an abstraction, but in the sense of the literally unknowable, unguessable condiiton of being apart from the potentially comprehensible states of being, that are limited by their own nature not just our nature as mortal creatures.

Jeff Wilson - jwilson at io.com
IEEE Student Chapter Blog at
< <http://ieeetamut.org> >

James Wynn — 14 Aug 2010, 17:00 · in reply to Jeff Wilson

James Wynn--assuming one lived in an environment where all life was intelligently designed, questions about how an undefined intelligent life might have arisen naturally in an some unknown environment would be an entirely speculative question--beyond the realm of hard science. The principles of engineering would be the best path for understanding biology. Paleontology would be Architectural History.

Jeff Wilson--I don't think this is necessarily the case, unless you include the possibility of radically variant physical laws that would prevent any kind of emergent, self-organizing behavior; a universe without spiral galaxies or snowflakes.

Well, lets assume that life on a planet was intelligently designed...that it was an artifice. And lets assume that after that moment and for 3 billion years following, although the life changed superficially over time, no new life developed there on its own--that all the life found there was a descendant of the originally ID life (this part is actually applicable to our planet). It would be reasonable to presume that studying the ID life would tell us nothing about life (intelligent or otherwise) that occurred by purely natural means. In fact, the planet would tell us nothing about the environment necessary for life to occur naturally.

u+16b9

António Pedro Marques — 14 Aug 2010, 21:01 · in reply to Jeff Wilson

Jeff Wilson wrote:

On 8/13/2010 12:37 PM, Lee Berman wrote:

Jeff, in a previous post I wondered if hyperspace could have suns and planets. My understanding was that matter and energy don't really exist there (hence the meadow and brook of Madregot are not real, just metaphors to allow Severian to understand what he sees).

My conclusion was that Yesod cannot be hyperspace because it contains planets and suns and gravity, etc. You asked me for text citation of the Yesod planets and suns and I meant to get to that. But now it appears you have done this yourself. Happy I can scratch that off my to-do list! :-)

The problem is that my idea is that any planets or stars in Yesod are fakes, only constructs that simulate the appearance and useful features of the authentic ones in Briah, for the convenience of the Yesodis.

Fakes or not, they're matter and energy in a 'place' that should have neither unless they're 'travelling in hyperspace'. Though I guess you can say they're ships or animations on a ship's screen.

António Pedro Marques — 14 Aug 2010, 21:16 · in reply to Dan'l Danehy-Oakes

Dan'l Danehy-Oakes wrote:

On Fri, Aug 13, 2010 at 3:40 PM, Jeff Wilson<jwilson at io.com> wrote:

That's begging the question, in the original sense. Somehow intelligence had arise for the first time in the universe, unless you have a steady state universe where intelligence has always existed. There is very strong support for the Big Bang, so the steady state model is not convincing locally.

Of course, theism begs the question in an isomorphic way; it ignores the question, "And where did God come from?"

It doesn't, because it posits something extraneous to the universe(s) and hence not accountable to observed processes such as space, time and causality. Or as it's usually put, 'not contingent'. Whereas 'scientism' makes a leap of methodological faith and says contingent things may ultimately need no justification. That's why the idea of infinite universes appeared: rather than overcome contingency by justification, one tries to overcome it by infinite supply.

António Pedro Marques — 14 Aug 2010, 21:20 · in reply to Jeff Wilson

Jeff Wilson wrote:

On 8/13/2010 7:57 PM, Dan'l Danehy-Oakes wrote:

On Fri, Aug 13, 2010 at 3:40 PM, Jeff Wilson<jwilson at io.com> wrote:

That's begging the question, in the original sense. Somehow intelligence had arise for the first time in the universe, unless you have a steady state universe where intelligence has always existed. There is very strong support for the Big Bang, so the steady state model is not convincing locally.

Of course, theism begs the question in an isomorphic way; it ignores the question, "And where did God come from?"

That's about the only thing I can objectively answer about God, for the Judeo-Christian value of "God"; He must come from outside the observable, knowable domain of existence. I mean that not as an abstraction, but in the sense of the literally unknowable, unguessable condition of being apart from the potentially comprehensible states of being, that are limited by their own nature not just our nature as

mortal creatures.

I'd even venture that it isn't heretical to suggest that there may be other things beyond God. It's just that, from our vantage point, there's only God. God is our singularity. If one day we get closer to God, we may find out that God is only part of something bigger, but in *our* context, there is nothing but God.

Ryan Dunn — 14 Aug 2010, 21:54 · in reply to António Pedro Marques

On Aug 14, 2010, at 5:16 PM, Ant?nio Pedro Marques wrote:

That's begging the question, in the original sense. Somehow intelligence had arise for the first time in the universe, unless you have a steady state universe where intelligence has always existed. There is very strong support for the Big Bang, so the steady state model is not convincing locally.

Of course, theism begs the question in an isomoprhic way; it ignores the question, "And where did God come from?"

It doesn't, because it posits something extraneous to the universe(s) and hence not accountable to observed processes such as space, time and causality. Or as it's usually put, 'not contingent'. Whereas 'scientism' makes a leap of methodological faith and says contingent things may ultimately need no justification. That's why the idea of infinite universes appeared: rather than overcome contingency by justification, one tries to overcome it by infinite supply.

If you are Pantheist, then you believe the Universe is equivalent to God. If you are Panenthiest, you believe the Universe is connected to God, and that God is above the substantive Universe.

I find these trains of thought more appealing in terms of "religions" myself.

...ryan

Tony Ellis — 14 Aug 2010, 22:17 · follows Ryan Dunn

Ant?nio Pedro Marques wrote:

The problem is that my idea is that any planets or stars in Yesod are fakes, only constructs that simulate the appearance and useful features of the authentic ones in Briahe, for the convenience of the Yesodis.

Fakes or not, they're matter an energy in a 'place' that should have neither unless they're 'travelling in hyperspace'. Though I guess you can say they're ships or animations on a ship's screen.

As a point of interest, Apheta says the stars of Yesod aren't so much fakes as haven't been built yet, and they can only be seen because "time runs as we ask here, and we like their light." Chapter XX.

That throwaway line is another of the reasons I don't think that Yesod can be an 'ordinary' Briahtic universe. For Apheta, Severian and everyone to experience time flowing in one direction, while elsewhere it's flowing in another... suggests there has to be something hyper about this place.

António Pedro Marques — 15 Aug 2010, 00:31 · in reply to António Pedro Marques

Jeff Wilson wrote:

Jeff Wilson wrote:

The problem is that my idea is that any planets or stars in Yesod are fakes, only constructs that simulate the appearance and useful features of the authentic ones in Briahe, for the convenience of the

Yesodis.

Fakes or not, they're matter an energy in a 'place' that should have neither unless they're 'travelling in hyperspace'. Though I guess you can say they're ships or animations on a ship's screen.

There has to be energy in Yesod for energy to flow from there to BriaH, as it is said (...)

Sure thing, I's not saying Yesod shouldn't have energy, I's saying 'hyperspace' shouldn't. (And that *because* Yesod has it, Yesod doesn't look like hyperspace.) But I'm ready to stand corrected on anything regarding hyperspace.

I don't know, if anything sounds like hyperspace in the BNS to me, it's Madregot, not Yesod. Yesod to me sounds like something of a different order. A universe, but not a BriaH-like one.

António Pedro Marques — 15 Aug 2010, 00:35 · in reply to Ryan Dunn

Ryan Dunn wrote:

On Aug 14, 2010, at 5:16 PM, Ant?nio Pedro Marques wrote:

That's begging the question, in the original sense. Somehow intelligence had arise for the first time in the universe, unless you have a steady state universe where intelligence has always existed. There is very strong support for the Big Bang, so the steady state model is not convincing locally.

Of course, theism begs the question in an isomoprhic way; it ignores the question, "And where did God come from?"

It doesn't, because it posits something extraneous to the universe(s) and hence not accountable to observed processes such as space, time and causality. Or as it's usually put, 'not contingent'. Whereas 'scientism' makes a leap of methodological faith and says contingent things may ultimately need no justification. That's why the idea of infinite universes appeared: rather than overcome contingency by justification, one tries to overcome it by infinite supply.

If you are Pantheist, then you believe the Universe is equivalent to God. If you are Panenthiest, you believe the Universe is connected to God, and that God is above the substantive Universe.

And those are other ways out for scientism, albeit uncomfy ones.

I find these trains of thought more appealing in terms of "religions" myself.

I certainly agree they may be appealing, but personally I find them unfulfilling.

Ryan Dunn — 15 Aug 2010, 00:42 · in reply to António Pedro Marques

On Aug 14, 2010, at 8:35 PM, Ant?nio Pedro Marques wrote:

I certainly agree they may be appealing, but personally I find them unfulfilling.

True, however, I was raised Catholic, and Pantheism has become my belief of choice. It handles the science as well as the "why do we dream" aspect of our life (as well as "what is life?") rather well for me.

...ryan

António Pedro Marques — 15 Aug 2010, 00:49 · in reply to Ryan Dunn

Ryan Dunn wrote:

On Aug 14, 2010, at 8:35 PM, António Pedro Marques wrote:

I certainly agree they may be appealing, but personally I find them unfulfilling.

True, however, I was raised Catholic, and Pantheism has become my belief of choice. It handles the science as well as the "why do we dream" aspect of our life (as well as "what is life?") rather well for me.

I can only feel happy for you that you're in good terms with that angle of life :)

(I gather it's 'on'. 'In' sounds better to me.)

Jeff Wilson — 15 Aug 2010, 03:45 · in reply to António Pedro Marques

Jeff Wilson wrote:

On 8/13/2010 7:57 PM, Dan'l Danehy-Oakes wrote:

On Fri, Aug 13, 2010 at 3:40 PM, Jeff Wilson<jwilson at io.com> wrote:

That's begging the question, in the original sense. Somehow intelligence had arise for the first time in the universe, unless you have a steady state universe where intelligence has always existed. There is very strong support for the Big Bang, so the steady state model is not convincing locally.

Of course, theism begs the question in an isomorphic way; it ignores the question, "And where did God come from?"

That's about the only thing I can objectively answer about God, for the Judeo-Christian value of "God"; He must come from outside the observable, knowable domain of existence. I mean that not as an abstraction, but in the sense of the literally unknowable, unguessable condition of being apart from the potentially comprehensible states of being, that are limited by their own nature not just our nature as mortal creatures.

I'd even venture that it isn't heretical to suggest that there may be other things beyond God. It's just that, from our vantage point, there's only God.

God is our singularity. If one day we get closer to God, we may find out that God is only part of something bigger, but in *our* context, there is nothing but God.

Yes, a singularity is the kind of flaw in knowable existence I had in mind.

It's also worth mentioning that GW cops to lesser, pagan powers who may also be accommodated in this fashion.

Jeff Wilson — 16 Aug 2010, 02:33 · in reply to António Pedro Marques

On 8/14/2010 7:31 PM, António Pedro Marques wrote:

Jeff Wilson wrote:

Jeff Wilson wrote:

The problem is that my idea is that any planets or stars in Yesod are fakes, only constructs that simulate the appearance and useful features of the authentic ones in BriaH, for the convenience of the Yesodis.

Fakes or not, they're matter an energy in a 'place' that should have neither unless they're 'travelling in hyperspace'. Though I guess you can say they're ships or animations on a ship's screen.

There has to be energy in Yesod for energy to flow from there to BriaH, as it is said (...)

Sure thing, I's not saying Yesod shouldn't have energy, I's saying 'hyperspace' shouldn't. (And that *because* Yesod has it, Yesod doesn't look like hyperspace.) But I'm ready to stand corrected on anything regarding hyperspace.

I don't know, if anything sounds like hyperspace in the BNS to me, it's Madregot, not Yesod. Yesod to me sounds like something of a different order. A universe, but not a BriaH-like one.

What's your source of authority on the character of hyperspace?

Jeff Wilson - jwilson at io.com
IEEE Student Chapter Blog at
< <http://ieeetamut.org> >

António Pedro Marques — 16 Aug 2010, 10:51 · in reply to Jeff Wilson

Jeff Wilson wrote (16-08-2010 03:33):

On 8/14/2010 7:31 PM, António Pedro Marques wrote:

Jeff Wilson wrote:

Jeff Wilson wrote:

The problem is that my idea is that any planets or stars in Yesod are fakes, only constructs that simulate the appearance and useful features of the authentic ones in BriaH, for the convenience of the Yesodis.

Fakes or not, they're matter an energy in a 'place' that should have neither unless they're 'travelling in hyperspace'. Though I guess you can say they're ships or animations on a ship's screen.

There has to be energy in Yesod for energy to flow from there to BriaH, as it is said (...)

Sure thing, I's not saying Yesod shouldn't have energy, I's saying 'hyperspace' shouldn't. (And that *because* Yesod has it, Yesod doesn't look like hyperspace.) But I'm ready to stand corrected on anything regarding hyperspace.

I don't know, if anything sounds like hyperspace in the BNS to me, it's Madregot, not Yesod. Yesod to me sounds like something of a different order. A universe, but not a BriaH-like one.

What's your source of authority on the character of hyperspace?

None, as I've said.

David Stockhoff — 16 Aug 2010, 11:51 · in reply to Tony Ellis

Is Apheta then speaking from within a singularity---before a star-building Big Bang? Does this explain the "yet unborn" remark?

This would require structure where I would have assumed there can be none.

Tony Ellis wrote:

Ant?nio Pedro Marques wrote:

The problem is that my idea is that any planets or stars in Yesod are fakes, only constructs that simulate the appearance and useful features of the authentic ones in Briah, for the convenience of the Yesodis.

Fakes or not, they're matter an energy in a 'place' that should have neither unless they're 'travelling in hyperspace'. Though I guess you can say they're ships or animations on a ship's screen.

As a point of interest, Apheta says the stars of Yesod aren't so much fakes as haven't been built yet, and they can only be seen because "time runs as we ask here, and we like their light." Chapter XX.

That throwaway line is another of the reasons I don't think that Yesod can be an 'ordinary' Briahitic universe. For Apheta, Severian and everyone to experience time flowing in one direction, while elsewhere it's flowing in another... suggests there has to be something hyper about this place.

Tony Ellis — 16 Aug 2010, 18:11 · follows David Stockhoff

David Stockhoff wrote:

Is Apheta then speaking from within a singularity---before a star-building Big Bang?

Apheta says that the Hierogrammates will "build" more worlds, and stars for them if required. Note the order. So I don't see any Big Bang in Yesod's future.

Or indeed in its past, given the lack of stars. I think Yesod is very much what it appears to be: a big, empty space.