



* On Archetypal Method *
www.mytho-logos.net

Archetypal, Archedynamic Analytical Method and the Mytho-Logos of Mythical Knowing

What Potent but Obscure Factors shape Consciousness and Identity?

How to examine Self and World for 'What We Do Not Yet Know?'

What Logic best guides Analysis of Radical Complexity?

Just what is 'The Force' of Habit?

Such basic questions prompt the investigations presented on this web site. These are approached through depth psychological, mythological, and philosophical perspectives on the irreducible complexity of identity, experience, phenomena, and truth. These perspectives are deployed to investigate knowing the complexities of self, other, and world in various social and cultural contexts. Other intellectual disciplines are also referenced in these efforts since a genuinely transdisciplinary perspective is essential to any adequate investigation. Thus many sets of criteria for 'how things are composed' and 'how processes work' are engaged in these analyses.

In applying those criteria to discerning and amplifying the roles of unconscious or background patterns in our lives, rigorous rational analysis is required. However, idealistic rationalism, objective description, and mechanistic explanation prove inadequate to portraying the radical complexity of how such patterns form and interact in human understanding. A reasoning that is subtly various, along with a mode of expression that is metaphorically logical, are required to articulate the meaningful significance of these 'forces' that configure mind or psyche—and thereby behavior and reality. Thus the style of the work offered here is meant to model a complimentary

relationship between self-consistently linear reasoning and more multi- or polyvalent interactive rationales. The complexities of that relationship between more linear and more recursive reasonings is articulated here in both discursively precise and poetically dynamic dictions. That range of language usage is directed by an overall preference in analytical method for reasonable but non-judgmental elaboration. In short, analysis is not approached here as offering any final, absolute 'truth.'

The purpose of the following discussion is not to propose some particularly new or unique form of analytical process. Most of what is proposed here about the character of analytical thought is neither new nor unusual. Rather, some basic aspects of analytical processes are stated in terms intended to emphasize differences between more singularly reductive and more concurrently inclusive investigations of form and activity.

Analysis as 'Loosening' that Seeks to Reveal Patterns of Formal Composition and Dynamic Relation

In the most general sense, analysis is referred to as an activity that seeks to reveal what is 'interior' to an entity or phenomenon. It involves effort to articulate qualities or conditions that often are not immediately obvious. Thus it seeks to 'see into' and in a sense 'reveal what is hidden' or concealed by ordinary assumptions and appearances. As such, analysis is an activity defined in reference to notions of 'loosening' and 'taking things apart.' But it is not defined as a simple unraveling, smashing, or breaking open, because it has a 'logical intention.' It is in part defined by a goal of understanding the composition of and dynamic relationships between components of some entity or unity by way of 'reason.'

Thus analysis differentiates the internal complexity of an entity by elaborating its structure and dynamic activity logically. Both discerning and understanding such structure and relationships derives from comparison with models already derived from analyzing other entities. The activity of analytical examination requires such references to direct it about where to begin to distinguish component parts and then decompose how those are related or 'fit together.' Thus the 'loosening' of analysis is an inherently comparative process that proceeds in reference to models of association and examples of composition. Differences between aspects of 'an entity' and how these relate or interact are discerned by way of logical comparison to given sets of criteria. Thereby 'analytical inferences' or 'conclusions' are generated about the 'internal' composition, derivation, and function of the 'entity' being analyzed.

In one sense then, analysis is always concerned with discerning what patterns or processes organize or order the component parts of some entity. It seeks to 'loosen' component parts in such a way as to reveal how they together compose 'an entity' and

how their interactions generate the form, activity or function of that entity. But, again, analytical ‘loosening’ is not arbitrary. It is necessarily performed in reference to pre-determined criteria. There can be various types or sets of such criteria. Analyzing how a clock is composed and functions as a ‘device for measuring time’ requires both a sense of linear causation and a mechanical model of structure and function. These references enable an examination that reveals how elemental or background motifs of mechanical function are expressed in the particular structures of and relationships between the component parts of the clock. Yet an elaborating of the structure and activity of the singular entity of ‘a clock’ can also involve less mechanical references, such as how clocks influence social behaviors and even the configuration of consciousness in cultures that use clocks. Analysis of a particular entity thus can be conducted in regard to both various criteria and for different purposes. Analysis ‘loosens’ the composition of its subjects in relation to what ‘questions’ one asks about it. Analysis is thus a ‘quest’ for answers that can have different sorts of ‘objective’ intentions or expectations. Different comparative criteria and intentions create differing analyses of the same ‘entity.’

Analyzing Analysis—Logical ‘Loosening’ for Reductive or Elaborative Purposes

Since there are different sorts of analyses it is remarkably easy to combine and confuse different objectives and criteria for attempting an analysis of some entity or context. Thus people often end up arguing about whose analysis is correct when they are actually using different methods or criteria that have different interpretive characteristics. Their conclusions can differ because their methods or references differ. Similarly, a ‘single analysis’ can employ differing criteria or intentions such that its logic is inconsistent. Consistently logical analysis thus requires careful reflection upon methods, criteria, and intentions.

In general, all analysis involves some efforts to reveal ‘background,’ ‘internal,’ or inherent (even if obscured) general patterns or principles ‘at work’ in the composition and activity of ‘an entity.’ The criteria for such examination tends to differ according to the ‘field of knowledge’ used to provide analytical references. Analysis from a biological perspective involves different references than does literary, philosophical, or sociological analysis.

In addition, the primary intention or purpose for applying analytical examination can differ profoundly. It can be conducted for either reductively conclusive *or* elaboratively diversifying purposes—with the intention of generating a more singular or more pluralistic conclusion. Such a distinction exists between quantitative and qualitative analysis. Analytical method can be employed for the purpose of elaborating ‘further

distinctions' that amplify understanding or, in contrast, in an effort to establish final, exact, and definitive assessments that specify complete explanation. This latter intention is intrinsically reductive. It analyses for the purpose of establishing singular determinations and interpretations. Analysis that seeks primarily to elaborate traits of compositions and relationships between component parts is less concerned with final or singular determinations and can be classed as non-reductive in that it does not seek to 'reduce' the composition and interactions of parts to a single, linear, self-consistent order or function. This distinction between analyzing for reductive definition and more diversifying elaboration is critical to the form of understanding emphasized in the work presented on this web site. Thus some thoughts are offered on how reductive and non-reductive intentions configure logical analysis.

The reductive mode tends to be more linearly mechanistic, deriving from a hierarchical or progressive logic of structure and function. The non-reductive mode generates a more interactively organic understanding of the dynamic relations of component parts, deriving from a more recursive and concurrent set of logical interpretations. Analysis of patterns of interactive relations in a complex ecosystem (where 'everything effects everything') would be such an instance. Etymological analysis of word origins and meanings presents another context for this contrast between reductive and non-reductive examination. Words and their meanings can be reductively analyzed as if each is a separate entity that has its particular, exact, and even exclusive meaning. Yet words can also be analyzed by emphasizing a less reductive pattern of word derivation in which their meanings 'overlap' or 'interpenetrate' each other in non-linear or radial complexes of interactive associations. This approach indicates that all word meanings are dependent upon clusters of other words, which in turn have various meanings deriving from yet other 'word clusters.' This latter analysis indicates that word meanings are not exact but derive from indefinite references among and between words.

Confusion about which analyses are more accurate can thus result from comparing conclusions derived from different sets of criteria (such as from the knowledge field of economics versus that of philosophy). It can also result from confusing analyses that are guided by reductively definitive and non-reductively elaborative intentions. Generally speaking, most analyses involve both more and less reductive intentions and references. However, distinctions between these intentions and references are seldom acknowledged. Furthermore, some analytic criteria offer more or less reductive models of composition and function. When reductive and non-reductive criteria are combined the intentions of analysis are inherently confused. Quantitative and qualitative criteria are often combined in this manner, resulting in attempts to regard qualitative elaboration as asserting the certainty of conclusively reductive quantification. Thus, reductive intentions are often imposed upon elaborative methods and reductive conclusions are compared frequently with elaborative ones without awareness of their different

purposes. Arguments and disagreements are readily maintained simply by such confusions of reductive and non-reductive method or purpose. Thus analyses that appear to be in conflict can actually both be mutually accurate according to their differing methods and purposes. This conflict can be characterized as between ‘analyzing for oneness’ versus ‘analyzing for manyness.’

Given these contrasts between sets of criteria and reductive versus non-reductive intentions, the activity of analysis as a loosening that discerns or reveals ‘background motifs’ or patterns ‘at work’ in the composition or activity of an entity can generate radically different understandings—all of which might express reasonably logical consistency relative to their criteria and intentions. Thus, in general terms, the reductive mode provides understanding of how entities are composed of specifically singular elements ordered by self-consistent and progressive dynamics or functions. The less reductive, more elaborative mode can provide understanding of how a variety of concurrently active patterns that do not necessarily align and interact in a definitively mechanical or progressive manner, logically compose ‘an entity.’ These distinctions are essential to understanding the logical dynamics of concurrently plural status, or concurrent being, and its representation in mythical expressions.

Of Progressively Conclusive and Dialectically Accumulative Analyses

Analytical processes that seek to determine reductively exact and final conditions of composition or dynamic activity have obvious practical value, as in the development of technological procedures. These provide understanding of precisely repeatable sequences that progress to predictable conclusions in a mechanically consistent manner. The knowledge of chemistry is an example. Analysis that provides logical understanding of more radically complicated composition and interactivity demand a rather different model of dynamical association. This difference can be characterized as that between a simply progressive and a more accumulative one. In the progressive mode, phenomena are examined to identify succeeding developments of structure or activity—one action or development leading conclusively to the next. In this manner a linear process of singular states leading to a final, singular status can be ‘arrived at.’ By contrast, in the accumulative mode a complex of factors or components remain presently, thus concurrently, active in an inclusively diversified yet often ‘self-organizing’ status. This contrast of progressive and accumulative analysis can be illustrated in approaches to what is termed dialectical process.

The notion of dialectical thought or reasoning is sometimes represented as a progressively conclusive transition from the opposition of a *thesis* and an *antithesis* to a *synthesis* that ‘transcends,’ thus logically negates and supersedes, the preceding elements of thesis and antithesis. However, there is another, less oppositional

interpretation of dialectical thought. This view posits dialectics as an ‘interactive’ dynamic. Dialectical thought thus analyzes the complexities that are ‘interior to’ a context or entity rather than the conflict between separate, opposed entities in competition. This view of dialectical thinking ‘begins with a oneness’ that it analytically ‘loosens,’ thereby revealing its contrasting yet cohering manyness. In this process, a previously evident status is examined to reveal its ‘dialectical activity’ or ‘internal dialogue’ of elements that ‘taken together’ constitute that status.

The term dialectic derives from a Greek root that is a compound of ‘between’ and ‘speak.’ It developed as a word for the ‘art of debate’ with its ‘going back and forth’ of dialogue. Thus it gets used both to indicate a sense of ‘resolution of opposition’ and ‘dialogical activity of reason.’ As a resolution of opposites it appears to be a reductive reference, but as a process of articulating interior interactivity, it appears more non-reductive. Dialectical reasoning that emphasizes the concurrency of interactivity is thus recursive rather than simply progressive. It is this dialogical dynamic being emphasized here in reference to analysis that elaborates accumulative factors and patterns as the basis for ‘an entity’ or status.

This version of dialectical process generates analysis that is neither reductively conclusive nor mechanistically progressive, since it derives its elaboration of composition and dynamic relations by way of an inclusion of diverse elements, some of which might be in a sense ‘historical.’ That is, a given form or context might be analyzed as revealing the present effects of preceding forma or contexts. Accumulative analysis can posit a ‘history’ of ‘logical forms’ that are, in effect, concurrently participating in the present status of manifestation. In this sense there is a dialectical relationship between typewriters and personal computers, chariots and automobiles.

Such analysis of composition and dynamic activities facilitates understanding in terms of evolving aggregates of factors or propositions. In this sense a ‘line of reasoning’ exists as all of its aspects concurrently relating ‘back and forth, not just as its conclusion. ‘A rationale’ can thusly derive from various and diverse other rationales that are not entirely self-consistent but when ‘taken together’ in particular way present a logical development. The color grey can be analyzed as a singular consequence of the combination of the opposed or ‘conflicting’ conditions of black and white. In this view two different states become a single one. But it can also be viewed as the mutual presence of blackness and whiteness. Here the condition grey does not appear to simply succeed those of black and white. Dialectically these are both still present in the condition or status grey. Grey constitutes a dialectical concurrency of black and white that is of but is different from those two.

The logical form of this more inclusive notion of dialectical process asserts a bi- or polyvalent logic of interactive factors and rationales. That recursive form of logic provides a different understanding of composition and dynamic activity than does more mechanically linear reasoning. This dialectically accumulative method characterizes the analyses presented on this web site. Though it tends to suggest a progression from less to more elaborately logical understandings, it also supposes no end to such elaboration. It is thus more aggregative and open-ended, rather than totalistically conclusive.

Of Archetypes and Dialectically Archetypal Analysis

The notion of concurrent relation between the ‘old and new’ in accumulative dialectical process can be associated with the term archetypal. Dialectical inclusion posits the persisting expression of ‘preceding’ forms of composition and activity in present contexts. The term archetype is typically used to designate the existence of a more original or ‘archaic’ form that influences or manifests in the composition of a present one. The word is composed of a root meaning original, arche, and type. As such, the concept of archetypes can be employed in analysis by providing models of basic or more original forms that exist ‘within’ the composition of given objects or contexts. In this sense an archetype is an original and thus originating trait of composition.

Archetype as Original and Ideal Form: In biological terms, an ‘archetype of vertebrate skeletal anatomy’ exists that has many variations in the evolved status of different vertebrate species—from fish to birds and humans. Such shared typical patterns can be conceived as ‘a form from which all originate,’ thus as ‘an archetype.’ Such shared patterns or forms can be regarded in as deterministically reductive origins. This view is obvious in the evolutionary theory of all vertebrates having ‘descended’ from a single ancestor. As a more abstract reference, this concept of an archetype can be used to establish elemental identity, as in Platonic Idealism that conceives all forms of a type, such as ‘tree,’ as deriving from a single, original, *ideal* example—of which all trees are imitative variations. In that view, what makes trees trees is an essential, shared, original and thus ideal form. Variations of tree form thus become superfluous to their tree-ness because these diverge from the ideal example. Such reductively asserted archetypes are readily seen as singular and ‘in opposition with’ each other, as in archetypes of Light and Dark, Master and Slave, Male and Female. Thus analysis that proceeds in reference to such elemental or ideal forms tends to ‘discard’ or discount inconsistent or diversified aspects of singularly defined original or ideal form.

Archetypality as Originating Range of Qualities: The general notion of original or originating forms can also be used as a more dynamically complex reference for guiding analytical investigation. Posed as adverb or adjective rather than as noun, the concept

becomes more descriptive, as in archetypal, archetypical, or archetypic. In this expression the concept provides a less reductive, more diversified mode of referencing models for identity, composition, and relationship. The logic of this form of association enables a method of analysis that is more comparative than definitional, more inclusive than exclusive, more multivalent than oppositionally linear. It refers not so much to 'a type' as to a range of related traits or patterns that are 'typal.' The differences between analyzing by reference to exact archetypes in contrast to an 'archetypal range' or 'set of archetypic qualities' is actually quite dramatic. The reference for 'the' archetype of trees is, logically, reductively singular since it is 'a' type. The reference for the archetypal character of 'tree-ness' is diversified and inclusive of all forms of trees, which taken together constellate the related patterns of forms manifested by trees. An archetype tends to be singular and an archetypal range to be pluralistic and diversified, yet still characteristically related. Reference to archetypallity or archetypal range thus readily demonstrates a quality of dialectical accumulation and inclusion. Archetypallity thusly involves contrast and diversity. It actually derives from the inclusion of their interactivities in 'a typal field' composed by a 'going back and forth' or dynamic relationship of aspects that compose it. The archetypal character of tree-ness thus involves many variations of leaves, buds, branching, roots, etc.

Archetypal Form as 'Behind' and 'Within' Phenomena: Both the concept of archetypes and that of archetypallity can be referenced in performing analysis that seeks to reveal formal and dynamic patterns 'behind or 'within' the seeming singularity of a given phenomenon. A steel sculpture can be analyzed either in reference to how it manifests 'the' archetype of ideal tree form or in reference to how it expresses identifiable aspects of the archetypallity of tree-ness. Despite asserting an 'originating' role in composition and dynamic activities, archetypal forms often exist as background patterns that go unacknowledged as sources for the more evident forms of phenomena, thought, and behavior. The tree-form or tree-ness of a steel sculpture is not necessarily obvious, since it is most immediately identified as a sculptural form made of steel.

Thus archetypal patterning, composed by various traits that together suggest a typifying range, presents a logic of order or composition that is intrinsically dialectically accumulative and interactive. This mode of analysis 'takes things apart' in relation to characteristic patterns that appear in different contexts and phenomena, thereby relating these in an archetypal range or field that is more radically interactive than can be posed by reference to oppositionally singularly examples (such as either Light or Dark). The process of differentiating archetypal patterns (or 'patterning') to be used as references for analytical examination, requires comparing many instances of a general type of phenomenon in order to correlate characteristic traits that provide a range of diverse but somehow similar examples. The behaviors and experience of many different children in diverse contexts must be examined if one seeks to discover certain characteristic yet

diverse traits of childhood or child-ness. Those traits can be used to discern archetypally child-like patterns in the behavior of adults—even though those adults, assuming their selves not to be children, are typically unaware of ‘acting out’ archetypal traits of child-ness. The archetypal forms of child-ness can exist ‘within’ adult behavior, though not immediately obvious.

This method of comparing general patterns to specific instances is not mechanistically deterministic, however, because the background patterns referenced are diversified as ‘originating forms.’ These are concurrently present or expressed in varied ways in the particular manifestations of a ‘present’ form or context. Child-like behavior in one adult can be notably different from that in another, indicating that a broad range of archetypal references are involved in the manifestation of each. The typically characteristic patterns of childhood status, behavior, and experience are complex, though interrelated. There are many traits of being child-like and some are contradictory if used to define child-ness as a singular or self-consistent status. Together these configure an ‘originating’ field of references for being child-like, a sort of ‘palette’ of related elemental aspects. This provides a reference for child-ness that is irreducibly complex though logically coherent.

Archetypal Constellation: This mode of association can be termed constellatory since it firstly poses related but not entirely congruent aspects in a non-linear set of contrasting yet complimentary associations as an archetypal ‘field’ of reference (child-ness, book-ness, mother-ness). The diversity of that constellation of references provides analysis with a ‘flexible’ category of identification when examining an object or phenomena to determine what archetypal patterns are involved in ‘originating’ it. Traits of form and activity in the phenomena being analyzed are compared with various aspects constellated in an archetypal field. The resulting analysis does not simply match singular statuses between criteria and object of analysis. Instead, traits of the object of analysis are compared to the constellated criteria of an archetypal field to determine if the latter appears to be significantly ‘present’ in the form and activity of the object.

A logical ‘match’ between object of analysis and an archetypal range is thus a logical approximation, a judgment of relative resemblance in form and dynamic activity. This assessment involves associating various traits of the object of analysis with the criteria of an archetypal field to determine if the interrelations of each are similarly constellated—have similar patterns of association and interaction. How a particular adult’s behavior might be childish can vary greatly. Behavior in one adult might associate with certain aspects of archetypal field of child-ness but not others.

Recursive or Multivalent Association of Archetypal Analysis: Analysis using such criteria for its examination of ‘how things are composed’ and ‘how things function’ is

complexly comparative. It cannot rely on the simple criteria of exclusive categories and progressive rationales for its conclusions. It must reason in complexly concurrent ways relative to diverse archetypal criteria, thus its logic is at least in part recursive or multivalent. This form of analysis necessarily needs to resist attempts to impose predetermined values or standards on phenomenon if it is to be dialectically attentive to what is specifically ‘active’ in composing a status. It is thus also inconclusive, in that it seeks indications about how phenomenon are structured by comparing them to discover somehow similar patterns of form and dynamical activity without expecting to ‘arrive’ at final, self-consistent definitions and sequences of causation. It attempts to discern characteristics that are shared and repeated in different contexts despite disparate appearances in order to assert characteristically archetypal relationships.

Revealing Implicit but Often Unexpected Archetypal Expressions: Using the analytical references of archetypal fields, one can differentiate particular nexes or patterns of archetypal characteristics that are present or expressed in the forms of seemingly unrelated objects and contexts (such as child-ness in adult behavior). One can examine both personal and collective contexts of behavior for the presence and influence of archetypal patterns that impart some ‘originating structure’ to identity, understanding, and activity. How humans think, experience, and act can be examined for archetypal continuities and contrasts both within and across different cultures. In this manner, seemingly divergent social orders or religious beliefs and practices can be shown to manifest similar or related motifs of form and dynamic activity. Archetypal references for monotheism or capitalism can be discerned in diverse cultural contexts where each ‘takes on’ differing expressions

However, it can be extremely challenging to effectively assert the logic of how these often obscure ‘background patterns of form’ are ‘active’ in a seemingly unrelated context. A successful analysis of such implicit interplay tends to involve deconstructing habitual assumptions derived from appearances of difference or longstanding definitions. Bringing background or internalized archetypal influences to awareness thus involves making extra-ordinary connections and unexpected comparisons between typically unrelated contexts, topics, and disciplines of knowledge. Analysis that reveals the ‘present expression’ of such unacknowledged influences often provokes incredulity and resistance—though sometimes also fascination.

Such reactive responses to positing unexpected archetypal connections indicate that some significant background or underlying dynamic is indeed coming to awareness. Reactive responses to this type of analysis of ‘hidden dynamics’ can be compared to the effects of much so-called modern art on people’s ordinary sensibilities. The extra-ordinary ‘seeing into’ the ‘hidden character’ of forms and dynamics of perception that impressionist, cubist, and abstract art styles ‘revealed’ were are still rejected by many.

This 'way of seeing' tends to shock and disturb ordinary assumptions about 'how the world is' and what art 'ought to be.' Similarly, archetypal analysis often presents surprising and disturbing associations that seem extra-ordinary or even rather fantastic to ordinary understanding.

Multiple Interplays of Archetypal Patternings: Analysis in reference to archetypal ranges of form tends to be pluralistic because it refers to a diversified range of expressions of 'a type.' The diversity of manifestations of an archetypal field of related forms also tends to overlap other, related archetypal fields. Child-ness and Adult-ness are different yet related archetypal fields of formal expressions that are not exactly and absolutely separate. Yet despite some overlapping traits, these categories also tend to characterize each other by general contrasts between them. Archetypal analysis thus tends to 'play off of' both the shared and contrasting characteristics of different archetypal fields of reference. Child-ness and Adult-ness are known both by way of contrasts and continuities. If all formal expressions are considered to be composed of diverse elements, then various archetypal patternings or references can be expected to 'take part in' composing any given form, activity, or context. Archetypal analysis thus inherently involves not only revealing 'background forms' or patterns, but also how these archetypal fields interact in any given context. When not approached in an effort to establish a hierarchy of priority among such archetypal influences, analysis of their interplay asserts a dialectically accumulative understanding of the concurrency of a given formal expression. The archetypal traits of child-ness and youth-ness are both different from and intrinsic to that of adult-ness. Masculine-ness and feminine-ness can be seen to manifest interplay in all persons, male or female.

Archedynamic Aspects of Archetypal Analysis

The term archetypal suggests a formal quality. Thus 'archedynamic' is offered as posing a further distinction between 'formal types' and 'dynamic patterns.' Just as archetypal is used to indicate a resemblance to some background or originating type of structural pattern, archedynamic is used here to indicate a pattern of dynamical activity evident in a context of phenomenal occurrences. This emphasis upon dynamical patterning is important to understanding how the diversity and radical complexity of concurrent being and its pluralistic becoming is manifested and known. Various 'background' patterns of dynamic activity contribute to the 'origination' of all specific manifestations. Those that are more mechanistic and linear are readily illustrated by reference to successive singular states of being. However, the more pluralistic condition of concurrent status does not present an identifiable 'singular form' by which to identify it.

Analyzing concurrently diverse status and the radical complexity of its inter-activity thus involves reference to non-linear dynamical patterns rather than static forms. Such

dynamical complexity is difficult to represent in self-consistently progressive logic and ordinarily discursive language. It is in this regard that the recursive, polyvalent logic of mythical representation becomes an essential reference for analytical investigation of many-ness in/as one-ness.

Archetypal Analysis, Dialectical Process, and Polyvalent Triangulatory Association

Obviously, archetypal and archedynamic references are an inherent aspect of most all criteria for analytical examination—be those biological, philosophical, or literary. Archetypes and archetypal ranges of ‘originating’ patterns are intrinsic to analytical assessments. However, placing primary emphasis on archetypal and archedynamic ranges as analytical criteria shifts subsequent understanding away from oppositional relations and definitively conclusive expectations. In place of such reductive assessments comes a ‘triadic’ style of association that foregrounds multiple ‘directions’ of association. Archetypal ranges derive from ‘related contrasts’ rather than definitive oppositions. The specification of a singular status suggests a contrasting or opposite one—dry implies wet, black implies white. Much understanding is configured by such opposing states. However, these opposing pairs, when viewed as elements of an archetypal range (of moistness, or illumination), tend to imply a third, related but different status—such as damp or grey. These third references in turn suggest other aspects of the archetypal range in relation to the original two that had once seemed a simple oppositional contrast: dry is opposed by wet, which together imply damp, that in turn implies other qualities of wetness and dryness, such as humid, moist, succulent, sticky, and so on, elaborating an archetypal range of moist-ness that ‘constellates’ around the opposed statuses of wet and dry.

Thus the dialectical accumulation and interplay of archetypal analysis derives from its tendency to ‘triangulate’ references. An archetypal view of grey indicates that the conditions black and white are current, participatory factors a triangulated association--though these are not explicitly evident. In this view the status grey does not simply ‘proceed from’ the combination, and thus synthesize of black and white, but also logically ‘refers back to’ them as well, in a bivalent manner. Just as grey relates back and forth with the archetypal range of black to white, so do black and white interact in contributing to the status grey. This is a very simple version of triangulated and thus polyvalent association. There is no singular directionality or beginning and end in the triangulation of these factors that, by virtue of their contrasting but interactively related qualities, suggest an archetypal range for lightness or brightness.

Archetypal, Archedynamic Method in Psychological, Cultural, Mythical, Transdisciplinary, and Non-Hierarchical Understanding

This mode of analysis (perhaps most overtly exemplified in analytical psychology) is suited to differentiating various operant factors that are concurrently ‘active’ in a given circumstance—such as the interactive aspects of a person’s psyche or consciousness. It is not an analytical method suited to reducing such contrasting multiple elements and dynamics to a self-consistent, hierarchical order or status. Thus it does not lend itself to definitive conclusions or deterministic interpretations. It is not appropriate to determining what is absolutely Right or Wrong, True or False, Real or Unreal. Rather, it tends to amplify associations and interpretations rather than reduce understanding to singular or oppositional statements. Its logic is not strictly self-consistent but variously associative. It elaborates triangulated ‘webs’ of interactive relationships rather than progressive lines of causation. It is most effectively applied to ‘opening up’ understanding rather than ‘narrowing it down.’ Its triangulating mode of associating traits enables intricately rational examination of forms and dynamics in ways that elaborate the complexity of their interrelations without forcing these into binary or linear relationships. It is concerned with distinguishing what ‘originating’ or ‘arche-elements’ are involved in the forms and activities being analyzed rather than determining exact statuses and priorities for these.

This analytical process for specifying what patternings of form and activity in some way ‘originate’ or link seemingly disparate phenomena is ‘variously rational.’ It must deploy reasoning that is in itself archetypal rather than literalistically equational or linearly reductive. Such logic renders it especially appropriate to examining the complexities of thought, expression, action, and interpretation found in particular personal, social, and cultural contexts. Tracking the essential ambivalence of meaning making in human consciousness and socio-cultural symbolism requires such diversified amplification and interpretation. Archetypal method is thus particularly suited to analyzing the psychological and philosophical aspects of symbolic meaning. Similarly, using reason to articulate such non-linear complexity also provides a methodology of analysis appropriate to investigating the logics of ‘knowing mythically through multiplicity.’ Archetypal analysis is well suited to analyzing the concurrent plurality of meanings characteristic of mythical expressions. (See below and on **Web Site Introduction Page** for a description of “mytho-logos” or mythical logic.)

A further application for this method is in making associations among ‘field of knowledge’ or intellectual disciplines. By discerning archetypal correlations between specialized disciplinary theories and information, genuine transdisciplinary insights can be articulated without attempting to reduce diverse disciplines to reductively equational interpretations. Instead, their related ‘meaningfulness’ can be constellated in an

archetypal range. Thus, ways in which mathematics understands non-linear dynamics and depth psychological theorizes interpret the radical interactivity of psyche can be meaningfully correlated as manifesting similar archetypal patterns of interactivity without equating their irreducibly different methods and data.

A last significant trait of archetypal method for elaborating understandings is a capacity to forestall reductive valuation. Its investigation, correlation, and interpretation of multiple dynamics of meaning-making allow presentation of an analysis that is less reflexively preferential, judgmental, or hierarchic than most—and thus more immediately attendant to ‘what is actually happening’ rather than ‘is it good or bad, proper or improper, true or false, real or unreal.’

Archetypal Patterns of Reasoning and the Mytho-Logos of Knowing through Concurrent Multiplicity

The term mytho-logos is offered here as a way of suggesting that there is a reasonable logic to the way mythical expressions enable knowing the concurrencies of reality. Appropriate understanding of the multiplicity of manyness in/as/of oneness is proposed to require a ‘mythical logic.’ However, to articulate how the fantastic and seemingly unreal representations of mythical expression are logical forms for knowing and interpreting phenomena requires some archetypal analysis of how logic is typically understood. The common assumption that the overtly impractical expressions of myth constitute un-truth or falsehood derives from a presumption that logical reasoning is linearly self-consistent, reductively exact, and empirically verifiable. Obviously, from ordinary perspectives, mythic expression appears unrealistic and thus irrational.

Formal Logic: However, this view of logic or logos as reductively absolute and literally accurate derives from a particular archetypal form of reasoning. The concept of reason as utterly self-consistent, absolutely true or false constellates around the model of mathematical logic. This form of reasoning is referred to as “formal logic.” Formal logic is constituted in mathematical reduction to abstract numerical quantification and calculation. It reduces all status to numbers and its logic ‘proceeds’ in equational sequences that have “proofs.” Formal reasoning also manifests in the form of the syllogism. As with mathematical equations, the syllogism is defined by its conclusion being true because it is logically consistent with its preceding proposition. It has a “major premise,” a “minor premise,” and a conclusion: ‘All men are mortal. Socrates is a man. Thus Socrates is mortal.’ The accuracy or ‘truth’ of the syllogism is in its self-consistency, not its ‘resemblance to actual phenomenal reality.’ The ‘objects of reason’ here are secondary to the formal process. Similarly, mathematical reason asserts that ‘two goats plus two wolves equals four.’ But what, one might reasonably ask, do two goats and two wolves ‘put together’ tend to ‘actually equal?’ The ‘true’ outcome of this

‘addition’ is likely to be ‘two wolves.’ Formal logic is not concerned with context or content of an argument. Thus it is but a minor aspect of the larger archetypal field of references for forms and processes of ‘reasonable thought and rational understanding.’

Informal Logic: The equation of logical reasoning with the logical formalities of mathematical reduction and syllogistic form indicates a confusion (or ‘unconsciousness’) about the archetypal range for forms of logic. Most rational thinking is actually derived from what is termed “informal logic.” The latter derives not from the precise quantitative and calculative process of mathematics that has demonstrably true or false conclusions. Instead, it involves an exercise of rational comparison between examples of other rationales. Logical assumptions derived from this comparative process are based on other logical proposals, not exact measurements. It is constructed by linking sequences of proposed similarities or consistencies of association presented as logically or reasonably valid. Thus it proceeds with its reasoning in a hypothetical manner (if X is accepted as logical, then Y can be), and its conclusions are always subject to being re-reasoned in reference to yet other logical propositions and analyses.

Obviously, some informally reasoned rationales are more correct or accurate than others. But because its structure is different from the formal style, informal reasoning is not subject to “proofs.” The informal version does not proceed on a formulaic and equational basis. Rather, it operates by selectively choosing logical propositions or rationales to compose the criteria for a logical premise about ‘what things are,’ ‘how things work,’ or ‘why do people do what they do.’ Various informally reasoned analyses or interpretations can be generated to explain how a given phenomenon is composed or functions—all of which can appear valid *relative to* the rationales from which they proceed. But discerning which rational analyses are more accurate is itself a task of applying reason in a relative rather than formulaic manner. Though informal reasoning frequently refers to reductively quantitative and empirical data (measurements, statistics, historical events) it cannot be reductively exact. The conclusions of informal logic are thereby ever approximate, relative, and conditional. The comparative nature of informal logical process poses a logic that is qualitatively relative not quantitatively abstract. No amount of wanting it to be reductively certain is, as it were, logically reasonable.

Much of scientific knowledge is derived from the reductive precision of formal or mathematical logic. But a great deal of ‘scientific understanding’ is actually based in informal logic. Awareness that scientific knowledge is not always formally exact but is largely hypothetical is often forgotten in a mechanistic, technological society that prizes reductive precision. Reductive certainty tends to become the objective consequence of logical reasoning. In such society, truth readily comes to be considered as ‘scientifically factual,’ and facts are automatically considered to be literally quantified, reductively

certain truths. Thus truth or ‘the real’ tends to be considered as absolutely what it is stated as. The true and the false, the real and the unreal in such context are exact and literal opposites. The exactness of formal logic readily becomes an ideal of correctness. Conclusions deriving from informal reasoning are readily imbued with this aura of exact accuracy. But informal logical process cannot produce that ideal of absolute accuracy. Despite the fact that people rarely use formal logic in their daily reasonings, a tendency persists to argue as if there were only one real, absolute truth about any given issue. Thus, if one’s reasoning is self-consistent and correct, then one’s conclusions should be *the* singular and *only* truth. Such a tendency indicates a reflexive impulse to reason reductively and promotes vehement argumentation about whose (informal) reasoning is The Truth.

These so-called formal and informal modes of logical process, with their intrinsically more and less reductive emphasis, are appropriate to different concerns about phenomena. There is only one correct or accurate answer to the abstract question ‘what does 2 plus 2 equal?’ There are many reasonably valid answers to a non-quantitative question such as ‘how do children become adults?’ When informal logical process is directed at understanding the radical complexity of concurrent being and becoming it confronts the problem of reasonably describing compounded, non-linear interactivity. How to describe such a status of multiple, mutually modifying statuses that are concurrently transforming in the terms of linearly successive rationalism? If the dynamical activity of such concurrency is not to be ‘collapsed’ into a reductively linear representation, then a subtly intricate, dialectically accumulative mode of reasoning must be manifested.

The style of language most suited to re-presenting such concurrent complexity employs metaphorical and symbolic uses of words and meanings. Metaphor and symbol present a ‘both this and that’ logic of identity or occurrence. That logic of association can be seen as appropriate to a certain extreme quality of complex interactivity. Such appears to be the logic of art and myth—thus the term mytho-logos. Such a ‘logic of mythical expression and knowing’ must be radically inclusive, as opposed to radically reductive. One might propose then that the archetypal field of reference for logical understanding constellates around the radical reductions of formal method, the selective reductions of rationalistic comparison in the informal mode, and the radically non-reductive or inclusive association of the mythical mode.

The reflexively expectation that logic is defined the reductive certainty of its formal mode necessarily regards the overtly metaphorical representations of art and myth as unreal, fantastic, and logically false. The (informally) logical error of such an assumption is explored in various rational ways by work offered on this web site. The thesis developed in this work is that knowing by way of the multiplicity of mythical

representation can be eminently reasonable if one applies informal logic in a varied manner to represent the radical complexity of concurrently interactive phenomena. The logic of mythical knowing is like the concept of what is termed “deterministic chaos.” This notion depicts relations among phenomenal events as random or having no single, predictable ordering—and yet such seeming chaos can produce consequences whose causal development can be discerned in retrospect. Evidently chaotic contexts are here seen as ultimately generating some logical order even in the absence of clearly definable or predictable linear progressions of causation. Mythical logic, or mytho-logos, is proposed as a similar ‘order among seemingly chaotic diversity and complexity.’ Understanding the ‘logic of mythical understanding’ requires reasoning variously rather than in a singularly self-consistent, progressive, linear, and neatly conclusive manner.

This notion of a mythical logic for expressing the ‘dynamic character ‘ of concurrent being and its radical complexities is explored on this web site in relation to myths, art, literature, social practices, cultural beliefs, psychological perspectives, philosophical assumptions, and scientific theories. (More on mytho-logos on **Web Site Introduction** page.)

The work presented on this site attempts to demonstrate a range of stylistic modes for engaging in archetypal and archedynamic analysis. These range from more strictly discursive styles of scholarly discourse to lyrically prosaic and metaphorically poetic dictions. Taken together these are offered as an archetypal and archedynamic articulation of the diverse logics of mythical knowing considered essential to understanding the radical complexity of nature and psyche, or mind and matter, as a concurrently diversified continuum.

* * * * *

© Copyright June 3, 2005
Leslie Emery