



* On Concurrent Becoming *
www.mytho-logos.net

Engaging the Transient Concurrencies of Diversified Being in/as the Metamorphic Dynamism of Mythic Status

Posing the Multiplicities of Becoming Variously as Radically Interactive Dynamical Status

If the status of concurrent being is variously diversified and interactive in a polyvalent manner, then it necessarily constitutes a ‘becoming’ whose dynamics are non-linear and even intrinsically indefinite. It might be considered a ‘process of processes’ except that, if radically complex, its diversity manifests a characteristic of interactivity that is not ‘organized’ in any ultimately unitary or sequential manner. Thus the term process seems too linearly reductive to describe it. Such a context for activity can be considered as having ‘lateral width’ as well as ‘longitudinal progression’—it manifests interactive ‘movement’ in a ‘side to side’ or ‘back and forth’ manner even as it also ‘progresses forward.’

There is a sense then that it is a ‘status that is not a status’ in that it is a radically complicated and shifting composite of interactive and thereby overlapping statuses manifesting both order and randomness. As such, it cannot have ‘a’ singular condition in a given ‘now’ or moment. Furthermore, its concurrently diversified elements are transient in such a way that these are not necessarily convergent or ‘parallel’—though some might be. The forms of concurrent becoming are ‘trans-forms’ or ‘meta-morphs’ in that these are inherently ‘this and that,’ partly one thing or status and partly others. Thus, in terms of space, things are both ‘here and there.’ Extending this overlapping interactivity in relation to time, the very notion of past versus present becomes untenable. The transience of concurrent being’s becoming is, in this regard, atemporal—it does not ‘take from’ in the usual sense of consistently structured time and space. The ‘present moment’ becomes ‘spread out’ both in space and time.

This is, appropriately enough, an extra-ordinarily difficult concept to ‘grasp’ logically or even experientially. And yet, many people will admit, when asked about how they experience time and space, that they are aware of notably different encounters with both that indicate a sense of concurrent being. Some days are ‘longer than others’ and unusual circumstances can stimulate dramatically more-than-ordinary sensings of ‘being present’ (i.e., physical danger, sexual arousal, etc.). The ‘person of anger’ seems radically different from the ‘person of sexual ecstasy’ or deep sorrow—yet both can seem to manifest ‘in the same moment.’ People experience being such ‘different persons’ simultaneously, however incongruously. Thus, in both physical and mental senses, these are somehow ‘all one person’—or at least ‘beings’ that can occur concurrently. Somehow such diverse disparity of being and becoming ‘self organizes’ so that there is some continuity, whether of ‘this diversified person’ or, more broadly, as ‘the present moment of concurrent being’s transiently metamorphic becoming.’

The mutually affecting interplays of sensorial, emotional, and rationally cognitive components active in the manifestation of consciousness (like the concurrently modifying aspects of environmental ecologies) are exemplary contexts of such ‘self-ordering concurrencies.’ These radically intricate interplays of becoming variously are as evident in an individual psyche as in collective social contexts of compounding interpersonal relationships. What is perhaps most difficult to grasp about such a radically interactive status is that its seeming particularities—such as emotional versus rational qualities of consciousness—become so mutually modifying that regarding them as separate and isolated phenomena becomes an irrational distinction. From a perspective that embraces the overall dynamical qualities of concurrency, the metamorphic ‘permeability’ or overlap of its particularities can appear quite logical. But how is one to validate such a polyvalent logic *from the perspective of* more ordinarily singular, sequential reality?

Representation of such a status of shifting, overlapping statuses would seem to require a similarly unfixed, polyvalent quality. The static character of ‘a formal representation’ thus seems inappropriate. And yet, if it is to be known, to be ‘thinkable,’ its dynamism must be re-presented to consciousness by way of some form or figuring. Such an appropriate representation would need to suggest, to an ordinarily pragmatic perspective or frame of mind, a ‘thing of impossibly complex dynamic status.’ Obviously, then, ordinarily literal and habitually socialized modes of expression that favor reductive specificity are not suited to expressing this dynamical status that manifests as ‘neither this nor that’ yet also as ‘both this and that.’ This is no minor philosophical conundrum because the problem is one of adequately representing the intricacies of the inclusive or totalistic dynamical character of concurrent realities. This present discourse on the topic presents the challenge of how to represent such radical status from within the language

usage of ordinarily pragmatized perspective on identity and reality. That language usage necessarily favors reductive singularity and linearly sequential causation essential to logical understanding. Within ordinary contexting it is useful. But it is thereby inadequate to re-presenting the dynamical nature of concurrent becoming.

Articulating the Becoming of Being Variously through the Metaphorical Metamorphosis of Myth-ing

It is presumably just this dilemma of knowing and interpreting the totality of phenomenal interplay in the transient multiplicities of concurrent being/becoming that prompts human cultures to generate mythical representations. The stories and descriptions typically classed as myths frequently portray ‘how things came to be as they are.’ The subject matter of myths tends to be about origins and the struggles of human consciousness with ‘inhuman’ forces and intentions, though these are presented in ways fantastic to ordinary, practical understanding. In so far as myths are characterized by an overtly metaphorical and metamorphic mode of representation, then that style might actually be considered to be their ‘content.’ Such a style provides a ‘dynamical mirror’ for the ‘status of statuses’ attributed to radically interactive being. Thus mythical representation can ‘figure’ a dynamical quality of many-ness in/as/of one-ness in the metaphorical combinations of ordinarily disparate entities that constitute the trans-forms of its fantastic ones. Mythical status is thereby made manifest as a metaphorically metamorphic ‘status of multiplicity.’

And yet, such figuring is also done *in reference to* more ordinarily evident ‘appearances’ of singular identity and progressive causation. That is to say, ordinarily reductive attitudes are included in and thus somehow confronted by the stories and images of mythic status. There are ‘real’ persons, places, and events included in mythic representations. Thus reductive references are positioned in context with extra-ordinarily inclusive ones. To simply eliminate references to any ordinarily familiar identity and reality would fail to bring reductive awareness ‘into relationship with’ more inclusive consciousness. This relationship is induced in mythic status by overlapping, interactive, changing, extra-ordinary categories such as human <> divine, ordinary <> monstrous, dead <> living, socially proper <> improper, or natural <> supernatural.

Representation that associates and combines such categories in an evidently actual contexting suggests some more-than-ordinary reality that is somehow related to its more ordinary counterpart. Things, persons, events become transiently convergent and hybridized in these representations. That metaphorical metamorphism provides an extra-ordinarily interactive contexting for what are ordinarily utterly distinct elements of self, other, and world. When more ordinarily familiar persons and aspects of society are ‘placed within’ the contexting of these ‘other worldly’ dynamics then conscious

awareness can be directed overtly toward the interplay of reductive and non-reductive engagement with singular and concurrent aspects of manifestation. The ‘rule of (reductive) social structure over nature’ is thereby suspended as it is submitted to the more radically interactive dynamic of concurrency.

All cultures and societies can be said to produce mythical representation of the dynamical character of inclusive totality. However, the ‘thing in itself’ of such a representation, the stories that are called myths and the images these generate, are in a sense ‘objects.’ These can be ‘taken literally’ as objective actualities in a reductively definitive manner. In so far as their metaphorically metamorphic mode is reduced to such a static condition of ‘fixed’ and exclusive status, or understood as mechanistically sequential causation, the ways in which these representations actively ‘myth’ or ‘make myth-ing’ is de-potentiated. Myth as a ‘thing’ becomes one more version of ‘how things are’ that can be regarded as ordinarily ‘true or false.’ Myth-ing regarded as a radically dynamical mode of representation has the capacity to articulate the ‘becoming of being variously’ in/as human consciousness. The literalizing of myths defends ordinarily reductive modes of hermeneutic interpretation from the implications of mythical knowing about the concurrency of reality and consciousness.

Literalized myth becomes a version of ‘historical event’ that can be judged as accurate or inaccurate in ordinarily pragmatic terms. Organized religions often assert such a literalism to the dynamically figurative representational modality of myth-ing. But asserting religious myth as history conflates ordinary and extra-ordinary frames of reality. This move suggests a ‘taking the thing of myth for its myth-ing of concurrent being.’ Such an attempt to force its metaphorically metamorphic ‘content’ into ordinarily literal terms dispels its ‘truthfulness.’ In this respect there is a correlation between literalistic religious belief and scientifically based assertions of absolute, definitive truth. Scientific representation can be considered mythical in so far as it seeks to provide human consciousness with access to the dynamical character of radically complex phenomena.

However, those technically articulated representations of phenomena (measurements, formulas, theories) are not the phenomena they seek to re-present. The representations thus function in consciousness as a means of ‘knowing and interpreting by way of dynamical figuring.’ To take scientific representation as what it represents, or vice versa, is to mistake the character of its dynamical re-presentation of phenomena. Scientific representations such as those that seek to provide awareness of the complexities of non-linear dynamics and deterministic chaos are more overtly mythical than most in that these attempt to acknowledge their ‘figuring’ of radical interactivity. Yet even such scientifically derived representations, whether of the complimentary contrasts of particle and wave status in light, or the interactivities of evolutionary

'process', can and are 'taken literally' to be what they seek to represent. That reduction of 'the phenomenon' to the representation is similar to the reduction of myths to ordinary, literalistic facts of reality, and has been termed idolatry.

The activity of myth-ing is thus presented here as a style of representation that can stimulate an epistemic mode suitable for knowing radically complex interactivity such as seems to compose concurrent being/becoming. In order to be experienced as such, these representations must encounter a hermeneutic model for interpretation (in persons who encounter them) capable of accommodating the polyvalent logics of concurrency. Otherwise, mythical knowing can be validated.

The dynamic qualities of myth-ing, or mythical dynamism, is observable in the representation of extra-ordinary or 'hidden' complexities of self and world, or psyche and phenomena, encountered in much artistic expression. How 'art' is interpreted, what models for meaningful understanding are 'applied' to it as a mode of knowing, further illustrate how ordinarily habitual attitudes reflexively try to impose reductive definitions even upon extra-ordinary knowing and manifestation. 'All the mythical representation in the world' can be so deflected from altering ordinary sense of self and world by the resolutely reductive habits of knowing identity and reality.

Myth-ing the Ordinary into Its Inherent Strangeness without Fantastic Representation

Though myth-ing is associated primarily here with the role of fantastic or extra-ordinary modes of representation in images and events, the notion is not quite so 'black and white.' It is quite possible for ordinarily established identity and reality to be 'made strange' and mysteriously complicated without using fantastic imagery and actions. Uses of unusual juxtaposition, disruptions of habitual expectations about what ordinary assumptions actually imply, or how these relate to each other, can suddenly alter one's sense of 'how things really *really* are.' Representation that reveals unacknowledged aspects of ordinary identity and reality can take the form of subtle departures from typical associations, narrative pacing, point of view, contextualizing of familiar information, and uses of normal vocabulary.

Manipulations of these aspects of perceiving and interpreting can quite radically reposition how 'the ordinary looks at the ordinary.' This mode of 'rendering the ordinary mythical,' or more obviously concurrent and radically complex, is obviously important. It can seem more valid to literalistic attitudes than metaphorically metamorphic representation. However, it does not appear adequate as a means of disrupting the reflexive dominance of reductive understanding in consciousness and social life. Despite its accuracy and cogency it is frequently dismissed as simply

‘inaccurate’—much in the way that literalized or ‘historical’ myth is ‘debunked.’ Mythic status as an encounter with the radical complexity of concurrency in/as mythical dynamism, it is not simply an inherent consequence of mythical representation. Mythical knowing requires some preparation to ‘know and interpret mythically.’

Additional elaboration of these concepts in Chapter Seven of **Manifesting the Many in the One**

* * * * *

© Copyright June 3, 2005
Leslie Emery