



Descriptive Abstract for :

## Manifesting The Many in The One

On Knowing the Irreducible Complexities of Self, Other,  
and World through Singular Reduction and Diversifying Plurality

An Archetypal Epistemology of Inclusive Knowing

This work is an extensive transdisciplinary association of concepts, theories, and references for how and where inclusive or mythical understanding the 'manyness of oneness' is generated. It is comprised of an extensive introductory overview followed by chapters that investigate experience, expression, and interpretation of such concurrent being in various social, cultural, and psychological contexts through diverse intellectual disciplines of knowledge.

### **The Manyness of Oneness and a need for Knowing Variously**

Human knowing can be considered as having two contrasting modes: knowing objects and events as singular and separate, or knowing these as composites of many parts, some of which are parts of other objects and events so that these overlap. The first mode of knowing is reductive in that it separates the world into distinct, consistent states of being. It reduces to singular states that have progressive, consistent causal relationships. The second mode is pluralistic or non-reductive. It amplifies seemingly singular states and objects by differentiating 'parts' and interrelationships between these. These two modes can be referred to as knowing by 'ones' and by 'manys.'

Knowing in reference to oneness or singular status is the knowing of 'separate things.' It makes absolute distinctions. It is most obvious in the mathematical distinctions of quantification and measurement that 'exactly define' things and phenomenon. Knowing in reference to manyness is the knowing of dynamic interrelations. It is more typical of art, poetry, dream, and myth. The complexity of knowing by oneness involves

precise yet complicated series of sequences, such as mathematical calculations of scientific formula or extended rationales of successive causation between many objects and events. These tend to progress in ‘one direction’ of causation—from beginning to end. Oneness thus enables one to know ‘a thing’ or ‘a process.’ It is useful for mechanical and systematic understanding.

The complexity of knowing by manyness involves intricate webs of relation and interactions that are active concurrently rather than successively. Causality in manyness goes in ‘both directions,’ is ‘polyvalent.’ Thus it can be known only as a concurrent set of different yet interrelated activities and states of being. The complexity of manyness is radical in the sense that it is irreducible, it cannot be ‘reduced’ to a singular, sequential sequence of actions or causes. It has, in this sense, no ‘center,’ no beginning, middle, or end. Mythical complexity can be understood to have an ‘ordering’, however. It has its own logic or ‘logos’ of dynamical association and causation. What one knows by way of manyness is not so much separate states but the complex dynamics of interactivity, a matrix or web of complimentary associations.

A simple example of knowing by ones and by manys is as follows: Knowing by oneness, a square is experienced as a single, distinct shape that can be described as having four equal sides of equal length comprising four right angles. Knowing by manyness, there is square-ness, composed of four lines, four angles, the shape of the space ‘inside’ those *and* that of the space ‘outside.’ All these different entities together compose the square-ness that is termed ‘a square’ when we know it as a one-ness. But to knowing-by-manness, this status is actually a status of concurrent plurality, a dynamical phenomenon of association rather than a static, discrete, separate, singular entity.

### **Reasoning the Mythical Knowing of Concurrent Being**

A presentation of thought seeking to express logics of mythical complexity that variously articulate the concurrent statuses of being variously yet also as some singular entity. Mythical knowing is understood here as a ‘knowing variously’ or ‘knowing through multiplicity,’ in contrast to knowing in reference to singular, exclusive status. The logic of such knowing is thus not linear, progressive, or simplistically self-consistent. The logic of mythical understanding is necessarily multiple because it must ‘make sense of’ radically complex interrelations among seemingly separate entities. Articulating a reasonable understanding of such a ‘mytho-logos’ involves a correlation of complimentary yet non-identical work in different disciplines of knowledge. The concept of mythical comprehension investigated here involves both rational analysis and intuitive experience capable of embodying radically complex abstractions of concurrently logical yet disparate or plural states of being. Mythical knowing is thus a

'reasonable' knowing of irreducible complexity as a valid, immediate, yet plural status of being manyness in/as/of oneness.

This endeavor engages a transdisciplinary conversation between philosophical, psychological, anthropological, mythological, sociological, artistic, and scientific fields of knowledge. It is particularly concerned with the psychological and philosophical implications of concepts deriving from studies in postmodern statuses of society and culture, poststructuralist-style thought about the uncertainty of language and knowledge, and scientific explorations of chaotic and non-linear causation.