

## **Enantiodromia and The Tree Of Wyrd**

Reproduced here is a chapter from Myatt's *The Numinous Way Of Pathei-Mathos* [1] whose title is self-explanatory: Enantiodromia and The Reformation of The Individual. It is relevant to our Hebdomian Way [2] because it is an enantiodromia, a discovery of one's wyrd and thus a changing, an evolution, of the individual. In both the Hebdomian Way the term wyrd is cognate with the Saxon *werthan*, from the Old Frisian *wertha* which became the Old English wythan/wuthan, and the Icelandic verða. The meaning is 'to become', to develop; or in the esoteric sense 'to evolve'. Hence why the septenary system, as illustrated above, is termed the Tree Of Wyrd. Thus the esoteric (Batin) meaning and usage of the term wyrd is 'to evolve', to change, as opposed to the exoteric (Zahir) usage or meaning of 'to be destined'. Fate, and so on.

It should be noted that Myatt uses the terms masculous and muliebral as descriptors and not as causal abstractions. In Appendix VII of his *The Numinous Way Of Pathei-Mathos* he defines a descriptor as

"a word, a term, used to describe some-thing which exists and which is personally observed, or is discovered, by means of our senses (including the faculty of empathy). A descriptor differs from an ideation, category, or abstraction, in that a descriptor describes what-is as 'it' is observed, according to its physis (its nature) whereas an abstraction, for example, denotes what is presumed/assumed/idealized, past or present or future. A descriptor relies on, is derived from, describes, individual knowing and individual judgement; an abstraction relies on something abstract, impersonal, such as some opinion/knowing/judgement of others or some assumptions, theory, or hypothesis made by others. An example of a descriptor is the term 'violent' [using physical force sufficient to cause bodily harm or injury to a person or persons] to describe the observed behaviour of an individual."

He defines masculous and muliebral as:

Masculous is a term, a descriptor, used to refer to certain traits, abilities, and qualities that are conventionally and historically associated with men, such as competitiveness, aggression, a certain harshness, the desire to organize/control, and a desire for adventure and/or for conflict/war/violence /competition over and above personal love and culture. Extremist ideologies manifest an unbalanced, an excessive, masculous nature.

The term muliebral derives from the classical Latin word muliebris, and in the context the philosophy of Pathei-Mathos refers to those positive traits, abilities, and qualities that are conventionally and historically associated with women, such as empathy, sensitivity, gentleness, compassion, and a desire to love and be loved over and above a desire for conflict/adventure/war.

[1] https://davidmyatt.files.wordpress.com/2022/10/numinous-way-pathei-mathos-v7.pdf [2] https://sevenoxonians.files.wordpress.com/2022/06/noetic-hebdomad-v5.pdf

## **Enantiodromia and The Reformation of The Individual**

## The Muliebral and the Masculous

The third axiom of The Way of Pathei-Mathos is:

That because of or following  $\pi \alpha \theta \epsilon_1 \mu \alpha \theta \circ_\zeta$  there is or there can be a change in, a development of, the nature, the character - the  $\varphi \dot{\upsilon} \sigma_1 \zeta$  - of the person because of that revealing and that appreciation (or re-appreciation) of the numinous whose genesis is this  $\pi \alpha \theta \epsilon_1 \mu \alpha \theta \circ_\zeta$ , and which appreciation of the numinous includes an awareness of why  $\check{\upsilon}\beta\rho_1\zeta$  is an error (often the error) of unbalance, of disrespect or ignorance (of the numinous), of a going beyond the due limits, and which  $\check{\upsilon}\beta\rho_1\zeta$  itself is the genesis both of the  $\tau \dot{\upsilon}\rho\alpha\nu\nu\circ\zeta$  and of the modern error of extremism. For the tyrannos and the modern extremist (and their extremisms) embody and give rise to and perpetuate  $\check{\epsilon}\rho_1\zeta$  and thus are a cause of, or contribute to and aid, suffering.

This change, this development of the individual, is or can be the result of a process termed enantiodromia, which is the process of perceiving, feeling, knowing, beyond causal appearance and the separation-of-otherness and thus when what has become separated - or has been incorrectly perceived as separated - returns to the wholeness, the unity, from whence it came forth. When beings are understood in their correct relation to Being, beyond the causal abstraction of different/conflicting ideated opposites, a relation manifest in the cosmic perspective and thus a knowing of ourselves as but one fallible, microcosmic, fragile, mortal, biological nexion connected to and not separate from all other Life.

An important and a necessary part of enantiodromia involves a discovery, a knowing, an acceptance, and - as prelude an interior balancing within themselves, of what has hitherto been perceived and designated as the apparent opposites described by terms such as 'muliebral' and 'masculous'. A perception of opposites manifested in ideations such as those concerning assumed traits of character, and assumed or 'ideal' rôles, behaviour, and occupations, assigned to each person, and especially historically in the prejudice of how the rôle - the duty - of men is or should be to lead, to control, to govern, to possess authority, to dominate, to be master.

The discovery of enantiodromia is of how such a designated and perceived dichotomy is but illusive, unnecessary, unhealthy, appearance, and does not therefore express either the natural, the real, nature ( $\varphi \dot{\sigma} \sigma \varsigma$ ) of our personal character, our being, or the real nature, the  $\Phi \dot{\sigma} \sigma \varsigma$ , of Being itself. In essence, this is the discovery, mentioned by Heraclitus [1], concerning Πόλεμος and γινόμενα πάντα κατ΄ ἔριν καὶ χρεώμενα; that all beings are naturally born - become perceived as separate beings - because of ἕρις, and their genesis (their 'father') is Πόλεμος.

Thus the strife, the discord, often engendered by an external and by the internal (within the individual) clash between such apparent opposites as the 'muliebral' and 'masculous' is one that has naturally arisen due to misperception, due to the separation-of-otherness, as a result of a purely causal, egoist, apprehension of ourselves and of others; an error of perception that, as previously mentioned, empathy and  $\pi \alpha \theta \epsilon_1 \mu \alpha \theta \circ_{\zeta}$  can correct, and which correction reveals the truth of  $\psi \upsilon \chi \eta$  and a knowing of the cosmic perspective.

One practical consequence of this misapprehension, this error of  $\check{b}\beta\rho\iota\varsigma$ , concerning 'muliebral' and 'masculous' has been the distaste - even the hatred - of certain ideologies and religions and individuals for those whose personal love is for someone of the same gender. Another practical consequence is and has been the error of extremism, where what is masculous is emphasized to the detriment (internal, and external) of what is muliebral, and where, for example, as in many harsh ideologies, men and women are expected, encouraged - often forced, as for example in fascism - to assume some rôle based on or deriving from some manufactured abstraction, some ideation, concerning what is assumed to be or has been posited as 'the ideal man' or the 'ideal woman' in some idealized society or in some idealized 'nation'.

Furthermore, given that these attributes of personal character that have been termed 'muliebral' and 'masculous' are founded on an illusive apprehension of beings and Being - and on ideations (such as rôles, occupations, and so on) posited as a result of this misapprehension - they not symbolic, or mythological, or unconscious, or even archetypal in the sense of anima and animus.

## **A Natural Reformation**

The balance attained by - which is - enantiodromia is that of simply feeling, accepting, discovering, the empathic, the

human, the personal, scale of things and thus understanding our own fallibility-of-knowing, our limitations as a human being; that, in essence, αἰὼν παῖς ἐστι παίζων πεσσεύων· παιδὸς ἡ βασιληίη [2], that τὰ δὲ πάντα οἰακίζει Κεραυνός [3] and that Φύσις κρύπτεσθαι φιλεῖ [4].

Which in practical terms simply amounts to understanding, knowing, Being and the genesis, the  $\varphi \dot{\sigma} \sigma \varsigma$ , of beings. Or, expressed in terms of the philosophy of pathei-mathos, it amounts to wu-wei, and to the understanding that 'what and who' are out of range of our empathy and what and who we have no personal knowledge of, is and are of no concern, of no passionate relevance, for us, because 'beyond the control, the influence' of our own fallible, error-prone, nature, and should thus be regarded 'without prejudice', as 'innocent', and the subject of no opinion, no ideations, by us. That is, we accept empathy and pathei-mathos as our guide, and (i) we do not speculate about, do not manufacture our own ideations about, those whom and that which are beyond the purveu of our empathy; and (ii) we do not accept the ideations/abstractions of others concerning those whom and that which are beyond the purveu of our empathy, and who and which we have no direct personal experience of.

Thus the process, the discovery, the reformation, is a natural one that does not involve any theory, or dogma, or praxis, or require any faith or belief of any kind. There is the personal cultivation of empathy and wu-wei, and that is all. How then - for those not having endured a personal  $\pi \alpha \theta \epsilon_1 \mu \alpha \theta \circ \varsigma$  - might empathy and wu-wei be cultivated, and thus how might the natural balance be found/restored, thus allowing  $\psi v \chi \eta$  to flourish, bringing  $\dot{\alpha} \rho \mu o v (\eta \text{ and } \sigma \omega \phi \rho o v \epsilon \tilde{v})$ ?

We might let go of ideations, of causal abstractions, many or most of which only serve to try and distinguish us from them, from other living-beings, human or otherwise, and thus increase our illusion of separation. We might consider, ponder on, the cosmic perspective and learn to value tolerance and humility. We might muse on innocence and the nature of the good, for the good is simply what is fair; what is compassionate, what inclines us to appreciate the numinous and understand why  $\check{0}\beta\rho_{I}\varsigma$  is an error of unbalance. We might consider why, for example, the bad is just bad  $\varphi\acute{0}\sigma_{I}\varsigma$ . Or a natural consequence of undeveloped, unformed, not-mature, unreformed  $\varphi\acute{0}\sigma_{I}\varsigma$ . Of a lack of empathy, of a lack of  $\epsilon\acute{0}\tau\alpha\xi(\alpha, of little or no appreciation of, of no personal experience of, the numinous, leading thus to individuals$ doing what is unfair; what is harsh and unfeeling; what intentionally causes or contributes to suffering.

We could, for example, and perhaps importantly, learn from the culture of our society and that of others, for correctly appreciated such culture - as manifest, for example, in literature, music, memoirs, poetry, history, Art, and sometimes in myths and legends and religious allegories - is but the recorded/aural pathei-mathos and empathic understanding of others over decades, centuries, millennia.

David Myatt

000

[1] Fragments 53 and 80[2] Fragment 52[3] Fragment 64[4] Fragment 123

Creative Commons Attribution-NoDerivs 4.0 license