

# Defining Apithology: Ten Interpretations and Resultant Definitions

Will Varey <sup>1</sup>

---

**ABSTRACT** – This article acknowledges that multiple interpretations of conceptual non-objects will be generated by the forms of conceptions that operate on those non-objects. More simply, without conscious techniques of intervention or mediation, the mind that we have determines what we understand is being seen. The practice of apithology evokes an ethic respecting the formation of conceptions as expressions of human meaning making. One object that will generate many different conceptions and resulting interpretations for practitioners will be the theory of apithology itself. If the theory is correct, its presence will generate distinct and discernibly different interpretations as a result of its own manifestation. This article explores these possible interpretations prior to their formation, examines the reason for their likely existence, and the basis for their validity. While not representing the theory of apithology, these generated ‘theories of apithology’ will also reflect its inherent necessity. Ten definitions of apithology are provided to inform the practice of observing interpretations in their process of formation.

---

## INTRODUCTION

The theory of apithology is a theory that describes the dynamics of biopsychosocial systems psychology and the evolutionary tensions that operate within humanity. As a theory, its apparent complexity and inaccessibility makes it of limited utility. It is a narrow practice of extremely wide expanse. Its practitioners self-select accordingly. One attraction of apithology is the possibility of greater appreciation of the dynamics of human meaning making. One of the features of human meaning making, when viewed apithologically, is that if we are faced by new conceptual ideas that are

potentially meaningful to us, we experience potentially three opportunities for them cognitively. We can seek to dismiss new ideas as already being *understood* (by equating them to existing concepts held), we can seek to develop an *understanding of* them (by relating the new concepts into existing concepts held), or we can seek *to understand* the new ideas (by a process of open engagement). The first of these processes requires no real engagement. The idea vanishes into the known. The second process involves a transmutation of meaning, such that rather than the new innovations being seen within the context proposed, the processes of minds re-define the indiscernible qualities to give them recognition within our existing structures. The new idea is fitted into the known. The third process is more complex and benefits from an understanding of the practices of apithology. The new idea holds the formation of new understanding in the unknown.

The theory and practice of apithology recognizes these alternatives of potential understandings and suggests that practitioners of apithology should be able to recognize this process within their own minds as it occurs. This article invites them to engage in the third process, *to understand*, in relation to apithology itself. This article is intended to provide a means for practitioners to do this for themselves.

## INTERPRETATIONS AND DEFINITIONS

The process of bringing an idea into conceptual focus, of adding increasing definition to a vague impression of something not readily recognizable, is an essential part of the process of human meaning making. Definition is part of the interpretation process. It is preceded firstly by holding a vague impression. (Article continues ...)