# The Sociological Function And The Trickster

The Sociological Function, which Campbell decried as having, “… taken over in our world … ethical laws, the laws of life in the society … what kind of clothes to wear, how to behave to each other … in terms of the values of this particular society”[[1]](#footnote-1).

The Sociological Function is a narrower focus than the Cosmological Function; whereas the latter seeks to describe and explain the nature and working of the objective physical universe, the former concentrates on the institutions and practices that are specific to a particular culture’s social functioning and interactions. Whereas the Cosmological Function often describes the origins and creation of humankind, the Sociological Function, in part, is the vehicle for “… validating or maintaining a certain society; ethical laws, the laws of life in the society … the values of [a] particular society.”[[2]](#footnote-2)

Thomas Hobbes in *Leviathan*, believes that humans originally existed in *State of Nature*[[3]](#footnote-3) (in Latin, *Bellum omnium contra omnes*; “war of all against all”) in which the natural condition is for each person to do whatever seems best to ensure their own survival and thriving. They spent their time competing ceaselessly with one another over limited resources and life was, “… solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short.”[[4]](#footnote-4)

Hobbes goes on to explain that eventually people realized that oftentimes more can be achieved through cooperation than competition, but that for cooperation to be engendered and maintained, certain limitations must be levied against the liberty of the individual by the collective. Certain behaviors, mandatory in the State of Nature, must be curtailed or proscribed in the social environment in order to ensure the smooth functioning of collective efforts. Social stratification, hierarchy, and structures of legislation and systems of justice all resulted from the advent of collective life and livelihood.

Thus, there are certain behaviors, available to the individual because of their inalienable right to personal liberty, which must be voluntarily surrendered for the benefit of the group; the other side of this coin, of course, is that the group also reserves the right to require certain behaviors from the individual which are not necessarily naturally voluntary. In other words, the collective decrees some behaviors as approved and others as prohibited. Engagement in approved behaviors elicits rewards; transgression of prohibitions induces punishments.

In this way, the Sociological Function is associated with the Trickster archetype, which may be justifiably termed “the most human” of all the archetypes.

William Hynes, et. al., in *Mythical Trickster Figures: Contours, Contexts, and Criticisms*, identifies and enumerates “… a number of shared characteristics [which] appear to cluster together in a pattern that can serve as an index to the presence of the trickster. At least six similarities … can be identified,”[[5]](#footnote-5) but these should not be viewed as in any way exhaustive or proscriptive.

The six characteristic qualities or behaviors[[6]](#footnote-6) are:

1. *Ambiguous and Anomalous*: the nature of the Trickster, its motivations and goals are never clear or concise; as soon as one believes they have “nailed the Trickster down”, it will alter its behavior to escape definition.
2. *Deceiver and Trick-player*: the most commonly recognized trickster trait; whatever the Trickster appears to be, it is always something more; any act it performs will always have unexpected (though not necessarily always malicious) results.
3. *Shape-Shifter*: whatever guise the Trickster appears in, there is always more than meets the eye; and the Trickster is supremely talented at either actually changing its physical form, or at least disguising itself (often playing its opponent’s own *naïveté* against them).
4. *Situation-Invertor*: similar to Shape-Shifter, any situation in which the Trickster is involved is certain to have more aspects and complexity than a cursory inspection reveals.
5. *Messenger and Imitator of the Gods*: Tricksters are often (unwisely?) employed by divine authority to announce or disseminate their decrees and pronouncements, and in this way the Trickster often seems to (or actively does) take on the mantle of authority, itself.
6. *Sacred and Lewd Bricoleur*: a tinker or jack-of-all-trades, the Trickster is adept at using whatever objects or circumstances are at hand to fashion the means and accomplishment of its trickery.

Some of these characteristics have areas of overlap, in that a given behavior may be identified as falling into more than one category. For instance, in the Nez Percé story “How Beaver Stole Fire From The Pines”[[7]](#footnote-7), Beaver hides under a bank in order to snatch up an ember from the fire.

Beaver’s act of hiding can be seen as simple *deception and trick-playing* (he is not making his presence known); a form of *shape-shifting* (he is disguising his own nature to appear as simply part of the natural surroundings); *situation-inversion* (the Pines believe their meeting place to be secure, when it has, in fact, already been infiltrated); acting as *bricoleur* (Beaver didn’t construct the bank under which he hides — it was already there and he simply made use of it); and, finally *messenger of the gods*, in the sense of bringing a boon from the divine realm to the mundane realm (Beaver’s intent is to bring fire to his people, à la Prometheus).

It is more of a stretch, but we could even invoke *ambiguous and anomalous*, in the sense that while thievery is generally frowned upon in civilized society, the intention and motivation of Beaver’s transgression is ultimately noble — he freely shares fire equally once he is in possession of it, whereas the Pines had been selfishly keeping the secret for themselves.

This, however, also points out the fact that the Trickster is often used in folklore as a warning that selfishness and refusal to share is a major source of social disruption (especially within a small population) and may be viewed as a punishable offense by the group. A marvelous example of this is found in the White Mountain Apache story, “Coyote Steals Sun’s Tobacco”[[8]](#footnote-8), in which Coyote, having stolen Sun’s tobacco, keeps it all for himself and is tricked by the community into giving it all away to them when they pretend to give him a house and a wife.[[9]](#footnote-9),[[10]](#footnote-10)

Lewis Hyde, in *Trickster Makes This World: Mischief, Myth, and Art*, reveals other frequent aspects of the Trickster archetype. Firstly, he says that the Trickster archetype:

…begins with a being whose main concern is getting fed and it ends with the same being grown mentally swift, adept at creating and unmasking deceit, proficient at hiding his tracks and at seeing through the devices used by others to hide theirs.[[11]](#footnote-11)

This hunger may be purely gastronomic, but it may stem from other, more id-centered sources as well, such as a desire for power, wealth, pleasure, security, etc. However, the object of such inducements, once acquired, is rarely enjoyed by the Trickster, for a variety of reasons. Either the food is inedible or unsatisfying, the object is less attractive once acquired, the authority is more onerous than glorifying, etc. This encodes the well-known adage to “be careful what you wish for, you may get it.”

This is effectively presented in the Aesop fable of the frogs and the stork, in which the former repeatedly entreat Zeus to send them a king to rule over them, but always find Zeus’ response inadequate or unsatisfying, until Zeus, simply to quiet their incessant pleading, finally sends a stork as King, which immediately sets to work devouring the frogs one-by-one.

Hyde also points out that the Trickster is often “hoist with his own petard”[[12]](#footnote-12), getting “… snared in his own devices… [so] trickster is cunning about traps but not so cunning as to avoid them himself.”[[13]](#footnote-13)

There is perhaps no better example of this in popular culture than Wile E. Coyote, the Warner Bros. cartoon character who is eternally being foiled by the very snares and devices he tries to employ to entrap the Road Runner.

On the wider sociological level, in true Trickster fashion, the Trickster serves simultaneously a dual purpose. The first of these, the *admonisher*, encompasses the cautionary tale, in which the Trickster serves to remind that punishments may befall an individual who refuses to adhere to divine and/or social mores and expectations. This relates to the “Messenger of The Gods” characteristic of the Trickster (see above), in which guise this archetype is often employed by the Moral Authoritarian Father god as a bringer of punishments to humans.

However, this aspect is also expressed in stories in which the Trickster is “back-tricked”: caught in its own trap, or has its own practices and methods used against it. Native American and African mythologies are rich with these kinds of Trickster tales. We observe Tricksters being punished by the negative consequences of their *own* actions (“…your sin will find you out”[[14]](#footnote-14)), by their leaders, or collectively by their communities, for engaging in misbehaviors such as refusing to share a bounty; for stealing rather than earning food or possessions; or, for causing disruption simply for the sake of watching the ensuing confusion.

The second aspect of the Trickster we might call it the *counselor* role; that of also pointing out that it is *not always the wisest choice to blindly obey the rules*, especially if those rules have become outmoded and inflexible. The young child in “The Emperor’s New Clothes” is performing this Trickster function by refusing to subscribe to the dangerous “group-think” of the elders who know perfectly well that the Emperor is naked, but who are all afraid to speak the truth for fear of rejection by the group.

We also, however, see Tricksters in these myths “misbehaving” because limitations imposed on society are too rigid and thus detrimental to progress and growth (a prime example comes from the Greek tradition — Prometheus bringing fire to humanity in defiance of divine will). In this we find Campbell’s famous Trickster-Hero melding of archetypes (discussed later).

The Trickster, thus, manifests across a spectrum from the *unconscious numbskull*[[15]](#footnote-15) (think of the hapless Gilligan) who causes disruption unintentionally (sometimes as a result of poorly planned and badly executed attempts to do good); to a *malicious spoiler*[[16]](#footnote-16)(à la Rumpelstiltskin), who resonates to the baser drives of human nature and seeks self-advancement and personal pleasure at the expense of others. In this aspect, the Trickster also serves to remind a culture/society of what it values by profaning its sacred icons and institutions.[[17]](#footnote-17)

As indicated above, the Trickster may be considered the most “human” of the primal archetypes, being able to associate with both mortals and with gods (Loki), perform feats of near superhuman daring and strength (Maui), and yet it is fallible and often incurs punishment, or at least reprimand. As the *unconscious numbskull*, the Trickster reminds us that fallibility is part of human nature; however, as the *malicious spoiler*, it teaches that our errancy is not a justification for willfully indulging our basest nature. The Trickster reminds us that we are fallible humans, which can make us evil if we consciously choose to follow our darker impulses.

Additionally, the Trickster is also the salve for human guilt over the need to kill to eat. Hunters, who are weaker, slower, and/or less agile than their prey, in order to obtain meat, must be able to trick animals in order to kill them: wearing a buffalo hide to get close to the herd; setting snares; dangling worms on hooks, and so forth.

Especially among earlier cultures and those which are still “connected” to the natural world, there is an overriding awareness that while killing to eat is an unavoidable necessity, it nevertheless requires a certain abuse of power over other living things to achieve its aims.

As Campbell says, in part quoting Arthur Schopenhauer, “‘Life is something that should not have been. It is in its very essence and character, a terrible thing to consider, this business of living by killing and eating.’ I mean, it’s *in sin* in terms of all ethical judgments, all the time!”[[18]](#footnote-18)

Lastly, it is important to note that the vast majority of Tricksters in earlier mythic traditions are male in character. This is not because females are incapable of engaging in Trickster acts (indeed, in some cultures, females must be come consummate Tricksters merely to survive), but in many (most?) cultures, females simply were not given the personal liberty to make a female Trickster believable to a given audience.

A signal departure from this is the Brule Sioux story of “Iktome Sleeps With His Wife By Mistake”[[19]](#footnote-19). In this story, the character of the wife and the young girl with whom the titular character attempts to have a dalliance *both* take on the Trickster archetype,[[20]](#footnote-20) in order to fool Iktome and teach him a lesson about his self-centered motivations and behavior.

# The Pedagogical Function And The Heroic
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Description automatically generatedThe Pedagogical Function, though it is the fourth and “lowest” function on the Mythic Structure Diagram, is in many ways the most important, as it is about the “… experience of being alive”[[21]](#footnote-21), within the context of the other three functions. It is about the question, “How do I do this thing called Life, in a way that fulfills me and expresses my individuality and uniqueness (Pedagogical Function); in a way that is minimally disruptive to the culture and society of which I am part (Sociological Function); in a way that is minimally destructive to the natural environment of which I and my culture/society are a part (Cosmological Function);, and in a way which keeps me ‘… in accord with the universal being’[[22]](#footnote-22) (Mystical Function)?” What a typically complex-simple question!

If we simplify the Mythic Structure Diagram as a perspectival image of a set of stairs viewed from above, we see that the exploration of mythology is like walking down those stairs, with each step bringing us closer to our destination, yet each step also having a part of its meaning carried forward from the step above it.

The *content* becomes ever more specific, even as the *context* becomes ever broader. Think of looking closely at a painting of a landscape: the whole picture may be of a stand of trees, but as you get closer and closer, you are able to make out particular trees, then separate branches of that tree, and finally individual leaves on that branch of that tree, but you are still aware that the leaf you’re inspecting is on a branch attached to a tree in a painting of a lot of trees.

The Heroic archetype is the manifestation of the Pedagogical Function, which “teaches us how to live a human lifetime under any circumstances,”[[23]](#footnote-23) as Campbell so poetically puts it. It has manifested in many guises in human cultures around the world and across time, but the heroic *character* is *always* a product of the society which produces it, and thus reflects the stresses its progenitor society is experiencing at the time of the archetype’s emergence (and which it is manifested to resolve). This is Campbell’s *monomyth*; the recognition that the Heroic (and, indeed, all of mythology), is a ubiquitous human expression across all cultures and throughout all time, differing in the particulars of each expression, but universal in substance. The archetypes *never* change, but their expressions across different cultures do.

The Heroic also highlights that what *was* heroic behavior in past times may be questionable (indeed, reprehensible) in present contexts (witness both Herakles and Theseus and their unkind treatment of some of the people — especially women — in their lives). Part of the purpose of the Pedagogical Function and of the Heroic archetype is to help individuals address those circumstances wherein the needs of self-expression conflict with the duties of social obligation. For example, an action which might have been questionable behavior for your grandparents may be a survival necessity for you. Contrariwise, some things your grandparents may have taken for granted as their just due as human beings may today land you in court. As Campbell says, “The virtues of the past are the vices of today, and many of what were thought to be the vices of the past are the necessities of today.”[[24]](#footnote-24)

The most straightforward presentation of the Heroic archetype for an effective study of mythology is encoded in the twelve steps of Christopher Vogler’s Hero’s Journey[[25]](#footnote-25) (as adapted from Campbell’s original 17-step cycle). This analysis (and template) for the Heroic storyline is applicable to a variety of both ancient and modern heroic figures, but is also not specific to a particular type of Heroic character. Some of Campbell’s 17 steps of the Hero’s adventure are still couched in Eurocentric or male-centric terms — for instance, “meeting with the goddess,” “woman as temptress”, “*master* of two worlds”, etc. Vogler’s adaptation of Campbell’s Heroic Journey is inclusive, not specific to race, culture, society, gender identity, or, indeed, species. A robotic viewpoint character may traverse the entirety of a Heroic adventure.

Vogler, thus, reinforces Campbell’s emphasis that the Heroic archetype was originally intended as an aid, a guide, and a comfort for everyday human life: a guidebook for “how to live a human lifetime under any circumstances.”[[26]](#footnote-26) However, inherent in the *traditiona*l Heroic journey is the assumption that the goal of the Heroic’s actions is, itself, worthy and worthwhile, and beneficial to “the greater good.” History, if not the Heroic’s own society, must see their deeds as laudable, selfless, martyrly, etc. A more modern understanding of the Heroic is less limiting.

Finally, there is Campbell’s lesson that there are two types of Heroic deed (the spiritual and the physical) and three fundamental types of Heroic character (intentional, accidental, and forced). This formulation reminds us that Heroic adventures may take *any* form and that the capacity for extraordinary accomplishment is within us all, regardless of circumstances or nature. As long as there is a “departure, fulfillment, and return”[[27]](#footnote-27), associated with a willingness to sacrifice self, a transformation of personal consciousness, and a potential created to alter the consciousness of the ordinary world, then a Heroic arc has occurred.

## Exceptional Heroism: The Problem Of The Superhero

The Heroic principle of the Pedagogical Function has been somewhat upended and overshadowed by the *superheroic* concept. The superhero can often place the capacity for heroism beyond the reach of everyday persons and into the realm of the exceptional and unattainable.[[28]](#footnote-28) A viewer/reader may be able to empathize with the moral/ethical dilemmas of a Tony Stark or Kara Danvers, but they will likely *never* experience the beyond-the-ordinary technologies or personal powers to which “heroes” such as Iron Man or Supergirl have ready access.

Thus, these superheroic characters can be admired, even imitated, but never actually *emulated*; you may sympathize with their human aspects and their personal moral and ethical struggles, but you can never hope to achieve what their superheroic counterparts achieve. In fact, it is a common trope for the superhero to chide their companions (and, by extension, the audience) “don’t try this at home,” or for them to steadfastly refuse to be accompanied by a “mundane” companion because whatever actions they are about to engage in are “… too dangerous,” with the implication “…for anyone else but *me*.”

The Pedagogical Heroic also provides a foil to a recent negative development in (especially U.S. American) society: the ascension of the “sympathetic villain” (also-known-as the *anti-hero* or *dark hero*) as a *replacement* for the Heroic. The sympathetic villain is a *fully legitimate* archetype, which explains harmful behavior by a character toward others as the result of their reactions to injustices or injuries they’ve suffered through the caprice of nature, or the malevolence of others. People sometimes *do* become dark and anti-social as a result of traumatic personal experiences, and it is valid for mythology to recount their stories *as cautionary tales*. They also serve as protagonists for redemption stories, in which someone who has fallen into personally damaging or morally reprehensible behaviors comes to recognize the error of their ways, reform their attitudes and actions, and remake themselves as positive forces in their culture/society. These are all realistic human situations and have value in both their formulation and their communication, but they should always be recognized as *exceptions to the true Heroic arc*, and neither synonyms nor substitutes for true Heroism.

The dark-heroic and/or sympathetic villain archetype *must not be confused with the* *Heroic*. These characters may be pitiable, but they are *not* moral exemplars to be emulated. The danger of allowing the sympathetic villain to usurp the Heroic’s place is that it serves to “excuse” harmful behavior as inevitable — or, worse, justifiable. It is all-well-and-good to sympathize with what made the Joker or Darth Vader what they are; it is another thing altogether to set them up as positive role models (which they aren’t, and weren’t intended to be). This is why we should prefer the term “sympathetic villain” (certainly to “dark hero”); because, it emphasizes that these characters are not, *in any way*, Heroic in the mythological sense.

There may be some value, however, in declaring the sympathetic villain to be “the poor man’s Hero” in modern popular cultural expressions. If the Heroic is accessible *only* to the mega-rich or the super-smart (or the alien or semi-divine), then “the rest of us” must make do with the second choice — the character whose heart is in the right place, but whose methods are morally questionable at the best of times. The inevitable result of this contraversion of the archetype is this: if the “everyday person” wishes to defeat the forces of “evil” in their own lives, they must resort to villainous means to do so. The ends come to justify the means, and success is paramount, regardless of the process of its accomplishment. Therein lies the danger.

The gateway to this rationalization is, of course, the Trickster-Heroic, often spoken of by Campbell himself: the Heroic character who is willing to break a rule here-and-there in order to uphold the wider Rule of Law. Of course, the Heroic *must* sometimes engage in distasteful acts in order to achieve their ultimate goal. This actually forms a part of the sacrificial nature of the true Heroic — they sacrifice their morality, their serenity, or even their very humanity, to defeat the “big bad” and put the universe to rights once again.

But the difference between the Trickster-Heroic and the Sympathetic Villain is that the former experiences and expresses guilt and shame over having to use such means. As Kahlil Gibran wrote, “Oftentimes, I have hated in self-defense, but if I were stronger I would not have used such a weapon.”[[29]](#footnote-29).

Most crucially, the audience must recognize and acknowledge *that a terrible price was paid for the success,* and that such solutions should only ever be implemented in the direst of circumstances when *all other possibilities* have been rendered ineffective or unachievable.

Confusing the dark-but-guilty Trickster-Heroic with the dark-and-impenitent Sympathetic Villain eclipses the original, fundamental function of the Heroic archetype — which was to remind and prove to the audience that it is possible (and preferable) to succeed against hardship and evil, *not by adopting the methods of your adversary*, but by holding to a higher moral and ethical standard than theirs.

A perfect example of a Sympathetic Villain *mistaken* for a Heroic character is Paul Muad’Dib from Frank Herbert’s 1965 novel, *Dune[[30]](#footnote-30)*, a fact which Herbert, himself, addressed on more than one occasion:

*Dune* was aimed at this whole [dangerous] idea of the infallible leader, because my view of history says that mistakes made by a leader (or made in a leader's name) are amplified by the numbers who follow *without question*.[[31]](#footnote-31)

The study of mythology, then, must also include the effort to restore the true, original characteristics and examples of the Heroic, which needs to be revived in modern society. So, the study of mythology must also address the *relatability* of the Heroic.

## The Relatable Heroic

This takes the form of a two-fold exploration:

1. Determining whether or not particular Heroic characters represent a model of behavior and/or achievement that is actually, realistically attainable by the members of the audience; and,
2. Discovery of how the “anti-hero/dark hero/sympathetic villain” has implemented moral relativism to justify anti-social actions by both groups and individuals, so that these effects may be exposed and corrected.

This effort also involves exploring and clarifying the distinction between myths and legends, the conflation of the two having been the root cause of the ascendance of both the superheroic and the sympathetic villain over the true Heroic.

Legends are, by definition, *exaggerated stories* about actual, historical figures, but their exploits have been hyperbolized after the fashion of tall tales, to the point where they are not humanly possible actions. Relatability suffers when you aren’t able to achieve such a similar feat; your societal training tells you that you are a worthless excuse for a human being as a result. Abraham Lincoln, for instance, was a real, flesh-and-blood, historical human being, but he was far from superheroically infallible. The same goes for George Washington, Giuseppe Garibaldi, Charlemagne … the list goes on.

The Heroic isn’t perfect or infallible; the Heroic succeeds *despite its inabilities* by *overcoming* them, not by circumventing them.

## The Feminine Heroic

This also informs the study of the *feminine Heroic.* By discussing the distressing paucity of true Heroic female characters in Classical mythologies, we draw the circle closed by referring back to the feminine energy of the Primal Goddess. Witness Durga and her extreme expression, Kali, slaughtering demon hordes with wild abandon. To say that the feminine is incapable of violence is just as demeaning as all other restrictions that have been placed upon women by male-dominated culture for the past two hundred centuries (or more).

Studying the (admittedly rare) examples of feminine Heroics in mythology has the effect of emphasizing the loss of the balancing power of the feminine in modern, techno-industrial society. The need to recognize the effects of this loss can be seen in an exploration of the relationship of *mythological* awareness to *ecological* awareness, focusing on how the ancient Earth-connectedness of mythology is (or is not) present in modern ecologically minded (green) philosophies and movements.
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