



A Brief Comparison of the Unconscious as Seen by Jung and Lévi-Strauss

GIUSEPPE IURATO

University of Palermo,
giuseppe.iurato@unipa.it

ABSTRACT

Retracing the primary common aspects between anthropological and psychoanalytic thought, in this article, we will further discuss the main common points between the notions of the unconscious according to Carl Gustav Jung and Claude Lévi-Strauss, taking into account the thought of Erich Neumann. On the basis of very simple elementary logic considerations centered around the basic notion of the separation of opposites, our observations might be useful for speculations on the possible origins of rational thought and hence on the origins of consciousness.

KEYWORDS: analytical psychology, structural anthropology, unconscious, archetype, classical logic

*In the beginning, all the things were together;
then, it came the mind (ὁ νοῦς) and set them in order*

—Anaxagoras of Clazomenæ
(Diogenes Lærtius, *Lives and Opinions of Eminent Philosophers*, Book 2,
Chap. III)

Carl Gustav Jung (1875–1961) and Claude Lévi-Strauss (1908–2009) were two of the greatest thinkers and scholars of the last century. The former was an eminent psychiatrist and psychoanalyst, the first pupil of Sigmund Freud and then the founder of a new school of psychoanalytic thought called *analytical psychology*. The latter was an eminent anthropologist and ethnologist, as well

as one of the primary leaders of French structuralism; he also made fundamental contributions to philosophy and psychology. A brief sketch of the main lines of their thought will be outlined and compared in the following sections; in this section, we wish to simply outline the reasons and purposes for which we invoke them in this article.

Jung was one of the main connoisseurs and supporters of Freudian thought, having been, for many years, one of Freud's closest co-workers. Nevertheless, he believed that the entire Freudian framework was not very open toward other possible applicative perspectives such as, for instance, those related to anthropological and ethnological thought, in particular toward mythological thought, although these perspectives also played a fundamental role in the foundation of Freudian thought itself. So, Jung decided to approach part of Freudian thought by placing a major emphasis on these new perspectives, reaching an original and appreciative line of thought with a notable interdisciplinary valence.

From this viewpoint, it is more than likely that there are common themes between psychoanalytic and anthropological thought. Moreover, the efficient results of Jungian psychotherapeutic praxis (Laughlin and Tiberia 2012) might be taken as indirect proof of the validity of the anthropological ideas that contributed to creating the Jungian theoretical framework, including certain Lévi-Straussian ideas that will be briefly recalled herein. More than any other perspective, Jungian thought has played a fundamental role in explaining the possible origins of consciousness (Laughlin and Tiberia 2012). In this article, we would like to revisit some aspects of the known critical comparison between Jungian and Lévi-Straussian thought while also trying to enlarge this comparative debate using very elementary concepts of classical logic. In doing so, it will also be possible to elucidate some fundamental aspects of human conscious reasoning, in particular, its early origins. To be precise, as we will see, the Lévi-Straussian and Jungian systems of thought have many common theoretical backgrounds (D'Aquili 1975); for example, the Lévy-Bruhl work on primitive compared with civilized thought has been included in their theoretical systems. The current anthropological viewpoints say that the only possible differences between these last two should be searched for in the different qualitative use of the primary rules of logic rather than in quantitative modalities. According to our final considerations, it is in the lack of some of these very basic logic rules that the substantial differences between these two types of thought may be retraced. This lack confirms some assumptions made by both Lévi-Strauss and Jung on the origins of conscious human thought, which we would like to descry in the occurrence of the fundamental dialectic operation of the separation of opposites. In short, the primary conclusion of this article is that elementary Aristotelian logic, with its very

elementary arguments, also corroborates these common Lévi-Straussian and Jungian assumptions about the early origins of consciousness.

For an updated re-evaluation of Jung's thought and its influence on the anthropology of consciousness, also with the support of the clinical work of the authors, see the basic article by Charles Laughlin and Vincenza Tiberia (2012). In this very interesting work, which further highlights the fundamental importance of analytical psychology in anthropology, Jung's approach to consciousness is presented from a more modern neuropsychological standpoint (Laughlin having been, with Eugene G. D'Aquili, one of the founders of the so-called *biogenetic structuralism*, a new perspective in psychological anthropology that takes neuroscience results into account). Laughlin and Tiberia (2012) also explain why Jungian anthropology has been ignored.



ON SOME KEY MOMENTS IN THE HISTORY OF PSYCHOANALYSIS, MAINLY FREUD AND JUNG

In this section, we want to highlight only those aspects of the historical evolution of psychoanalysis that have some relation to the arguments of this article. The primary intent of this section and those following (most in the Appendix) is to outline the aspects of this evolution that have led to psychoanalytic anthropology, the primary context within which this article has been worked out. In pursuing this intent, we mainly follow one of the primary references on the history of psychoanalysis (i.e., Ellenberger 1970). Along with Henri Ellenberger's text, we also follow the biographical dictionary of Aldo Carotenuto (1991), in which a brief but systematic recall of the primary lines of thought of each thinker is also presented together with minimal biographical notes. For further outlines of some other aspects of psychoanalytic theories primarily concerning the thought of Jung and of Erich Neumann, we refer to the final Appendix to this article.

Fleshing Out Freudian Thought

Freudian thought evolved from a 20-year pre-psychoanalytic period of gestation, primarily characterized by a neurological and psychophysical viewpoint, toward a pure psychological model. Through attempts to dynamically explain neuroses, Freud reached the first phase of his *metapsychological* theory, which was centered around the notions of the unconscious, repression, drives, and the free-association method. The second phase was characterized by new notions of transference and counter transference and by the libido theory of infant sexuality, which in turn centered on the Oedipus complex, which became the central pillar of his psychodynamic framework. In the years 1914–1915, Freudian theory underwent a new reorganization in its

theoretical structure, initially from a topographical standpoint, with the topography given first by the static constructs of the unconscious, preconscious, and conscious; then from a dynamic standpoint, with various psychic conflicts; and finally from an economic standpoint, with the principles of pleasure and reality. In the 1920s, the theory underwent another revision regarding the theory of drives and their classifications, until it reached a second definitive topography including the Ego, Super-Ego, and Id (or Es) agencies. Freud's last work was the magnificent 1938 *Abriß der Psychoanalyse* in which he axiomatically tried to sketch his definitive vision of the structure of human psychodynamics.

On Jungian Thought, Part One

Carl Gustav Jung started as a psychiatrist at the Zurich Burghölzli Hospital under the supervision of Eugene Bleuler in the early 1900s. He then attended the Janet's lessons at the Paris Salpêtrière Hospital until his pivotal meeting with Freud in 1906. Thenceforth, the close and deep relationship between Freud and Jung led to Jung's appointment as the first president of the International Psychoanalytical Association (IPA) in 1909. The first significant disagreements between their ideas started with Jung's famous publication *Symbols of Transformation* in 1912, which underwent successive revisions by Jung and which constitutes the central conceptual key of his analytical psychology. In 1914, Jung resigned his role as IPA president, retiring himself into a phase of personal deep inner reflection that led to his knowledge of the polyhedral nature of the human psyche with its multiple dimensions. To this end, he started an in-depth study of alchemy, theology, mythology, history of religions, and shamanism, from whence came the necessary encounter with anthropological thought. The three primary motivations that led Jung to turn away from Freudian orthodoxy were: (1) criticism of Freudian pansexualism, whose theory interprets each symbol only from the sexual individual standpoint; (2) the Freudian conception of the libido understood exclusively from a personalistic sexual viewpoint; and (3) the assumption that neuroses date back only to those phases of libidinal psychosexual evolution of the human being that go from birth to approximately 6 or 7 years old, ending with the Oedipus complex.

The Jungian notion of libido is larger than the Freudian one: it denotes the general psychic energy, which is present in all that "tends toward" *appetitus* (Laplanche and Pontalis 1973). Neurosis is no longer relegated only to infancy, but rather it should be laid out within the wider and more complex dialectic relationship between the individual and the world because the former is always continuously growing throughout his life. According to Jung, human psychic evolution takes place through a particular dynamic process, called the *individuation process*, which should be

considered to be a perennial psychic transformation of the human being in the continuous relationship between themselves and their own unconscious until the realization of the *Self*. The 1912 Jungian individuation process is a pivotal concept around which the entirety of Jungian thought and its approach to the psychic world is articulated. By means of this basic process, the human psyche tries to dynamically realize its own self, which is a totality comprising consciousness and unconsciousness and which pushes for self-realization in such a manner to determine a new *center* of the conscious Ego.

The determination of the Ego is meant to be a process of consciousness formation by differentiation and integration from an initial original state of undifferentiation, identification, and promiscuity (with the object¹) to starting to separate both from the Mother—the latter being understood both from a personal and archetypal meaning—and from the collective. Jung is therefore forced to introduce a larger epistemological construct for the unconscious than the Freudian construct. He distinguishes between a *personal* (or *individual*) and a *collective* unconscious and then introduces the notion of *archetype*. The collective unconscious and an archetype are two closely related Jungian notions. The former is the result of previous long-term studies made by Jung on mythology and archaic practices, from which he inferred that the above-mentioned psychic processes are peculiar to any human being of any time; that is, they have an ahistorical and an atemporal structural nature, regardless of culture. Such universal psychic processes are all potentially available in the collective unconscious and become dynamically active during the psychic evolution of the human being. The structure of the collective unconscious is given by archetypes, whereas its content is given by the *archetypal* (or *primordial*) *images*, which never have an individual character but rather have a collective nature. The archetypal images are a type of “historical precipitate” of the collective memory whose existence is suggested to us, inter alia, by the recurrent mythological themes that are likely common to every race and all epochs. The archetypes express themselves by means of symbols or images; they are the same for every person on the planet and, in modern parlance, are neural circuits that are genetically organized during the neurogenesis of the young brain (Laughlin and Tiberia 2012). Depending upon adaptation, the social environment, and enculturation, some archetypes develop, while others languish in a relatively undeveloped state; when archetypes develop into more elaborated structures, they are called *complexes*. Later, particularly in the Appendix, we will return again to these basic aspects of analytical psychological thought.



ON LÉVI-STRAUSSIAN AND JUNGIAN UNCONSCIOUS

Herein, we briefly recall the main theoretical points concerning the notions of the unconscious according to Claude Lévi-Strauss and Carl Gustav Jung to compare them. Further considerations are in the Appendix.

On Lévi-Straussian Unconscious

According to Ugo Fabietti (2001:Ch. 18) and² Ino Rossi (1973), the primary ideas on structural anthropology were first presented in the famous work *The Elementary Structures of Kinship* in 1949. In this work, Lévi-Strauss places the unconscious reciprocity principle, which explains the prohibition of incest, at the root of the passage from nature to culture. According to Lévi-Strauss, taking structural linguistics as a primary paradigm (D'Aquili 1975), every social model is the result of a symbolic process obtained from primary oppositions between structures that are unconscious elementary entities devoid of content, so that the symbolic function is the primary result of a mediation between opposite tendencies. Lévi-Strauss freely acknowledged his debt to the Prague School, but he never quoted Jung. The first influence arising from linguistics is the basic concept of linguistic structuralism, that is to say, that the meaning lies in the relationships of terms. According to D'Aquili (1975), it appears probable that the origin of this basic concept is an earlier idea regarding the reconciliation of opposites on a psychological level, which was then projected onto a social level; this reconciliation clearly involves a Jungian dynamic. The ultimate origin of structuralism in Lévi-Strauss, for all its subsequent presentation in linguistic form, may very well be the dynamics of the resolution of antinomies resembling Jungian archetypes. The second influence of linguistics and his earliest major conceptual formulation is the theory of *binary opposition*. The basic function of the human mind is the binary contrast, which organizes percepta (or sensory inputs) into either *opposite* pairs or into *positively opposite* pairs (i.e., real psychological antinomies that he later calls *contrasting* pairs) or both at different levels. The opposition, then, may also run between two opposite or contrasting pairs, such as *Jungian quaternio* and so forth.

The passage from nature to culture takes place thanks to the human tendency to symbolically think of biological relationships in terms of systems of oppositions³; these systems are the fundamental and immediate data for social and mental reality as well as the crucial starting points of any further theoretical explanatory attempts. Lévi-Strauss was led to conceive of the *structural unconscious*⁴ as the universal basis for every human thought of every epoch and every civilization on which the common laws of such a thought rely. The structural linguistic discipline then highlights the essentially uncon-

scious nature of the fundamental phenomena of the life of mind. The unconscious would be the intermediary between the Self and Others,⁵ making their integration possible by overcoming their initial opposition. The binary and oppositional logic molds the representations of social and natural reality into social models, following a pattern similar to the ethnolinguistic pattern. The incest prohibition and exogamy rely on this pattern, both having the formal nature of a reciprocity principle, which fills a gap between two initially separated worlds, the natural and the cultural world. The reciprocity principle, as we have said, explains the incest prohibition by means of dualistic organizations (Cressant 1970:Ch. 2). With *The Elementary Structures of Kinship*, Lévi-Strauss defines the basis for a *psycho-logic*, that is to say, the quest for the *a priori* universal formal principles of the human mind, which, though hidden, influence concretely visible data and phenomena (Cipriani 1988:Ch. 3, Sec. 3.1). To pursue this quest, he frequently made reference to the mathematical sciences.⁶

According to Comba (2000:Ch. 4, Sec. 1), after Lévi-Strauss' fieldwork in Brazil, the relationships between the social relation system and mental representations were always the object of his attention. To this end, he was forced to reach a human thought level deeper than the conscious. Lévi-Strauss, through the evolution of his thought, reached a notion of the unconscious quite different from the Freudian one (but from which it started⁷), which allows us to apply the reciprocal comparison to different and otherwise incomparable cultural contexts. This notion allows communication in every place and every time between us and others, thus attaining a well-defined concept of history. Through this notion of the unconscious, its regularities and recurrences, as well as its common functional laws, Lévi-Strauss speaks of a *universal soul* or *mind*. According to Marcel Hénaff (1998):Ch. 4), this universal mind allows us to state the finite number of possible logics with which it operates as well as to postulate the precedence of the logic rules with respect to the functional ones. There is a sort of anteriority of the (common) logic relation systems that structure the unconscious level to give rise to the next symbolic thought and to historical language. According to Francesco Remotti (1971:Ch. 4, Sec. 2), the unconscious plays a very fundamental epistemological role in the entire Lévi-Straussian anthropological system, which at different times touches on Freud's,⁸ Jung's, and (later) Lacan's ideas. According to Sandro Nannini (1981:Ch. 7, Sec. 2), Lévi-Strauss considers the unconscious to be the place of *transindividual symbolic order* within which the communicating subjects—who are the protagonists in a game of free choice—recite roles implied by the dualistic combinatory logic the reciprocal relationships among them emerge and dominate the individuals. This binary logic is the essence of the unconscious, which is also the place of the inner human conflict that forces the Ego to work with the Other, to give rise to the Otherness.

On Jungian Unconscious

The Freudian unconscious relies on a basic repression mechanism that furnishes an essential character of individuality to this entity. As stated above, only in old age did Freud turn his attention toward possible transpersonal and archaic unconscious influences on the human psyche. Instead, Jung was the first psychoanalyst who gave substantial attention to these aspects, distinguishing between a personal (or individual) unconscious and a collective one. According to Carotenuto (1990, 1991):Ch. 5; see also Laughlin and Tiberia 2012 and Evans 1964), the Jungian *collective unconscious* is an entity that is understood to be dynamically structured according to a phylogenetic order by a set of primary, unobservable, and irreducible elements called *archetypes*. The theory of archetypes has also undergone a historical evolution that deprives it of a unique and definitive formulation, placing the notion of archetype between the psychological dimension and the somatic reality (Laughlin and Tiberia 2012). Thus, because the archetype is connected with instinctual reality, it is an innate predisposition that is devoid of certain psychological attitudes. However, because it is also related to the spiritual dimension, it is an *a priori* category of knowledge, a transcendental dimension that, in turn, may be historically retraced in Platonic ideas, in the Schopenhauer prototypes, or in the *a priori* forms of the transcendental Kantian logic. The archetype, completely invisible and unconscious, may manifest itself only by means of *archetypical images*, whose phenomenology acts through modalities depending on the cultural and traditional context, giving rise to the personal unconscious. The collective unconscious, as meant by Jung, is an objective structural entity conceived of as a universal sediment of past experiences.⁹ To support this idea, Jung used the anthropological method of cultural parallelisms (Kroeber 1948), observing that every ethnic group, with respect to meaningful universal events such as death, birth, love, and so on, responds with quite similar behavioral and expressive modalities.

This observation is motivated by comparison among the different mythologies, religious systems, and artistic and cultural creations, as well as by the comparison of these with the psychic material emerging from dreams, fantasies, and deliria. Jung considered the collective unconscious to be the result of a human teleological adaptation, in turn due to a primary biological need to cope with the anxieties of life (Jacobi 1971:Ch. 3). Jung's interests in anthropology and ethnology constitute, therefore, an indispensable premise to his theory of archetypes: for instance, the Lévy-Bruhl theories had a great influence on the creation of the Jungian theoretical framework; vice versa, Jungian theories also had a great influence on anthropological thought (Carotenuto 1994:Ch. 6; see also Laughlin and Tiberia 2012).

■
 A FIRST COMPARISON BETWEEN THE JUNGIAN AND THE LÉVI-
 STRAUSSIAN UNCONSCIOUS

Many studies have been conducted that compare the Lévi-Straussian unconscious with the Jungian collective unconscious. These studies discuss many common points between these two theoretical constructs, which nevertheless are not equal. Among these articles, we recall Remotti (1971:Ch. 4, Sec. 2); D'Aquili (1975), John Raphael Staude (1976), Vernon Gras (1981), and Richard Gray (1991) and the references quoted therein. Gray's article, among other objectives, compares the various previous studies conducted regarding this crucial question, trying to objectively argue that many common points exist between these two constructs in contrast to those who would prefer to see a gap between them. Both notions are joined by their common basilar structural nature as well as by the common laws with which they operate and that obey a primary binary and oppositional logic; as regards the Jungian collective unconscious, this last aspect emerges from the study of mythological thought, as we will see later.

According to Gray, strict parallelisms exist between the constructs because both authors were observing the same entity from very similar perspectives. Both divide the unconscious into dual segments, one personal and one impersonal (or collective); they also see the deeper, impersonal level as providing a content-free infrastructure upon which to build content. The next element of similarity is the pattern of oppositions and their resolution (D'Aquili 1975). Lévi-Strauss sees this opposition as representing the underlying structure of the unconscious. Again, Lévi-Strauss, in explaining the myth, states that:

The mythical thought always progresses from the awareness of oppositions toward their resolution . . . We need only assume that two opposite terms with no intermediary always tend to be replaced by two equivalent terms which admit a third one as a mediator; then one of the polar terms and the mediator become replaced by a new triad, and so on. [1955:440]

The patterns of opposing elements were central to Jung's scheme. The principle of oppositions is noted by Jung as an essential characteristic of conscious thought and lies at the foundation of two basic psychic mechanisms devoted to overcoming it, the dialectic process of the *coniunctio oppositorum* and the polar process of the *enantiodromia law* (Galimberti 2006; see also Section 4.1). Many parts of Lévi-Strauss' work are similar to these last aspects of Jungian thought, although Jung himself is never explicitly quoted, although he preceded Lévi-Strauss by 10 to 20 years¹⁰ (D'Aquili 1975). Jung notes that "there is no consciousness without discrimination of opposites"

(1969b:96). The previous quote, drawn from *Aion*, reflects the fact that Jung saw the heart of the psyche in oppositionally based dynamics. Although the quotation reflects Jung's view of psychic organization, it is nevertheless quite similar to Lévi-Strauss's own binary opposition. To be precise, Jung says that:

As opposites never unite at their own level (tertium non datur), a superordinate "third" is always required in which the two parts can come together. And since the symbol derives as much from the conscious as from the unconscious, it is able to unite them both, reconciling their conceptual polarity through its form and their emotional polarity through its numinosity [1959:180].

In this statement, Jung meant that the archetype concept had an aprioristic form, but it was not completely rigid; indeed, this form undergoes a continuous mutability, except for its unavoidable dualistic and oppositional nature, according to a phylogenetic evolution. However, this latter possibility is not allowed by the Lévi-Straussian unconscious structure. The Jungian archetypes are neither representable nor visible, being fully unconscious, but they appear only symbolically—for instance in dreams, in fantasies, and in psychotic deliria—as primeval *archetypical images*, as stated above. These last archetypical images provide substantial content to the Jungian archetypes. Therefore, the first common point between the Lévi-Straussian and Jungian unconscious stems from their universal structural nature. Another common point concerns the mythological thought that, in both authors, structurally takes place through processes of opposition, as recalled above.

According to a famous remark by Paul Ricoeur (Renzi 1965), the Lévi-Straussian unconscious is conceivably more similar to the Kantian type than the Freudian type; that is to say, it is of a categorical and combinatorial type but without thought's transcendental subject. This last aspect means that in place of the "I think" (Ego) there exists a well-determined ahistorical and atemporal formal organization meant as a sort of *facultas præformandi* (Carotenuto 1991:Ch. 5; 1994:Ch. 6) that is common both to ancient and modern individuals as well as to primitive and civilized persons, as proved by the study of symbolic functions, which are one of the primary features of unconscious as well as of human thought. This symbolic function is expressed through structures and forms meant to be pure ontological modes of being for the human mind, foregoing all possible structurally organized content.¹¹ According to Lévi-Strauss, this (his) epistemological model of the unconscious represents the primary structure upon which the assumed Lévi-Straussian hypothesis of universality and the objectivity of every possible human thought is grounded, within the methodological unity of the knowledge

through which it is possible to reach a type of equal leveling between the *Geisteswissenschaften* and the *Naturwissenschaften* in the celebrated Wilhelm Dilthey sense.

Moreover, in the Lévi-Straussian unconscious model (Galimberti 2006), the crucial meeting takes place between the *subjective* and the *objective*, on the one hand, and between the *model* and the *structure* on the other. Therefore, this meeting should be meant as mediation among the various, otherwise irreconcilable, individual subjectivities, thus making intersubjective communication and cognition possible. The latter is possible through the transposition of every individual toward a higher plane that does not transcend that individual in an alienating manner but simply puts him or her into a relationship with other common forms of knowledge that are, together, ours and of others. Furthermore, again following Lévi-Straussian thought (Caldiron 1975), the laws of unconscious activity remain always, on the one hand, outside of individual cognition (at most, it is possible to be conscious of them only as a historical object). On the other hand, it is they themselves that determine the modalities of this cognition, or else, the unconscious warrants the objectivity (or the scientificity) of the individual cognition. In this last sense, it is possible, according to Lévi-Strauss, to speak of the unconscious as *the place of the science*, or else as the place of every form of rational knowledge (Rossi 1973). The statement that sees the collective unconscious as the primary source of philosophy, science, and mythology, which would originate from successive differentiations, is also expressed by the classical scholar Francis M. Cornford as well as by many other scholars such as the physicist Wolfgang Pauli, the historian Arnold J. Toynbee, and so forth, who based their studies just on the Jungian collective unconscious hypothesis (Ellenberger 1970:Ch. 9).

Only at the unconscious level (Grampa 1976), as has already been mentioned above, does the otherwise unrealizable metahistorical integration takes place between *subjective* and *objective*.¹² The unconscious operating modalities are the same for everyone in any time because they represent the conditions of all possible mental lives of all men of all times. Otherwise, the unconscious is the set of all possible mental and psychic structures that regulate every human thought, both normal and pathological. In particular, in normal conditions, the (abstract) reification of certain symbolic forms takes place (by means of archetypical images); these forms have a structure leading to that provided by the Boolean algebra of bivalent logic¹³ (Piaget 1968). The Lévi-Straussian unconscious, as a metastructure categorized into pure free-content forms with a universal, atemporal, and formal character (Fabiatti and Remotti 1997), is above all aimed toward the explication of the unconscious-science (or knowledge) relationship, if one primarily considers it to be an entity of all of the possible absolute laws and all of the necessary relationships

(Moravia 1969). Finally, and according to the epistemological thought of Mario Ageno, which is derived from Ageno's work and philosophical meditations on biophysics (hence, by comparing the epistemological patterns of physics and biology), a substantial unity of nature as well as a communion of methods and foundations of all of the sciences follows (Ageno 1962:Ch. 1, Sec. 1).

As has already been said, Jungian and Lévi-Straussian unconscious notions turn out to be, despite their common aspects, different: among their primary distinct points, we recall, above all are the diachronic (or historic) dynamicity of the structure of the former¹⁴ as opposed to the utter synchronic (or ahistorical) staticity of the structure of the latter.¹⁵ Furthermore, the archetypal structural forms of the Jungian unconscious may undergo changes in terms of their dependence on the phylogenetic evolution of the related contents¹⁶ and vice versa; that is to say, there is a certain reciprocal relationship between forms and content. The Lévi-Straussian unconscious, however, is primarily characterized by the absolute and full predetermination of its structural forms, which are completely independent of the various contents that will fill them. Hence, there is a remarkable ontological insufficiency of contents in the Lévi-Straussian unconscious, unlike the Jungian one, because of the merely symbolic nature that the former must have. However, as has already been mentioned, we would like to stress again the two notable common points between these unconscious notions, which may be identified in their primary structural nature and in their common binary logic. Indeed, a basic assumption for both is their primary constitution as an entity, formed by elementary structures according to Lévi-Strauss and by archetypes according to Jung. This common structural essence is then carried through elementary and irreducible entities (i.e., the Lévi-Straussian structures and the Jungian archetypes), which relate among them through an oppositional binary logic. These are, in short, the primary common points that we want to highlight for the purposes delineated in the following sections.



SOME FURTHER ANTHROPOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS ON LOGIC

According to Fabietti and Remotti (1997), the comparison between the logic of civilized thought and the logic of primitive thought is a *vexata quæstio* still open. In-depth studies were conducted by Christopher R. Hallpike (1979) and Jack Goody (1977). Currently, the general notion of *primitive* is anthropologically discredited if one considers it in opposition to the modern notion. In this regard, there was a semantic switch of the term "primitive," which is currently understood as referring to the first original structural forms of logi-

cal thought. Therefore, the term “primitive” refers to a previous logic condition, namely to a logic anteriority rather than a social-historic one (Bonte and Izard 1991); hence, from this last point of view, the elementary analysis conducted in this article is quite justified. Nevertheless, there is no full clarity about the passage from primitive thought to civilized thought, whose borders appear to be quite vague.¹⁷

The first valuable studies on primitive mentality were made by Lévy-Bruhl,¹⁸ who identified the first core of prelogical thought characterized by the lack of the elementary basic Aristotelian principles of *identity* and of *non-contradiction*, primarily due to the presence of the *mystic participation law*,¹⁹ which establishes relationships on the basis of emotive and mystic links. Indeed, Lévy-Bruhl himself does not deny that a primitive individual could rationally and logically think in a manner comparable with the individuals of civilized society. Nevertheless, it is just the social-cultural context, pervaded by this participation law and the related collective representations, that hides these mental potentialities, giving rise to forms of syncretic reasoning. Later, Lévy-Bruhl abandoned the net contraposition between prelogical and logical thought, accepting the idea that these may coexist but that only one of them may be manifested (at the expense of the remaining one) depending on individual existential experiences and the related invested affective charge. Thus, both of these types of thought are present in every society and in any human being but in different ratios. In our case, we also point to a remark from Lévi-Strauss in *La pensée sauvage* (of 1962), according to which the logic of primitive societies is quite fragmented due to the residuals of psychological and historical processes devoid of the notion of *a priori* necessity, which must be discovered only *a posteriori*. According to Lévi-Strauss, *classification by oppositions* and *binary relations* is one of the primary atemporal characteristics of the universal symbolic function, which explicates itself through the action of a binary principle on the basis of the structural linguistic pattern. It relies on oppositional and relational binary logic, which is the central pillar of the entire theoretical framework of Lévi-Straussian work as well as the Jungian system, as has been stated above.



FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

From what has been said above, notwithstanding their few dissimilarities as entities, it is now possible to conduct further disquisitions on the above-mentioned theoretical points common both to the Jungian unconscious and to the Lévi-Straussian one, which might turn out to be of certain importance as regards the possible early origins of consciousness. In the Lévi-Straussian conception, the unconscious is seen as the primary location of every possible psy-

chic and mental structure, hence of each form of thought and knowledge. From the unconscious comes, in particular, all forms of logical structure, including the bivalent Aristotelian structure, which is typical of common rational thought (consciousness) but not the only possible structure.²⁰ This Aristotelian structure is, however, the most elementary and primary one, and it lies at the foundation of the first forms of conscious reasoning; it arose during the passage from mythological to rational thought. On the other hand, from what has been said above about Jungian and Neumannian ideas, the *separation of opposites* plays a very fundamental role in the dawning of the first forms of consciousness. If this separation were hindered or inhibited, then it would be possible to verify, with very simple elementary logical arguments, that logical deduction is possible for any thinkable proposition and rational statement, thus clearly reaching prelogical forms of syncretic²¹ reasoning.

To be precise, in that realm of the unconscious resulting from the non-void intersection between the Lévi-Straussian unconscious and the Jungian one, which is structurally created by elementary dualistic entities operating according to an oppositional binary logic, every possible proposition and statement is valid, as follows from the well-known Pseudo Scoto argument. In this argument, we find one of the most characteristic theoretical aspects of the Lévi-Strauss unconscious concerning the presumed unifying unconscious-science relationship; to be precise, as has already been mentioned above, that it is the unification place of any science and every thought.²² Therefore, only by means of separating opposites, in accordance with Jung and Neumann, will it be possible to attain rational thought respecting the usual basic Aristotelian bivalent logic rules and principles, including the *principle of non-contradiction*²³ and the *principle of identity*, as also recalled by Jung (1969a) himself. However, Freud himself claimed that every human act of consciousness is basically the result of a dialectic process arising from a separation of opposites (Akhtar and O'Neil 2011) by negation. Likewise, Imre Hermann (1989) also argued for the primary role played by the so-called *dual procedure*, basically founded on the separation of opposites by negation, in the formation of the elementary principles of Aristotelian logic.

The simple elementary logic argumentations that lead us to these conclusions are as follows. According to Evert Beth (1959) and Ettore Carruccio (1971, 1977), if a *rational theory* is roughly meant to be a coherent and non contradictory set of *premises* (i.e., primitive propositions or statements, axioms, or postulates, aprioristically assumed to be true) and *consequences* (logically deduced from the premises), then the well-known *Pseudo Scoto theorem*, maybe dating back to Scholastics, states the following: if, in a certain rational theory *T*, at least two contradictory propositions or statements coexist, say *A* and $\neg A$ (=negation of *A*), forming a *pair of opposites*,²⁴ then it is possible to prove within *T* that every possible proposition or statement *X* is

also true. This result clearly reaches forms of prelogic and (psychologically) syncretic reasoning (Malatesta 1982, Ch. 4, Sec. 5) typical of the primary process and of primitive thought (see the references to Lévy-Bruhl in the Appendix). We repeat that the elementary basic principles upon which Archimedean logic relies (i.e., the first logic system to be historically outlined by human beings both phylogenetically and ontogenetically) are the identity principle and the principle of non-contradiction. In turn, these are both closely related to negation and hence to the primary psychological notion of the separation of opposites. Without this last basic process, the Pseudo Scoto theorem states that we inevitably fall back into the *realm of the undifferentiated*. However, according to John Sowa (1984:386) and Salman Akhtar and Mary Kay O'Neil (2011), the basic operations of elementary Aristotelian logic are conjunction, disjunction, material implication, and biconditional implication, even if Charles S. Peirce proved that all four of these operations can only be derived from two primitive operations, conjunction and negation, consistent with the above statements addressing the primary role played by the separation of opposites.

Thus, the origins of the foundation of bivalent classical (Aristotelian) reasoning, that is to say, of the first forms of conscious rational thought (as gradually emerging from mythological thought), should be traced in this primary process of differentiation and separation from the above-mentioned initial (Neumannian) uroboric undifferentiated state and from the subsequent various incest phases, in which simultaneously prevail conditions of opposition and undifferentiation. However, according to Andrew Samuels, Bani Shorter, and Fred Plaut (1986), the opposites are the indispensable and unavoidable precondition of every psychic life. Jung puts the opposition principle at the root of his framework, as had been done by his predecessors. Alternation between two irreconcilable extremes of a pair of opposites is the distinctive trait of an awakening of consciousness. When the corresponding tension attains its highest degree and becomes intolerable, then a solution must be found: the only possible solution is placed at a higher level than the initial opposite elements. At first, this third element is, in itself, irrational, unexpected, and incomprehensible to the conscious mind, which feels only two oppositions contrasting between them. The conscious mind does not know what will join these two contrasting tendencies together until the *symbol* appears and accomplishes the difficult unifying task. This unification is the result, above all, of a *coniunctio oppositorum* but, in some cases, also of the *enantiodromia law*, both of which take place within the unconscious; according to D'Aquili (1975), this process is also identifiable within Lévi-Strauss' work on binary process.

As has already been said, *opposites* play a fundamental role in Jungian theory, which starts from the principle²⁵ (said to be the *compensation principle*) that psychic life is a self-regulating system. This system can attain a condition

of equilibrium between conscious and unconscious instances only by means of the accommodation or mediation of opposites, which takes place through two main principles, the *enatiotropia law* and, above all, the *coniunctio oppositorum*. The first is a psychological law, first formulated by Heraclitus, denoting the tendency of everything to transform into its opposite. According to Jung, the essence of psychic dynamics is at first the creation of pairs of opposites (from the primordial conscious-unconscious opposition), hence the *compensation* of their elements; it is then thanks to the *enantiotropia law* that the opposite pair takes place, which will remain in an oppositional and dynamic tension that never reaches a dialectic resolution. The latter, however, will be overcome thanks to the *coniunctio oppositorum* with the subsequent symbolic formation (Samuels, Shorter, and Plaut 1986; Galimberti 2006). These two elementary processes of the general compensation principle might be invoked to explain the oppositional and relational binary logic of Lévi-Strauss's theoretical framework, which is the essential core of Aristotelian logic. According to Jung, the unconscious mind is undifferentiated, whereas the conscious mind can discriminate; the hallmark of consciousness is therefore discrimination. If consciousness wants to attain awareness of things, it must separate the opposites, which are always inclined to merge (Samuels, Shorter, and Plaut 1986). Once the separation has taken place, the two distinct elements must still maintain a conscious relationship between them to avoid a nullifying fusion. Erich Neumann (1954) therefore developed his own theory on the origins and developments of consciousness starting from these Jungian elements and pursuing a phylo-ontogenetic stance (see also Laughlin and Tiberia 2012). Taking into account the mythological perspective, Neumann worked out a development of consciousness according to individual stages, phylogenetically isomorphic to mythological development, indicating the centrality of the opposite separation theme. In conclusion, thanks to very elementary basic logical arguments, it has been possible to ascertain that the consciousness of the human being can take place only in that non void realm of the unconscious given by the non empty intersection between the Lévi-Straussian structural unconscious and the Jung collective unconscious, through those psychic processes explained by Jung and Neumann.

Finally, these last considerations make use of very basic topics drawn from elementary logic applied to psychological contexts; they might also undergo impertinent objections if one accepts, in principle, a certain distinction between mathematical and psychological logic. We do not consider this distinction on the basis of the statements of one of the major scholars of mathematical epistemology, Federigo Enriques (1871–1946), who considered, in a precise sense, formal logic to be part of psychology (Enriques 1985). Therefore, the few considerations given above should be considered within this

Enriquesian epistemological framework.

■

APPENDIX

In this appendix, for the sake of completeness, we gather some further anthropological and psychoanalytic notes that should be seen as the deepening, integration, and completion of the main text. These notes have been relegated into an appendix so as not to overload the text and to avoid obscuring the line of thought that leads to the primary argumentation presented in this article; that is to say, that the separation of opposites is an unavoidable condition for the early origins of consciousness. This argumentation is also supported by very elementary logic considerations.

■

ON ANALYTICAL PSYCHOLOGY, MAINLY C.G. JUNG AND E. NEUMANN

In this section, we proceed by delineating the cornerstones of both Jungian thought—in continuation of what has been said above—and of that of Erich Neumann. Moreover, further considerations on the relationships between Jungian and anthropological thought will be briefly outlined, where possible.

On Jungian Thought, Part 2

According to Carotenuto (1991:Ch. 5; 1994:Ch. 6; Samuels, Shorter, and Plaut 1986; see also Laughlin and Tiberia 2012), before Freud and Jung, any psychopathological event was considered without considering any possible theoretical meaning. With these thinkers, these apparently meaningless psychic events could acquire a proper meaning with the introduction of a certain epistemological construct called the *unconscious*, which was nevertheless differently defined by these two authors. The primary hypothesis of the Freudian framework is that of psychic *repression*, according to which anxious object representations linked to a given drive are removed from the consciousness field because they contrast with internal or external needs. These anxious object representations, however, maintain their own energetic charge at a potential state in the individual unconscious. Therefore, repression is a fundamental psychic (defense) mechanism through which consciousness separates from the unconscious: this is one of the central statements of Freudian thought.

From an epistemological and historical standpoint, the Freudian pattern has always been the primary basis from which to start laying the foundations of any subsequent psychoanalytic model. This was the case for Jungian the-

ory, which, starting from some Freudian ideas, reached a wider construct of the unconscious, distinguishing between a *personal*²⁶ and a *collective* unconscious. The former is ontogenetically included in the latter, which has a phylogenetic order. Each of us, then, has their own manner of building a relationship with the collective unconscious that is dependent on the forces of the Ego: the stronger the Ego is, the wider the opening toward the collective unconscious will be. When building this relationship, the personal unconscious will simultaneously form. Later, we will discuss more deeply the Jungian notion of unconscious and its features.

According to Laplanche and Pontalis (1973) and Charles Rycroft (1968), and as briefly recalled above, the essence of Freudian doctrine revolves around two primary topographies of the human psyche. The first identifies a conscious, a preconscious, and an unconscious component. The second defines three agencies, namely the *Ego* agency, roughly corresponding to the conscious psychic part; the *Super-Ego* agency, which roughly corresponds to the preconscious apprehension of social and normative instances; and the *Id* agency, which refers to instinctual unconscious forces. The Ego agency acts (during the so-called *secondary process*) as a mediator between strong Id claims, which are uncompromising and desire immediate satisfaction (*pleasure principle*), and the Super-Ego normative forbiddances and rules, trying to find an intermediary resolution to achieve satisfaction (*principle of reality*). A neurosis takes place when the Ego fails in its fundamental and primary role, though it does exist and is intact; that is to say, the basic test of reality is not compromised. Nevertheless, the primary shortcoming of Freudian theory concerns the lack of consideration of psychoses because the theory was built, above all, on clinical data provided by the analysis of neurotics whose Egos are, after all, intact.

Because of this shortcoming, Jung felt the need to rectify this lack by trying to extend the Freudian framework to include psychosis. In achieving this extension, Jung was helped by his valuable previous experience as a psychiatrist at the Burghölzli Psychiatric Hospital in Zürich, which put him in direct contact with psychotics, in contrast to Freud²⁷ (who was a neurologist). From this valuable experience, Jung drew fundamental inspiration to formulate his new theory of the human psyche, following an epistemological paradigm quite similar to those of Kuhn's scientific revolutions. From all of the material collected through the analysis of deep psychotic suffering, Jung was led to widen the first Freudian framework. The basic assumptions of his theory are those of the individuation process, of the personal and collective unconscious, and of the principle of compensation. The personal unconscious is the place of the (Ego's) *complexes* that every human being experiences throughout her or his structuring of infant relationships with the collective unconscious (see also Laughlin and Tiberia 2012). An *Ego complex*

is defined as a set of (object) representations that refer to a given event that has an affective-emotive charge; that is to say, it is a set of images and ideas assembled around a central key,²⁸ which are strongly joined together by an affective tonality. An Ego complex autonomously acts within our personality and constitutes the basis of our own personal unconscious dimension. Complexes are the sources of dreams and symptoms of personal history, which symbolically manifest themselves. They constitute autonomous parts of the human psyche that are variously activated in certain circumstances: for instance, when one establishes an interpersonal relationship, a particular complex is activated that manifests, or activates, an aspect of the personality that may be different from or barely coherent with the usual personality upon which it prevails. The complex prevails because of its psychic partiality, which is strictly linked to the splitting attitudes of the human psyche (already identified by Freud's work). The prevailing complex will possess the person. The analytical treatment is turned, by compensation (and then through the individuation process), toward the integration and assimilation of the various emerging complexes through the conscious Ego. The variegation of complexes, which are completely split in the primitive spiritual condition, is a phylogenetic characteristic both of the primitive and the differentiated (civilized) psyche, by means of the collective unconscious, whose structural content is comprised of well-determined psychic elementary structures called *archetypes*. We shall return to these last points later.

With regard to the normal development of the human psyche, the conscious Ego gradually acquires its autonomy (enlarging its consciousness) by assimilating and integrating the various Ego complexes that take place as a result of those traumatic events that all human beings experience during their lives (but with particular emphasis on childhood). The complexes' structure is due to the *archetypical images* and *ideas* emerging from the collective unconscious, which are the only ways in which the archetypes may be manifested. They form the substantial (reified) content of the collective unconscious. This process for manifesting complexes is necessary to avoid the Ego's fascination with the numinous power of the (collective) unconscious, and it takes place thanks to the *individuation process*, which has its apex approximately between 30 and 40 years old. Only through such a process will it be possible to reach a creative and constructive integral psychic personality, which is indivisible but quite differentiated from the collective conscious and unconscious psyche.²⁹ The primary recurrent archetypical images with which every human being is called to compare herself or himself are the *Shadow* (i.e., the unknown or the unacceptable), the *Persona* (i.e., the image of a person proposing a "mask" to the world with which one often identifies oneself), the *Animus* and the *Anima* (as reciprocal sexual unconscious counterparts), the *Puer* (i.e., the eternal possibility of becoming

from the native state), the *Great Mother* (in both its good and its terrifying aspects—see the next sections). The Ego must compare itself with them during the individuation process to attain its autonomy. Such a primary process, by compensation, will try to integrate the different psychic parts into a total *Self*, beyond which the conflict between opposite tendencies is not eliminated but is used as a creative structural datum of the human psyche.

For Jung, the fundamental categories through which psychic reality develops are *polarization* (i.e., the idea of organization by opposites), *compensation*, and *relation*; these are all elements that refer to the basic conflicting nature of personality (Samuels, Shorter, and Plaut 1986). The dialectic of opposites is connate in the human being and embeds its deep roots into the Shadow; in particular, Jung assigns a determinant role to the Anima-Animus opposition. The Self then has the fundamental task of mediation and synthesis between opposite tendencies, whose dualistic nature is a recurrent characteristic of archetypes. The symbolic function—like, for instance, that inherent to the activity of dreaming—is of just this type, casting a bridge between the conscious and unconscious dimensions that allow the approach of opposites, generating a third element—the *transcendental function*—that makes possible the passage from one dimension to another. The reunification of opposites through this transcendental function (by *coniunctio oppositorum* or by *enantiodromia*) is properly called *mysterium coniunctionis*, a term drawn from alchemy, which also played a fundamental role in formulating Jungian thought. According to Galimberti (2006), a basic principle of analytical psychology is consideration of psychic life as a self-regulating principle, by compensation, which can reach a condition of equilibrium only by reconciling contraries either through *coniunctio oppositorum* or *enantiodromia*. At this point, it is now possible to continue with Neumann's thought, which is a further mythological deepening of Jungian thought.

On Erich Neumann's Thought

There have been many followers and pupils of Jung and of his thought, including Gerhard Adler, Luigi Aurigemma, Ernst Bernhard, Aldo Carotenuto, Hans Dieckmann, Gustav Dreifuss, Edward F. Edinger, Christou Evangelos, Michael Fordham, Umberto Galimberti, Hester Harding, Joseph L. Henderson, James Hillman, Jolande Jacobi, Dora Kalff, John W. Layard, Rafael Lopez-Pedraza, Carl A. Meyer, Erich Neumann, Pierre Solie, Sabrina Spielrein, Mario Trevi, Marie-Louise Von Franz, Joseph B. Wheelwright, Edward C. Whitmont, and Hanna Wolff. Each of them originally developed particular aspects of Jungian thought (see Carotenuto 1992 for brief details). Furthermore, Jung had fruitful collaborations with the historian Karl Kerényi and the physicist Wolfgang Pauli.³⁹ But for our purposes, we are primarily

interested in the thought of Erich Neumann, which we will briefly outline herein.³¹

According to Carotenuto (1991:Ch. 6; see also Laughlin and Tiberia 2012), Neumann may be considered to be one of the primary authors of analytical psychology and as a continuer of the Jungian *œuvre* from the point at which Jung himself had reached and stopped, as Jung himself stated in the preface to one of the main works of Neumann, namely *The Origins and History of Consciousness*, first published in German in 1949, later in English in 1954 (Neumann 1954). Another notable work of Neumann was *The Great Mother*, first published in English in 1955, then in German in 1956 (Neumann 1955). Neumann worked out his own genetic theory of the personal and collective psyche, tracing a parallel between the great mythologies and the individual historic-psychological development; that is to say, according to Neumann, the ontogenetic development of the human psyche is, in a certain sense, intertwined with a recapitulation path of the phylogenetic path of the great mythologies. These transpersonal aspects transcend the personal experiences in childhood; their roots are deeply embedded in the Jungian collective unconscious. According to Neumann, it is reductive to consider only personal events, as in the Freudian viewpoint; in addition to these, it should also be necessary to consider transpersonal events, according to a phylo-ontogenetic perspective.

Starting from Jung's work and taking into account the Egyptian, Hebraic, and Greek mythologies, Neumann identifies a parallelism between some fundamental themes of these mythological constructions and the formation of consciousness. As has been said above, Jung considers consciousness to be a psychic entity or agency that starts from the unconscious by means of the integration and assimilation of the various Ego complexes understood as archetypal images emerging from the undifferentiated collective unconscious that everyone activates through their own personal experience. Neumann studied this primary psychic process in depth; he describes it through a well-defined series of phases that are properly called *mythological stages*, through which the Ego acquires its autonomy. In short, Neumann tried to further explain the Jungian individuation process from a phylo-ontogenetic viewpoint on the basis of the mythologems³² of Egyptian, Hebraic, and Greek tradition.

The first stage is that in which the Ego is fully embedded into the unconscious: at birth, the child lives in a totally undifferentiated state, called the *uroboric state*, where the individual is fully unconscious and the female and male are undistinguished, as they were in the original universe in which all the cosmogonies were one. This state is the place of the All and is represented by the *Ouroboros* archetype, that is to say, the snake that circularly and dynamically bites its own tail. The latter is an ancient Egyptian alchemi-

cal symbol, the $\epsilon\nu\ \tau\acute{o}\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu$ (that is, the One-All), representing the union of opposites, so that it is a symbol of the Jungian *coniunctio oppositorum* as well as of the *enantiodromia law* (Samuels, Shorter, and Plaut 1986; Carotenuto 1990; Galimberti 2006), the two main processes through which basic Jungian *compensation* is carried out. The uroboric state is the natural dimension of the unconscious, also configurable as the maternal dimension. From this primordial state and through the second stage, the consciousness (paraphrasing Plato's *myth of the cave*) gradually elucidates this obscure world, from which an embryonic Ego starts to form.

In this second stage, these first gleams of consciousness strictly depend on the *Great Mother* archetype, which is present in many myths of antiquity. This archetype represents the first mythological evolution of the original uroboros archetype and plays a fundamental role in the psychic development of every human being. This archetype furthermore includes in itself both a destructive aspect and a protective and hospitable aspect. These aspects psychologically correspond to a tendency to remain in a totally regressive condition of psychic incorporation (*uroboric incest*) and to a propulsive and dynamic tendency toward differentiation. Uroboric incest is a symbolic return to the Mother, a prefiguration of the *hierós gámos*, that is to say, of the sacred marriage that reaches its definitive form with the next Hero phase. With primordial incest, we have a form of entrance into the Mother; hence, it symbolically denotes death, the dissolution of the son into the Mother. To acquire the first primordial status of an individual, overcoming this first uroboric incest is essential. Once disengaged from this maternal incorporation, the individual gradually starts to determine his or her own Ego and Self agencies through a vital process that will persist throughout life.

The psychic evolution phase dominated by the Great Mother archetype plays either a constructive or a destructive fundamental role in the individual's development and in her or his psychic formation. After uroboric incest follows the orgiastic *matriarchal incest*, which perpetuates the undifferentiated state and corresponds to the adolescence phase. It corresponds to matriarchal castration and the dissolution of an adolescent Ego that it is still not able to cope with the many strong forces symbolized by the Great Mother, which still manifests itself through different personifications. To this point, according to the Neumannian perspective, male psychic evolution is quite different from the female one, so it is necessary to distinguish both cases. We will briefly sketch (Neumannian) male and female psychic development later.

Further Remarks and Considerations

For our purposes, some points need to be highlighted regarding the comparison between Jungian and Neumannian thought as briefly explained above.

In particular, we are interested, above all, in those phases of human psychic evolution in which the so-called *separation of opposites* takes place. The problem of pairs of opposites has played a primary role since Freud's work (Laplanche and Pontalis 1973; Samuels, Shorter, and Plaut 1986; Galimberti 2006), where they are placed at the root of any psychic dialectic. Nevertheless, Freud did not give further details on their origins and development. Instead, Jung and Neumann put them at the root of the symbolic function as well as at the origins of consciousness. As seen above, this separation is achieved in both male and female psychic development. The separation of opposites, which plays a very fundamental role in the formation of consciousness, was already a central point in Jungian thought, although he did not treat it with the same mythological deepness as his continuer Neumann, who specified the phases in which it takes place in both female and male cases. Both authors, however, assign an archetypal origin to this fundamental psychic process, starting from the assumption of the existence of a collective unconscious. The dualistic nature of every archetype is also of fundamental importance. Furthermore, from the Neumannian viewpoint, this separation of opposites plays a primary role in the phases of first Ego formations, which in turn rely on the fundamental archetypal female-male comparison, that is to say, the dualistic nature of the archetype. From our standpoint, after having briefly discussed some points of Jungian and Neumannian thought, we will compare these points with other aspects of anthropological thought. The anthropological motives that underpinned Neumannian thought are evident, above all, on the mythological side. Therefore, at this point, it is necessary to briefly outline the main points of psychoanalytic anthropological thought from a historical viewpoint.

The Erich Neumann View of Male Psychic Development

With regard to boys, once they have overcome uroboric incest, the opposition of the son to the Great Mother will slowly lead toward the so-called *centerversion*, which is the tendency³³ toward the formation of a totality creating the (integrated) unity from its various parts (which are due to the fragmenting action of the Great Mother archetype). Through centerversion, the Ego starts to acquire its own (Cartesian) autonomy with respect to the unconscious, reaching the center of the consciousness, which constitutes the central place of the Ego's complexes (according to Jung). So that the Ego may sustain the hard comparison with the archetypal Great Mother, it must autonomously consolidate itself as a consciousness of itself, in such a manner as to be strong enough to separate the original undifferentiated situation into opposite pairs. To this end, the action of another archetype is necessary, that of the *separation of the world's parents*, which is prodromal to the next phases concerning the fights, respectively, against the terrible *Drake* in its two arche-

typical faces of the Great Mother and the Great Father. Thanks to this separation archetype, the fundamental separation of opposites takes place, thus leading to the third phase,³⁴ which will open the way to the Self.

As stated above, the first basic separation takes place between the conscious and the unconscious part of the personality (with its center in the Ego). During this phase, although there are first primordial forms of identity, the strong ambiguity still present in the previous form (the orgiastic state of uroboros) will be overcome by *matriarchal incest*, thanks to which the individual acquires the primordial Ego components. Once he has entered this second phase, it will be possible for the first forms of distinction between what is good and what is bad to take place, this being possible thanks to the fundamental dualistic nature of the Great Mother archetype, the good mother and the bad mother. In this dual nature³⁵ rests the primary importance played by the Great Mother archetype in the psychic evolution of the human being. There will be a first identification with only one of this primary opposition; the other oppositions will fall into the Shadow, that is to say, into the unconscious, but they will always try to emerge. The psychic phenomena that appear in this phase are particularly related to states of suffering and loneliness and strong guilt feelings. With disengagement from the uroboric state by means of the separation of opposites, the Ego is placed in a position that allows it to experience loneliness and separation, the first basic elements of the self-emancipation of the Ego. From this point onwards, the *Hero*³⁶ starts his autonomous path toward configuring himself as an individual-man, freeing himself from the unconscious powers that always try to overwhelm him. The Hero is the archetypal precursor of the man, and the various initiation rites typical of each culture also contribute to his formation.

This mythological figure of the Hero, which transvalues the individual one, undergoes various mythological fights that he must undertake to attain full autonomy and individuality. The first fight is against the Great Mother, that is to say, against matriarchal incest, from which the first rudiments of his Ego will emerge, until the adolescence in which the centerversion of this agency takes place; at the end of this final process, the Ego will be put at the center of the consciousness. This fight is also symbolically seen as a *fight against Drake* to conquer the *Princess* with her *Treasure*, which corresponds to the creative representation of the New (treasure), which arises only after the union (of the Hero) with the freed prisoner (the female dimension). The second fight is against the *Great Father* archetype to overcome the *patriarchal incest* and determine an exact place in which to locate the incoming *Self*. This place, in the end, will be the center of the psyche; the bipolar axes Ego-Self will then direct growth of the next personal life. Once the Great Mother is defeated, the unconscious tries again to reincorporate the Hero

(who represents the new consciousness). To this end, the Shadow acts as a new archetype, that of the *Great Father*, which symbolizes the patriarchal authority within the matriarchate, the old law or the hostile old king. The Great Mother archetype, as we have seen, has two dualistic archetypical aspects, the good one and the bad one. During the adolescence phase, this dualism implies a unique castration complex that consists of disengaging from matriarchal incest, which helps to overcome this ambiguous and bipolar state due to the above-mentioned archetypical duality. Matriarchal incest contrasts with other further forms of incest. The Great Father archetype, however, has a unique aspect, that of the old law, but two forms of the castration complex: *imprisonment* and *possession*. The former, on the one hand, hinders the Ego from completely disengaging from the earthly father values, who is the bearer of the collective norm, but, at the same time, isolates him from his own creative abilities. The second form tries to identify the Ego with the divine father or rather brings him near the transcendental, ascetic, and spiritual world. These two types of father castration are due to the double-parentage nature, both human and divine, of every Hero. Therefore, it is thanks to the father castration that an individual may uproot himself from the ancestral instinctual nature to which the Great Mother's terrifying aspects try to reduce him. However, these transpersonal fights against the parents are required for the dawning of personality and for the formation of psychic agencies, which will give autonomy to the Hero. Last, according to Neumann, three types of Hero exist: the first is the extroverted hero, inclined to action to change the world and hence primarily devoted to external reality; the second is the introverted hero, the bearer of culture and hence primarily interested in inner reality; and the third is more oriented toward a continuous and ever better modification of himself, independently of the collective dimension. Indeed, in both the first two types of Hero, the creative dimension is always at the center of the desire to conquer the princess's treasure—that is to say, the discovery of the New—which can take place only after his union with the freed prisoner (the female); in any case, both accomplish work aimed toward humanity. The third Hero however, is the only one turned toward himself and his inner path to an ever better contemplative perfection.

The Erich Neumann View of Female Psychic Development

Neumann was always greatly interested in the female psychological dimension because, according to him, the female Self plays a primary and irreplaceable role in the psychic development of any human being. Nevertheless, female psychic development is quite different from male. Considerable deficiencies in maternal care imply strong guilt feelings, which, in turn, will produce an inner emptiness whose consequent anxiety, for defen-

sive purposes, will lead the individual toward narcissistic satisfaction and aggressive tendencies. This interest led Neumann to an in-depth study of the creative dimension because he considered it to be primarily connate with femininity. This stance is difficult to criticize from a symbolic standpoint, given the procreative nature of the female.

According to Neumann, only the uroboric stage is common to male and female psychic development. In this regard, as we have already seen for males, the second stage takes place with a decisive symbolic fight against the Great Mother. A male basically considers the Great Mother to be something different and extraneous to which he opposes himself to overcome matriarchal incest. The female, however, sees the mother as someone who is similar and familiar to herself, hence spontaneously and unconsciously identifying with her. Such a fusional identity allows the female, in contrast to the male, to reach her own femininity thanks to the primary identification with the mother. This process and this primary identification may explain why most females are more inclined (at least, potentially) toward the relational dimension of life. Conversely, the male is more driven toward those professions that require an objective vision of reality and problems, putting himself into a position of comparison rather than one of identification to better explore.

The second stage of female psychic evolution is called the *self-conservation* phase and corresponds to the permanence of the woman in the female group (maternal clan), separating from the male. Often the female stays a long time within the Great Mother archetype, and this will mark the next relationship with the man. The longer the female stays within the maternal clan, the greater the Shadow projections will be upon the man, with his higher devaluation. Nevertheless, the above-mentioned separation and alienation from the male world will mostly concur with the first formation of the sense of opposition in females. The degree of the woman's persistence in the matriarchal clan will influence her relation with the man depending on the type to which she belongs: if the *horsewoman* type prevails, then we have a sadomasochistic loving relationship in which the woman uses the man only for her erotic and procreative aims; however, if the *puella-woman*³⁷ type prevails, then she is fully subdued by the male power, which nullifies her individuality and her human dignity. Due to this basic duality, according to Neumann, this phase is characterized by the myths of *Demetra* and *Kore*. The next phase, called *irruption of the patriarchal uroboros*, will see the encounter of the female element (characterized by the above mythological duality) with the patriarchal element, which is often experienced as a numinous power (*numen*).

Both for males and females, the human consciousness may develop and evolve only through touch with the other (the female with the male, and vice versa) to form their own Otherness. The female comparison with the

male in the patriarchal uroboros is a determining moment for the development of the female consciousness. During this crucial comparison, the role that will assume the *Animus* in respect to her counterpart *Anima* within the female will be of fundamental importance. The female will maintain her femininity only when she is able to avoid the strong plagiarism attempts by the Animus, so that in the next phase (said to be the *encounter phase*) she may refute the usual patriarchal values (polygamy by the man and marital fidelity by the woman) to maintain matriarchal values and not fall into a female psychic inertia of total male subjection. Only in this way will a complete and normal female psychic development be possible, to be dual to the male development. So that a right and equilibrated reciprocally constructive meeting between female and male may take place, each part must respect the other, abdicating its own exclusive authority upon the other and accepting and respecting the existence of the latter. To this end, Neumann epitomizes this last stage with the myth of *Eros* and *Psyche*, thanks to which the female (*Psyche*) reaches her own (female) individuation process with the achievement of maturity in her highest consciousness.



ON SOME KEY MOMENTS IN THE HISTORY OF ANTHROPOLOGY

In this section, for a coherent historiographical summary of what has been stated in the previous sections of the main text, we provide a brief sketch of the main lines of the history of Western anthropology. The primary intention of this section is to outline a brief synoptic framework of the history of anthropology in a manner that coherently and organically lays out the first elements of Lévi-Straussian thought into a theoretical system that can be easily compared with what has been said in the main text in relation to Jung's and Neumann's systems of thought.

General Outlines

According to Fabietti (2001), Marvin Harris (2001), Alan Barnard (2000), and Paul Mercier (1966), the first elements of non-autonomous anthropological thought may be found in France around the end of the 18th century in that intersection area between philosophy and history and in the wake of the Enlightenment. Through regular comparison with the emerging scientific method, anthropological thought gradually acquired increasingly autonomous features and started to delineate its own borders as a field of doctrine, particularly with the coming of the celebrated contrast between *creationism* and *evolutionism* in the first half of the 19th century accompanying the rise of Darwin's well-known work. The regular influences of geology, biology, and archaeology led to the so-called *evolutionist anthropology* of the Victorian

epoch. Great Britain was the primary center of the origin of modern anthropology, with the studies of Edward B. Tylor, William R. Smith, and James G. Frazer, who greatly influenced other foreign scholars such as Adolf Bastian and Johann J. Bachofen. Bastian observed a type of recurrence of similar cultural phenomena in different cultural contexts, thus elaborating the concepts of *elementary ideas* (*Elementargedanken*), primarily subconscious and hence implicit, and *folk ideas* (*Völkergedanken*), from whose comparison it is possible to explicate the former; through all of these, it is possible to think that certain “germs of ideas” or patterns of thought, common to all men, exist that are developed differently depending on the environmental stimuli (Barnard 2012:Ch. 7). From its very inception, anthropology has exhibited bases of structural thought, beginning with Bastian—the father of ethnology—and continuing through 19th century evolutionism and the psychic unity of humankind theorists: Durkheim’s social anthropology, Jakobsonian structuralist linguistics, Piagetian genetic epistemology, Lévi-Straussian structuralism, and, most recently, Laughlin and D’Aquili’s *biogenetic structuralism*. Nevertheless, the history of anthropology during most of the 20th century has unjustly seen a resistance and rejection of structuralist notions.

The primary idea of structuralism is that underlying the apparent variety of psychological or cultural forms may be found essential structures that, when understood, explain external variations. For instance, Bastian held that the proper research object is the collective mind of a people as iterated in the experience, thought and actions of individuals. In other words, while the ethnographer records the folk ideas of a particular society, he really addresses the elementary ideas (i.e., the structures from which the former are generated). From this perspective, the social group has a type of group mind, a “social soul” (*Gesellschaftsseele*) in which the individual mind is embedded and influenced. Bastian believed that the elementary ideas should be scientifically extracted from folk ideas as varying forms of collective representations (*Gesellschaftsgedanken*). Because one cannot observe the collective representations per se, Bastian felt that the ethnographic project had to proceed through an analytical process through which one deduces the elementary ideas from the data on folk ideas (Laughlin and Tiberia 2012). Bachofen, however, conducted important studies on kinship systems, in particular on matriarchate and patriarchate. Noteworthy works were also produced by John F. McLennan on marital relationships, coining the terms *exogamy* and *endogamy*. All of these studies were reabsorbed by the incoming American anthropological thought, above all by Lewis H. Morgan and Franz Boas,³⁸ who can be considered the primary founders of anthropology in the U. S. A first criticism of the evolutionistic trend was raised by Franz Boas, who introduced so-called *historical particularism* in anthropology, according to which, roughly, each culture should be seen as a singular event or phenomenon that opens

the way to the next *diffusionism* and *Kulturkreislehre* (in German). Boas also focused great attention on the social-psychological motivations underlying any singularly taken culture. Several of his ideas were developed by some of his many pupils, including Alfred L. Kroeber and Robert Lowie.

At the same time, French anthropological thought was primarily oriented toward sociological rather than ethnological aspects so that the French anthropological reflection on primitive societies did not significantly develop until the end of the 19th century. One of the primary exponents of the French sociological school of the time was Émile Durkheim, who also conducted notable studies on religious thought and its history from a social-anthropological perspective. Among those who originally developed some of Durkheim's ideas from a more ethnological stance, we remember above all Lucien Lévy-Bruhl, who turned his attention to primitive societies. He tried to explain the mentality of these societies by means of the so-called *collective representations* (*d'après* Durkheim) and the *participation mystique* law, criticizing the personal psychology methods previously followed by evolutionists. In applying sociological investigation methods to studying primitive thought, he managed to identify possible explanations for their typical social-cultural aspects, where the evolutionistic tradition failed. Lévy-Bruhl, taking Durkheim's thought to the extreme, came to the hypothesis that collective representations influence the entire individual psychology. According to Lévy-Bruhl, the symbolic primitive universe was the result of a collective mystic participation with a prominent socially shared emotional character. Nevertheless, in contrast to the case at first glance, primitive thought is not only mystical but also regulated by a certain type of logic that coordinates its mystic representations according to the above-mentioned basic principle of *participation mystique*. Compared to the logic of civilized thought, that of primitive mentality is a *prelogic* that coordinates the various mystic representations of the former. Primitive prelogical thought is insensitive to contradictions as well as to the impossible (Bonte and Izard 1991; Fabietti and Remotti 1997). Primitive mystic prelogic must not be understood as lower than civilized rational logic; they should be compared with great caution. Civilized logical thought is, according to Lévy-Bruhl, the result of a rebellious tendency of the individual mind to distinguish itself from the collective mind. Lévy-Bruhl's ideas had great influence on the formulation of later Jungian thought (Carotenuto 1994:Ch. VI). Furthermore, and this is a remarkable fact in our view, almost all of the studies on primitive thought (Fabietti and Remotti 1997) have ascertained a great incidence of binary contraposition schema during the crucial passage from primitive to civilized thought.

The legacy of Durkheim and Lévy-Bruhl was received by Robert Hertz, Arnold Van Gennep, and Marcel Mauss, founders of the new French ethnoscology. In particular, the work of Mauss on *total social fact, classification*

forms, and *structural homology* was of a certain importance for the subsequent work of Lévi-Strauss (D'Aquili 1975) and that of Lévy-Bruhl. The next transition period between the end of the 19th century and World War I marked a turning point for anthropology, with the decline of evolutionism and the development of fieldwork through ethnographic tools. This development was of interest above all for British anthropology with the new ethnographers William H.R. Rivers and Bronisław Malinowski. This interest lasted until the psychoanalytic anthropology trend (briefly recalled in the next sections) and, above all, the constitution of the chief dispute between *diffusionism* and *functionalism*. The Durkheimian French school gradually made the great "ethnological jump" thanks to the remarkable work of Mauss, along with new scholars such as Marcel Griaule, Maurice Leenhardt and Robert Montagne. At the same time, the American Culture and Personality trend (see the next sections), the *nomothetic* rebirth (following M. Harris), and ethno-science, as well as the British structural functionalism of Alfred R. Radcliffe-Brown and Edward E. Evans-Pritchard, earned their growing influence among anthropological thought. Thereafter, Claude Lévi-Strauss makes his appearance with his masterful *structural anthropology*. Lévi-Strauss, with a Durkheimian and Maussian basic training, as well as with long fieldwork experience in Brazil, was considerably influenced in his 1940s American period by the structural linguistics of Roman Jakobson and others, which led him to formulate his new anthropological trend (D'Aquili 1975). The contemporary anthropological directions were then oriented toward a materialistic and Marxist critical ideology as well as toward an interpretative trend, the latter also being quite inclined to reevaluate psychoanalytic theories.

On Lévi-Straussian Thought

Lévi-Strauss has built up a complex, variegated, and notable theoretical framework in which he laid out the fieldwork data gathered from his various and numerous research missions conducted, above all, in Brazil in the 1930s after having received philosophical training and having been in touch with some exponents of the Durkheimian French ethnosociological school of that time. Subsequently, he stayed in the U. S. in the 1940s, where he came into contact both with scholars of the Boasian ethnological school (like Alfred L. Kroeber³⁹ and Leslie A. White) and with notable exponents of American linguistic structuralism (like Roman Jakobson and Nikolai S. Troubetzkoy). These subjects were only a part of the complex set of disciplines that contributed to working out his next valuable anthropological trend. Indeed, above all, psychoanalytic and philosophical disciplines strongly influenced his theoretical framework, which, however, always started from the ethnographic data obtained from fieldwork among natives. His first works concerned kinship structures and their formal relations (Lévi-Strauss 1967; see also D'Aquili

1975). On the basis of Freudian theories, Lévi-Strauss placed at the root of any further theoretical social system the first and universal rule that allowed the passage from nature to culture, that is to say, *incest prohibition*. This rule marked the origins of any further system of human rules. In developing his notable theoretical framework, he took into account the previous meaning that the term “structure” had in ethnology (above all, after Radcliffe-Brown). He then reached a new and more general notion of (anthropological) *structure*, taking into account some suggestions and ideas coming from some exponents both of French Bourbakism (including André Weil⁴⁰ and Georges Théodore Guilbaud) and of epistemological structuralism (including Jean Piaget). We now discuss the main points of Lévi-Strauss’s structural anthropology, according to Mercier (1966:Ch. 4, Sec. III; see also D’Aquili 1975).

According to Lévi-Strauss, *social structures* are not observable and have no empirical referents, the latter being the so-called *models of social relations*, which are constructed upon the former. The models of social relations are the only ones that are observable, and they make manifest social structures through relations.⁴¹ The structures, in themselves, are empirically undeterminable because they are unconscious and devoid of content. In turn, the models may be either conscious or unconscious. The reciprocity principle of *complementary opposition* is, however, always operating between their component structures. Furthermore, the reciprocity principle, closely related to incest prohibition and lying at the root of the passage from nature to culture, is also unconscious. On the basis of his structural perspective, Lévi-Strauss considers totemism to simply be the result of human attempts to classify natural phenomena through the usual binary logic of oppositions and relations. According to Lévi-Strauss, totemism must not be understood as the result of a prelogical primitive thought, as made, for instance, by Durkheim, Lévy-Bruhl, Radcliffe-Brown, Malinowski, and others; instead, it should be simply considered to be the natural tendency of primitive human thought to classify as well as to set relations and structures. The only difference between primitive and civilized thought lies in the fact that the former is exercised upon concrete things rather than on abstract entities. In short, according to Lévi-Strauss, the primary characteristic of human thought is *classification* through an oppositional and binary logic operating among elementary (unconscious) structures, which, through the principle of reciprocity, give rise to observable models of *relations*.

Therefore, primitive thought and (so-called) civilized thought should not be placed into a hierarchical position but rather they should be meant as two, in a certain sense, *parallel* and ahistorical ways in which the human mind universally thinks the *real*. Because of this parallelism, both types of thought should be analyzed on the basis of similar or homologous formal principles because they operate according to the same logical laws, even if

oriented toward different objects (that produce history). Totemism is therefore the result of a mental attitude that assumes the sensitive experience data building systems of relations and classifications to give rise to a symbolic *codex*. The various systems of classifications thus determined are placed into reciprocal relationships by means of certain *transformation systems*,⁴² thanks to which it is possible to identify the formal analogies and parallelisms among them. The Lévi-Straussian notion of transformation finds its highest expression in explaining the mythology that, together with totemism, represents the main symbolic activities of savage thought (which must not be understood in the mere literary sense of the term—in this regard, see Fabietti and Remotti [1997] and Bonte and Izard [1991]). Lévi-Strauss makes a formal linguistic analysis of the myth on the basis of structural linguistic patterns. According to Lévi-Strauss, a myth is structurally composed of great constitutive units called *mythemes*, which formally correspond to linguistic units such as phonemes, morphemes, semantemes, and so forth. To be precise, he takes into account above all the phonetic pattern. The meaning of a myth is given by the various possible oppositions between mythemes, according to laws and rules similar to the structural linguistic ones. According to Lévi-Strauss, a myth does not concern any classification of the external world but is aimed at itself.

With the celebrated works *Les structures élémentaires de la parenté* (of 1947) (Lévi-Strauss 1967) and *Mythologiques* (written in the years 1964–1971), Lévi-Strauss tried to give a scientific explanation of the structure and purposes of general human thought, starting from his experience as an ethnoanthropologist, retracing an inverse to the path that goes from nature to culture. In doing so, he discovered the unconscious structures that determine the choices of human beings and their cultures; he therefore identified the so-called unconscious structures of social-cultural institutions. However, with his other best-seller *Tristes Tropiques* (of 1955), Lévi-Strauss indulged his deep affective-existentialistic philosophical vein, nostalgically recalling the contents of his individual memory that led him to his professional destiny. This is a dense book of meditations on the sense of human civilization and its fate, on the tragic comparison between civilized societies and primitive ones, and on the evidence for the loss of a happy relationship between them; something that is truer today than ever before!



ON SOME KEY MOMENTS IN THE HISTORY OF PSYCHOANALYTIC ANTHROPOLOGY

For our purposes, we herein also provide a very brief outline of the main ideas of psychoanalytic anthropology, recalling its main protagonists. For a

deeper analysis of this interesting chapter on anthropology, we refer to Harris (2001:Ch. 16), Fabietti (2001:Ch. 11), Erica Bourguignon (1979), Robert Paul (1989), Fabietti and Remotti (1997), and Alessandro Pagnini (1977). In some respects, we will also follow Carotenuto (1992) in delineating a brief portrait of the main protagonists. For a modern insight into psychoanalytic anthropology and its applications, see the beautiful book by Gananath Obeyesekere (1990), to which we shall return elsewhere. In this book, among other things, an interesting comparison is made between the old chapters of Western psychoanalytic anthropology, above all the Culture and Personality trend, and Eastern culture (including Hinduism, Buddhism, and other Asiatic cultures). The symbolic dimension and Œdipal problems are the leitmotiv of Obeyesekere's book, and the fact that the former is one of the primary characteristics of almost every Asiatic culture, as Jung himself understood well, is also apparent.

On Sigmund Freud and the Early Origins of Psychoanalytic Anthropology

Psychoanalytic thought has been part of the anthropological field since Sigmund Freud's work on psychocultural and social phenomena, opening the so-called *Culture and Personality* trend that is currently included in the intersection between psychological anthropology, ethnopsychiatry, and ethnopsychanalysis (Conti and Principe 1989). According to Bourguignon (1979:Chs. 2–3), the dawn of psychoanalytic anthropology should be searched for attempts to account for the origins of human culture. In pursuing this search, it was immediately realized that it was not possible to leave the psychological context aside, particularly the new Freudian ideas. The early 20th century American anthropological community was initially quite critical toward the Freudian attempts to psychoanalytically explain certain anthropological phenomena. This aversion, however, disappeared around the 1930s and 1940s, when psychoanalytical ideas exerted a dominant influence on the intellectual life of the U. S., in particular being deeply engraved into the cultural anthropology of the time. All of these trends took place after the first celebrated American Congress on Psychoanalysis held at Clark University in 1909, which marked the birth of psychoanalysis in the U. S. In 1911, the American Psychoanalytic Association was founded as a part of the International Psychoanalytical Association, and, thenceforth, psychoanalytic ideas gradually pervaded other knowledge fields. Therefore, the history of the Culture and Personality trend may be laid out as a type of dialogue between cultural anthropology and psychoanalytic theory, and since then, the relationships between these two disciplines have had a vicarious nature.

One of the primary meeting points between anthropology and psychoanalysis was the incest taboo and exogamy and their role in the formation of social groups; their analysis started from the study of primitive societies. This was, among others, one of the primary research arguments conducted by Lévi-

Strauss. Since the beginning, however, the psychological dimension has always been one of the main constitutive elements of anthropological thought. The evolutionists L. Lévy-Bruhl, E.B. Tylor, W.H.R. Rivers, and J.G. Frazer put psychology at the foundation of their works on magic and mythological thought until the attempts to explain the crucial passage from nature to culture or civilization. Freud, as well as Jung, assiduously read most of the contemporary anthropological literature. Through an analysis of the incest taboo, exogamy, and totemism, a first theory on the origins and developments of culture was proposed by Freud, first in⁴³ *Totem and Taboo* (of 1913), then in *Civilization and Its Discontents* (of 1930), *Mass Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego* (of 1921), *The Future of an Illusion* (of 1927), and *Moses and Monotheism* (of 1939). According to Ernest Jones, Freud wrote *Totem and Taboo* after having read Frazer's *The Golden Bough* (of 1890) and *Totemism and Exogamy* (of 1910), as well as the first series of W. Robertson Smith's *Lectures on the Religion of the Semites* (of 1894). Freud attempted to answer two important anthropological questions of that time: What is totemism? What type of relationships do totemism and exogamy have? In Freudian cultural studies, the anthropological and evolutionary biology ideas of that time also had great importance. His theory of culture is primarily based on the (Darwinian) *primordial horde* notion,⁴⁴ on which the incipency of the Oedipus complex, the main pillar of his theoretical framework, relies. From the tragic primordial horde event followed exogamy and totemism, hence the cultural order. With *Totem and Taboo*, Freud wanted to give an anthropological basis to his psychoanalytic theory, and these ideas would play a fundamental role in the subsequent work of Jung and Lévi-Strauss. In this article, we just want to identify a central common point belonging to the complex thought systems of these latter authors, which turns out to be very useful with regard to some speculations about the origins of rational thought.

On Adlerian and Eriksonian Thought

According to Alfred Adler (and an analogous criticism was also raised by Jung), Freud misunderstood the real symbolic and finalistic (or teleological) nature of the sexual drive, which instead should be correlated to the familiar context, which, in turn, must be considered within the wider social context. The Adlerian theory is more pragmatic than the Freudian one, in which a major weight is given to the individual with her or his neurotic conflicts arising from the basic opposition of conscious-unconscious. According to Adler, the human being is born with a connate *sense of inferiority* that he or she tries to overcome through an aspiration to personal success driven by a (Nietzschean) power will in a continuous *compensation* between individual and social instances or requests, the latter resulting from many connate social feelings without which no human constructive agreement could exist. So,

with Adler, the basic role played by the social dimension emerges as a fundamental structural component of the human psyche, thereby approaching anthropological dimensions.

Erik H. Erikson had his first encounter with psychoanalysis when he was a teacher in a very special school in Vienna where both adults and children were undergoing psychoanalytical treatment. After undergoing psychoanalytical training at the Vienna Psychoanalytic Institute under the supervision of Anna Freud, he moved to the U. S. where, among other things, he conducted fieldwork with Yurok and Sioux Indian natives in South Dakota. At the same time, he started a private psychoanalyst practice. His most famous work was the celebrated *Childhood and Society* (1950), in which he outlined the cornerstones around which the entirety of his next thought system would revolve. He worked out a psychosocial development theory of the human psyche that covered the entire life cycle, starting from the Freudian one until old age, through a long series of eight stages in which the individual establishes her or his own continuous relationship with the environment. The latter plays a very fundamental role in the psychic formation of an individual, so that, in the Eriksonian conception, the environment is an unavoidable structuring element for a human being. From this standpoint, it follows that the anthropological dimension may influence the human personality and hence psychoanalytic thought itself, which could not consider such a basic perspective given its theoretical frame.

On Bronisław Malinowski

On the suggestion of his mentor C.G. Seligman, Malinowski read the above-mentioned Freudian works when he stayed in the Trobriand Islands in the 1910s for fieldwork. In taking this opportunity, he wanted to examine the validity of certain psychoanalytic ideas, in particular the Oedipus complex, within a cultural context quite different from the European one. His fieldwork observations led to his writing the celebrated *Sex and Repression in Savage Society* (of 1927), in which he compares the patriarchal triadic structure of the European monogamous family with the matriarchal one of the Trobriand monogamous family. The former primarily had a patrilineal descent pattern whereas the latter primarily had a matrilineal descent pattern with a male figure often given by the maternal uncle. For this last familiar model, Malinowski set up a *maternal complex*, which was meant to be a type of Oedipus complex but referred to sister and maternal uncle instead of mother and father. So, with Malinowski's work, the Freudian assumption of the universality of the Oedipus complex was, for the first time, put in a dubious position, giving rise to criticisms by Ernest Jones toward Malinowski's thought as well as to an ad hoc *avuncular complex* that was thought out just to reconcile the Freudian Oedipus complex with Malinowski's ideas. In any

case, Malinowski's work noted that the individual psycho-affective dynamics should be considered in the light of the social and authoritative relationships typical of the related membership's social-cultural context. His work did, however, exercise a non-negligible influence on the subsequent social-anthropological thought (Bourguignon 1979:Ch. 4).

On Géza Róheim and Georges Devereux

Róheim began his training in analysis with Sandor Ferenczi. Later, thanks to funding from Marie Bonaparte, he was able to conduct some interesting fieldwork among primitive peoples in Australia, New Guinea, and North America. In this way, he had the opportunity to ascertain the validity of Freudian psychosexual evolution within these primitive societies. His observations and conclusions roughly confirmed Freud's ideas.

At first he was a close follower of the Freudian ideas exposed in *Totem and Taboo*, revealing his psychoanalytic anthropological ideas in *The Riddle of the Sphinx* (of 1934) and in *The Origin and Function of Culture* (of 1943), but he thereafter gradually showed his own conceptions to be quite far from Freudian orthodoxy. He ontogenetically interpreted culture as the traumatic result of a "late childhood" of the human being, to which a given social group replies with a sort of "collective neurosis." Culture is thought of as a structure built up to realize, in a translated form primarily by means of sublimation processes, the fantasies of our infancy. He stated that "it seems that we grow up only to remain children, living trying to realize what was desired in childhood" (1943:31). In Róheim's work, the sublimation process plays a very fundamental role. For more information on the work of Róheim, who should be considered one of the main leaders of so-called *psychoanalytic reductionism*, see Bourguignon (1979:Ch. 3).

Devereux first studied physics and later human sciences, including Greek culture. He is considered the founder of ethnopsychiatry and of ethnopsychanalysis (Bourguignon 1979:Ch. 8; Conti and Principe 1989; Carotenuto 1992).

On John W. Layard

With Layard, psychoanalytic anthropology took its first steps from Freudian toward Jungian theory. Layard was a pupil of Rivers in the 1920s. Rivers' attention in his last years was oriented toward the *cultural diffusion* perspective (or *diffusionism*) against the prevailing *functionalism*, whose two main exponents were A.R. Radcliffe-Brown and Malinowski; the former was also an opponent of the so-called "psychologizing anthropology" (Bourguignon 1979). None of these connections were useful to Layard's career, which explains the minimal consideration received by his work and why he remained a marginal figure in the British anthropology of the time.

After his fieldwork at Malekula, Layard published *Stone Men of Malekula* (1942), where the cultural diffusion hypothesis on the origins of local institutions, intertwined with the description of initiation rites, were the outcome of the twofold influence of Rivers and Jung. Indeed, Layard had worked in analysis under Jung since the beginning of the 1940s. Through Jungian thought,⁴⁵ Layard tried to explain the *maki* rite, observed at Malekula, calling into question the Jungian individuation process. For Layard's work, see MacClancy (1986). Nevertheless, very few texts quote Layard and his work, and very few were (or are) attempts to proceed toward a deeper comparison between aspects of anthropological thought and some of the general Jungian ideas (Laughlin and Tiberia 2012).

Further Developments

As mentioned above, in the first half of the 20th century, the relationships between anthropology and psychoanalysis were very deep within the general (diachronic) evolutionist perspective. In Europe, it was above all anthropology that influenced psychoanalysis (as witnessed by Freud and Jung's work), while in the U. S., psychoanalysis had a considerable influence on anthropology with the celebrated Personality and Culture trend. Between the 1930s and 1940s, this anthropological school had as its primary protagonists some notable Neo-Freudians, including Margaret Mead,⁴⁶ Abram Kardiner, Ralph Linton, Erik H. Erikson, Karen Horney, Ruth F. Benedict, Edward Sapir, Melford E. Spiro, Gardner Murphy, Clara M. Thompson, Gregory Bateson, Erich Fromm, and Leslie A. White. In Europe in the same period, the (synchronic) British functionalist perspective (*d'après* Radcliffe-Brown and Malinowski) prevailed, whereas psychoanalysis goes back to having its influence loaded with structural anthropology, whose predominant figure was that of Claude Lévi-Strauss. Finally, from the end of the 1930s, Alfred I. Hallowell, on the suggestion of the psychologist Bruno Klopfer, introduced and used the Rorschach projective tests in anthropology; Cora A. Du Bois also used these tools. Nevertheless, these studies were gradually abandoned, unjustly in our view.



ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My sincere gratitude to Professor Peter Benson and to Professor Rebecca Lester of the Department of Anthropology of the Washington University in St. Louis for their valuable initial instructions, as editors of the *Anthropology of Consciousness* journal, as to how to change the first draft of this article to achieve the appropriate form. I also thank the anonymous reviewers, who have followed the evolution of this work since its first submission, for their useful and interesting comments and hints, which have improved the article.



NOTES

1. This term is meant in the wider psychoanalytical sense (Laplanche and Pontalis 1973).
2. See also the final Appendix.
3. For instance, the resolution of the basic antinomy Self–Other is conducted at a social level via the exchange of women.
4. Although some authors point out that such a term was never used by Lévi-Strauss, nevertheless, we use it to denote the Lévi-Straussian unconscious as a notion in itself. Furthermore, Lévi-Strauss also provided a *preconscious* structure as an individual counterpart to the structural one, hence, in many respects homologous to the Jungian personal unconscious.
5. Among other roles, structural anthropology and linguistic ideas played a fundamental role in working out the framework of Jacques Lacan’s thought.
6. We shall return to these last interesting points elsewhere.
7. Lévi-Strauss also drew from other notions of the unconscious from previous anthropologists (including Marcel Mauss).
8. For a careful comparison between the Freudian and the Lévi-Straussian unconscious, see Gould (1978).
9. In this definition, a certain Lamarckism is identifiable (see D’Aquili 1975; Laughlin and Tiberia 2012).
10. D’Aquili (1975) states that there is no certainty whether or not Lévi-Strauss was acquainted with Jung’s work, but in view of his probable acquaintance with Jung’s earlier works, the possibility cannot be altogether ruled out. The least we can say is that there is certainly a remarkable parallelism (recalling the Alfred L. Kroeber’s concept of the *parallel development* of culture’s patterns [see Kroeber 1948]), similar to Newton’s and Leibnitz’s well-known parallel development of infinitesimal calculus.
11. In this regard, with a truly expressive metaphor, Lévi-Strauss picturesquely compares this “*with the empty stomach* [forms] *that assimilates the food* [contents]” (1972:203).
12. Seeing the unconscious as an intermediate term between subjective and objective was, in a certain sense, suggested to Lévi-Strauss by the famous notion of the *total social fact* of Marcel Mauss (Renzi 1965; see also D’Aquili 1975).
13. For this purpose, see also Iurato (2013a).
14. This diachronic dynamicity is primarily as regards the (dualistic) forms of the archetypes.
15. Lévi-Straussian (dualistic) forms are universal and determined once and for all.

16. These contents, in turn, are strictly linked to the related social-cultural contexts.
17. This crucial passage is similar to the passage from mythical to rational thought with the dawning of philosophical thought around the 6th century BC. We would be tempted to propose the hypothesis that these types of crucial passages were strictly correlated with the occurrence of some process of separating opposites, that is to say, with the advent of the first forms of dialectic thought.
18. Further interesting studies on the relationships between primitive and civilized thought, confirming what has been said in this article, were also made by Remo Cantoni (1914–1978), one of the primary Italian cultural anthropologists.
19. The mystic participation law had a certain influence on formulating the Jungian notion of *participation mystique*, which allowed Jung himself to make some considerations on the dawning of civilized thought from the primitive one. According to Staude (1976), the primitive mentality primarily differs from the civilized one—says Jung—because the conscious mind is far less developed, in extent and intensity, in the former case than in the latter. In the primitive mentality, basic functions such as thinking and willing are not yet differentiated; they are still pre-conscious. For Jung, the principle of participation is also applied to the internal development of the human psyche itself, in which, he thought, the contents move out of the unconscious by a process of differentiation and are gradually freed from the condition of “participation mystique.” In other words, they move into the light of consciousness, where they can come under the direction and control of the Ego’s dialectic and are brought into the service of the entire Self.
20. For instance, the logic of psychotic patients is quite different from the Aristotelian one, as witnessed by the fundamental studies conducted by Ignacio Matte Blanco (1975; see also Iurato 2013a for a very brief recall).
21. In this regard, the notion of *syncretism* is meant in its wider sense, including, above all, the psychological one.
22. However, the structural principles of the unconscious in the Freudian sense (albeit inherent to the individual one) also provide for the possibility of having contradictions, this being further confirmed by Matte Blanco’s studies (1975). Moreover, the Matte Blanco *bi-logic* process might have many common points with the Jungian notion of *compensation* (Samuels, Shorter, and Plaut 1986 and Galimberti 2006), in turn related to the Freudian notion of *ambivalence* (Laplanche and Pontalis 1973).
23. The *tertium non datur* principle is more general than the non contradiction one, but implies the latter; indeed, the latter imposes a disjointed choice between one statement (A) and its negation ($\neg A$), that is to say, only one of these two is true; nevertheless, this does not exclude the case in which both may be false, hence the third possibility (eventuality, which is just that forbidden by the *tertium non datur* principle).

24. Which is of a *dialectic* type when it leads to a synthesis, or of a *polar* type when a certain state of tension, which is at the basis of every psychic dynamism, is maintained (Samuels, Shorter, and Plaut 1986 and Galimberti 2006). However, the notion of opposite pairs, here taken from the Jungian psychoanalytic context (and, as has been mentioned above, already present in Freudian thought with the notions of *ambivalence* and *ambitendency*, which Freud himself set as the basis of every rational dialectical thought [Laplanche and Pontalis 1973; see also Akhtar and O'Neil 2011]) belongs to the wider class of *philosophical pairs* of general dialectic thought. For a good exposition of the various relationships between dialectics and formal logic, see Malatesta (1982).
25. In formulating this principle, Jung started from a careful historical recognition of the physical laws of general thermodynamics, addressing the evolution of dynamic systems and related laws on energetic balance (Samuels, Shorter, and Plaut 1986). This is another argument that emphasizes the primary historical role that physics has played in the birth of psychoanalytic theories since Freud's work. This last historical remark about the possible role played by physics in the birth and development of psychoanalysis deserves further attention.
26. The personal unconscious has many common points with the Freudian one, although they are different.
27. Even Freud himself, in the last years of his life, tried to explain psychosis by means of the *disavowal* mechanism. Such an epistemological need had been, however, felt by Freud since his early works on psychoanalysis. See also Iurato (2013b,c).
28. The central key may roughly correspond to the *cathexis object* of Freudian theory (Rycroft 1968).
29. The collective conscious psyche is related to society and its collective representations. In that, the influence of Lévy-Bruhl on Jungian thought is clear.
30. See Tagliagambe and Malinconico (2011).
31. Erich Neumann's work on the origins of consciousness also deserves further attention (see also Laughlin and Tiberia 2012).
32. A *mythologem* is the basic and elementary recurrent theme, or key, of a myth (Jung and Kerényi 1969; see also Laughlin and Tiberia 2012).
33. The Neumannian centerversion is quite comparable with Jungian compensation.
34. This phase is crucial for the development of consciousness because it begins to form the first nucleus of rational thought, as we have seen in the main text.
35. The Great Father archetype has another type of dualistic nature, as we will see later.
36. The Hero is the individual in his transpersonal stance in this psychic configuration process.

37. With the Latin terms *puer-puella* (boy-girl), the ancient Romans denoted the adolescent sons-daughters until 18 years old, still living within the familiar nucleus (Janssens 1981: Part II, Ch. 1, Sec. 2.b), hence primarily devoid of their own individuality and autonomy.
38. It is interesting to remember that Boas had very polyhedral academic training, starting with studying exact and natural sciences through to geography and history and then anthropology, of which he can be rightly considered one of the founding fathers.
39. In addition, Kroeber's *unconscious patterns* had a certain influence on Lévi-Strauss's unconscious patterns and vice versa (Remotti 1971:Ch. 4, Sec. 2; see also D'Aquili 1975).
40. Lévi-Strauss, aside from Weil, also quotes in Lévi-Strauss (1967), the mathematician John Von Neumann (Cipriani 1988:Ch. 2, Sec. 2.1; Piaget 1968).
41. In this process, it is not possible to overlook the parallel with the above-mentioned *elementary* and *folk ideas* of Bastian.
42. These systems are molded on the basis of mathematical transformation groups (*d'après* Weil).
43. In this work, inter alia, Freud also proposes a possible mythical origin of the incest taboo.
44. See Rycroft (1968).
45. Following Giovetti (2006), Jung always loved getting to know new people and places, undertaking long adventurous travels in North Africa through the Sahara; Central Africa; the U.S. including New Mexico, where he strictly lived with Pueblo Indians; and India. He embedded himself in the soul, in the atmosphere, and in the history of the various visited environments or places. For him, meeting with different cultures and people was a determining experience both for his personality formation and for his psychological studies. So, he also had an unavoidable and non-negligible anthropological attitude.
46. Margaret Mead was the daughter of George Herbert Mead, one of the pioneers of social psychology at the end of the 19th century and beginning of the 20th century.

REFERENCES CITED

- Agno, Mario
 1962 *Le radiazioni e I loro effetti* [Radiation and their effects]. Turin: Paolo Boringhieri Editore.
- Akhtar, Salman, and Mary Kay O'Neil, eds.
 2011 On Freud's 'Negation'. The International Psychoanalytic Association – Contemporary Freud: Turning Points and Critical Issues Series, Leticia Glocer Fiorini and Gennaro Saragnano, eds. London: Karnac Books, Ltd.

Barnard, Alan

2000 *History and Theory in Anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Translated by Andrea Cossu as *Storia del Pensiero Antropologico*. Bologna: Società editrice Il Mulino, 2002.

Barnard, Alan

2012 *Genesis of Symbolic Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Beth, Evert Willem

1959 *The Foundations of Mathematics. A Study in the Philosophy of Science*. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company, Inc. Translated by Ettore Casari as *I Fondamenti Logici della Matematica*. Milan: Giangiacomo Feltrinelli Editore, 1963.

Bonte, Pierre and Michel Izard

1991 *Dictionnaire de l'Ethnologie et de l'Anthropologie [Dictionary of Ethnology and Anthropology]*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France. Translated by Annadelfina Arcostanzo et al. as *Dizionario di Antropologia e Etnologia, a Cura di Marco Aime [Dictionary of Ethnology and Anthropology]*. Turin: Giulio Einaudi Editore, 2009.

Bourguignon, Erica

1979 *Psychological Anthropology: An Introduction to Human Nature and Cultural Differences*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc. Translated as *Antropologia Psicologica*. Rome: Giuseppe Laterza & Figli, 1983.

Caldiron, Orio

1975 *Claude Lévi-Strauss. I Fondamenti Teorici dell'Antropologia Culturale. Pubblicazioni della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia [The Theoretical Foundations of Cultural Anthropology]*. Florence: Università di Padova, Leo S. Olschki Editore.

Carotenuto, Aldo

1990 *Senso e Contenuto della Psicologia Analitica [Meaning and Content of Analytical Psychology]*. Turin: Bollati Boringhieri Editore.

1991 *Trattato di Psicologia della Personalità [A Treatise on Psychology of Personality]*. Milan: Raffaello Cortina Editore.

Carotenuto, Aldo, ed.

1992 *Dizionario Bompiani degli Psicologi Contemporanei [Bompiani Dictionary of Contemporary Psychology]*. Milan: Tascabili Bompiani.

Carotenuto, Aldo

1994 *Jung e la Cultura del XX Secolo [Jung and the 20th Century Culture]*. Milan: Bompiani.

Carruccio, Ettore

1971 *Mondi della Logica [Worlds of Logic]*. Bologna: Zanichelli Editore.

1977 *Appunti di Storia delle Matematiche, della Logica, della Metamematica [Notes on the History of Mathematics]*. Bologna: Pitagora Editrice.

Cipriani, Roberto

1988 *Lévi-Strauss. Una Introduzione [Lévi-Strauss: An Introduction]*. Rome: A. Armando Editore.

- Comba, Enrico
2000 *Introduzione a Lévi-Strauss [An Introduction to Lévi-Strauss]*. Bari: Editori Laterza.
- Conti, Luigi and Salvatore Principe
1989 *Salute Mentale e Società. Fondamenti di Psichiatria Sociale [Mental Health and Society]*. Padua: Piccin Nuova Libreria.
- Cressant, Pierre
1970 Lévi Strauss. Paris: Éditions Universitaires. Translated by Fulvia and Silvia Kanizsa as *Introduzione a Lévi Strauss*. Florence: C/E Giunti – G. Barbera, 1971.
- D'Aquili, Eugene G.
1975 The Influence of Jung on the Work of Claude Lévi-Strauss. *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences* 11(1):41–48.
- Ellenberger, Henri F.
1970 *The Discovery of the Unconscious. The History and Evolution of Dynamic Psychiatry*. New York: Basic Publishing House Book, Inc. Translated by Wanda Bertola et al. as *La Scoperta dell'Inconscio. Storia della Psichiatria Dinamica*. Turin: Editore Boringhieri, 1972.
- Enriques, Federigo
1985 *Problemi della Scienza. Ristampa Anastatica della Seconda Edizione del 1926 [Problems of Science]*. Bologna: Nicola Zanichelli Editore.
- Erikson, Erik H.
1950 *Childhood and Society*. New York: Norton.
- Evans, Richard I., ed.
1964 *Conversations with Carl Jung and Reactions from Ernest Jones*. New York: Litton Educational Publishing, Inc. Translated by Grazia Pietrangeli Lacovara as *Psicoanalisi o Psicologia Analitica*. Rome: Newton Compton Editore, 1974.
- Fabietti, Ugo
2001 *Storia dell'Antropologia [An History of Anthropology]*, 2nd edition. Bologna: Zanichelli Editore.
- Fabietti, Ugo, and Francesco Remotti, eds.
1997 *Dizionario di Antropologia. Etologia, Antropologia Culturale, Antropologia Sociale [Dictionary of Anthropology, Etology, Social and Cultural Anthropology]*. Bologna: Zanichelli Editore.
- Frazer, James.
1890 *The Golden Bough*. London: Macmillan and Co.
1910. *Totemism and Exogamy*. London: Macmillan and Co.
- Freud, Sigmund
1913. *Totem and Taboo*. Boston: Beacon Press.
1921. *Mass Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego*. London: Hogarth Press.
1930. *Civilization and Its Discontents*. Berlin: Internationaler Psychoanalytischer Verlag Wien.
1927. *The Future of an Illusion*. London: Hogarth Press.

- 1938 *Abriß der Psychoanalyse* [A Compendium of Psychoanalysis]. In *Gesammelte Werke* [Collected Works], Band XVII. Translated by Delia Agozzino et al. as *Compendio di psicoanalisi*. Turin: Bollati Boringhieri, 1999.
1939. *Moses and Monotheism*. London: Hogarth Press.
- Galimberti, Umberto
2006 *Dizionario di Psicologia* [Dictionary of Psychology]. Turin: UTET Libreria.
- Gioveti, Paola
2006 *I Grandi Iniziati del Nostro Tempo. I Maestri del Cammino Interiore. I Maestri del Cammino Interiore* [The Great Connoisseurs of Our Time. The Masters of the Intimate Route]. Rome: Casa Editrice Edizioni Mediterranee.
- Goody, Jack Rankine
1977 *The Domestication of the Savage Mind*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Translated by Vito Messina as *L'Addomesticamento del Pensiero Selvaggio*. Milan: Franco Angeli Editore, 1981.
- Gould, Nathan
1978 *The Structure of Dialectical Reason: A Comparative Study of Freud's and Lévi-Strauss' Concepts of Unconscious Mind*. *Ethos* 6(4): 187–211.
- Grampa, Giuseppe
1976 *L'Uomo e la Storia nell'Antropologia Strutturale di Claude Lévi-Strauss* [The Man and the History in the Structural Anthropology of Claude Lévi-Strauss]. In *Studi Sullo Strutturalismo*. vol. 1: *Natura e Problemi dello Strutturalismo*, vol. 2: *Proposte Didattico-Educative* [Studies in Structuralism. Vol 1: *Nature and Problems of Structuralism*, Vol. 2: *Education Perspectives*]. G. Proverbio, ed. Pp. 76–152. Turin: Società Editrice Internazionale.
- Gras, Vernon W.
1981 *Myth and the Reconciliation of Opposites: Jung and Lévi-Strauss*. *Journal of the History of Ideas* 42(3): 471–488.
- Gray, Richard M.
1991 *Jung and Lévi-Strauss Revisited: An Analysis of Common Themes*. *Mankind Quarterly* 31(3): 207–226.
- Hallpike, Christopher R.
1979 *The Foundation of Primitive Thought*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Translated as *I fondamenti del pensiero primitivo*. Rome: Editori Riuniti, 1984.
- Harris, Marvin
2001 *The Rise of Anthropological Thought: A History of Theories of Culture*. Walnut Creek: Altamira Press. Translated from the 1968 edition by Pier Giovanni Donini e Marta Sofri as *L'evoluzione del pensiero antropologico. Una storia della teoria della cultura*. Bologna: Società editrice Il Mulino, 1970.
- Hénaff, Marcel
1998 *Claude Lévi-Strauss and the Making of Structural Anthropology*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Hermann, Imre

1989 *Psicoanalisi e Logica* [Logic and Psychoanalysis]. Bari: Edizioni Dedalo.

Iurato, Giuseppe

2013a Mathematical Thought in the Light of Matte Blanco's Work. *Philosophy of Mathematics Education Journal* 27(1):200–209.

2013b Σύμβολου: An Attempt Toward the Early Origins, Part 1. *Language and Psychoanalysis* 2(2): 77–120.

2013c Σύμβολου: an Attempt toward the Early Origins, Part 2. *Language and Psychoanalysis* 2(2): 121–160.

Jacobi, Jolande

1971 *Complesso, archetipo, simbolo nella psicologia di C. G. Jung* [Complex, Archetype, and Symbol in the Psychology of C.G. Jung]. Turin: Editore Boringhieri.

Janssens, Jos

1981 *Vita e Morte del Cristiano Negli Epitaffi di Roma Anteriori al Secolo VII* [Life and Death of Christian in the Before 7th Century Rome's Epitaphs]. Rome: Università Gregoriana Editrice.

Jung, Carl Gustav

1912. [1967]. *Symbols of Transformation, Collected Works of C.G. Jung, Volume 5* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

1959. *Aion. Reserches into the Phenomenology of the Self*. Richard Francis Carrington Hull, trans. New York: Pantheon Books, Inc.

1969a *The Psychology of the Child Archetype*. In *Essays on a Science of Mythology*. C.G. Jung and K. Kerényi, eds. Princeton: Princeton University Press. Translated by Angelo Brelich as *Psicologia dell'Archetipo del Fanciullo*. In *Prolegomeni allo Studio Scientifico della Mitologia*. C.G. Jung and K. Kerényi, eds. Turin: Paolo Boringhieri Editore, 1972. Pp. 83–118.

1969b *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*. Richard Francis Carrington Hull, trans. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Jung, Carl Gustav and Karl Kerényi

1969 *Essays on a Science of Mythology*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. Translated by Angelo Brelich as *Prolegomeni allo studio scientifico della mitologia*. Turin: Paolo Boringhieri Editore, 1972.

Kroeber, Alfred Louis

1948 *Anthropology. Culture Patterns and Processes*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc. Translated by Ernesta Rogers as *Antropologia. Razza, Lingua, Cultura, Psicologia, Preistoria*. Milan: Giangiacomo Feltrinelli Editore, 1983.

Laplanche, Jean and Jean-Bertrand Pontalis

1973 *The Language of Psychoanalysis*. London: The Hogarth Press, Ltd. and The Institute of Psychoanalysis. Translated by Giancarlo Fuà as *Enciclopedia della Psicoanalisi*. Bari: Editore Laterza, 1973.

- Laughlin, Charles D and Vincenza A. Tiberia
2012 Archetypes: Toward a Jungian Anthropology of Consciousness. *Anthropology of Consciousness* 23(2): 127–157.
- Layard, John W.
1942 *Stone Men of Malekula*. London, Chatto & Windus.
- Lévi-Strauss, Claude
1955 The Structural Study of Myth. *The American Journal of Folklore* 68(270): 428–444.
1955 [1973]. *Tristes Tropiques*. John and Doreen Weightman, trans. New York: Atheneum
1962. *La pensée sauvage* (The savage mind). Paris: Librairie Plon.
1967 *Les Structures Élémentaires de la Parenté* [The Elementary Structure of Kinship]. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France. Translated by Alberto Mario Cirese e Liliana Serafini as *Le Strutture Elementari della Parentela*, a Cura di Alberto Mario Cirese, Edizioni Campi del sapere. Milan: Giangiaco­mo Feltrinelli Editore, 1984.
1972 [1958]. *Structural Anthropology*. Volume 1 Claire Jacobson & Brooke Grundfest, trans. London: Penguin.
- MacClancy, Jeremy
1986 Unconventional Character and Disciplinary Convention: John Layard, Jungian and Anthropologist. In Malinowski, Rivers, Benedict and Others: *Essays on Culture and Personality*. G. W. Stocking, ed. Pp. 50–71. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press.
- Malatesta, Michele
1982 *Dialettica e logica formale* [Dialectic and Formal Logic]. Napoli: Liguori Editore.
- Malinowski, Bronislaw
1927 *Sex and Repression in Savage Society*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Company.
- Matte Blanco, Ignacio
1975 *The Unconscious as Infinite Sets. An Essay in Bi-Logic*. London: Gerald Duckworth & Company, Ltd. Translated by Pietro Bria as *L'Inconscio come Insiemi Infiniti. Saggio sulla Bi-logica*. Turin: Giulio Einaudi Editore, 1981.
- Mercier, Paul
1966 *Histoire de l'anthropologie* [An History of Anthropology]. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France. Translated by Rosanna Albertini as *Storia dell'Antropologia*. 2nd edition. Bologna: Società editrice Il Mulino, 1988.
- Moravia, Sergio
1969 *La Ragione Nascosta. scienza e Filosofia Nel Pensiero di Claude Lévi-Strauss* [The Hidden Reason. Science and Philosophy in Lévi-Strauss Thought]. Florence: Sansoni.

Nannini, Sandro

1981 *Il Pensiero Simbolico. Saggio su Lévi-Strauss* [The Symbolic Thought: An Essay on Lévi-Strauss]. Bologna: Società Editrice Il Mulino.

Neumann, Erich

1954 *The Origins and History of Consciousness*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. Translated by Livio Argenti as *Storia delle origini della coscienza*. Rome: Casa Editrice Astrolabio-Ubaldini Editore, 1978.

1955 *The Great Mother. An Analysis of the Archetype*. Princeton: Princeton University Press. Translated by Antonio Vitolo as *La grande madre. Fenomenologia delle configurazioni femminili dell'inconscio*. Rome: Casa Editrice Astrolabio-Ubaldini Editore, 1981.

Obeyesekere, Gananath

1990 *The Work of Culture. Symbolic Transformation in Psychoanalysis and Anthropology*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Pagnini, Alessandro, ed.

1977 *Antropologia e Psicoanalisi* [Anthropology and Psychoanalysis]. Palermo: Sellerio Editore.

Paul, Robert A.

1989 *Psychoanalytic Anthropology*. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 18(1): 177–202.

Piaget, Jean

1968 *Le Structuralisme* [The Structuralism]. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France. Translated by Andrea Bonomi as *Lo Strutturalismo*. Milan: Il Saggiatore di Alberto Mondadori Editore, 1968.

Remotti, Francesco

1971 *Lévi-Strauss. Struttura e Storia* [Lévi-Strauss. Structure and History]. Turin: Giulio Einaudi Editore.

Renzi, Emilio

1965 *Sulla Nozione di Inconscio in Lévi-Strauss* [On the notion of Lévi-Strauss unconscious]. *Aut Aut* 88: 55–61.

Roheim, G.

1934. *The Riddle of the Sphinx : or, Human Origins*. R. Money-Kyrle, trans. Preface by E. Jones. London : Hogarth Press

1943 *The Origin and Function of Culture*. New York: Nervous and Mental Disease Monographs.

Rossi, Ino

1973 *The Unconscious in the Anthropology of Claude Lévi-Strauss*. *American Anthropologist* 75(1): 20–48.

Rycroft, Charles

1968 *A Critical Dictionary of Psychoanalysis*. London: Thomas Nelson & Sons, Ltd. Translated by Piero Angarano as *Dizionario critico di psicoanalisi*. Rome: Casa Editrice Astrolabio-Ubaldini Editore, 1970.

Samuels, Andrew, Bani Shorter and Fred Plaut

1986 *A Critical Dictionary of Jungian Analysis*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Translated by Chiara Sebastiani as *Dizionario di psicologia analitica*. Milan: Raffaello Cortina Editore, 1987.

Smith W, Robertson

1894. *Lectures on the religion of the Semites*. London: A. & C. Black.

Sowa, John F.

1984 *Conceptual Structures: Information Processing in Mind and Machine*. Reading: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc.

Stauder, John Raphael

1976 *From Depth Psychology to Depth Sociology: Freud, Jung and Lévi-Strauss*. *Theory and Society* 3(3):303–338.

Tagliagambe, Silvano and Angelo Malinconico

2011 *Pauli e Jung. Un Confronto su Materia e Psiche* [Pauli and Jung. A comparison between Matter and Psyche]. Milan: Raffaello Cortina Editore.