HAL
open science

On Jung and Lévi-Strauss unconscious: A brief comparison

Giuseppe Iurato

▶ To cite this version:

Giuseppe Iurato. On Jung and Lévi-Strauss unconscious: A brief comparison. 2013. hal-00840195

HAL Id: hal-00840195
https://hal.science/hal-00840195v1

Preprint submitted on 1 Jul 2013

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

On Jung and Lévi-Strauss unconscious: A brief comparison

Giuseppe Iurato
University of Palermo, IT

E-mail: giuseppe.iurato@unipa.it

Abstract. Retracing the main common aspects between the anthropological thought and the psychoanalytic one, in this paper we will further discuss about the main common points between the notions of unconscious according to Carl Gustav Jung and Claude Lévi-Strauss, taking into account the Erich Neumann thought. On the basis of very simple elementary logic considerations centered around the basic notion of separation of opposites, what will be said might turn out to be useful for some speculations upon possible origins of the rational thought, hence for the origins of consciousness.

Keywords and phrases: analytical psychology, structural anthropology, unconscious, archetype, classical logic, opposites.

«In the beginning, all the things were together;
then, it came the mind (ὁ νοῦζ) and set them in order»
Anaxagoras of Clazomenæ
(Diogenes Lærtius, *Vite dei Filosofi*, *II*, Chap. III)

1. Introduction

Carl Gustav Jung (1875-1961) and Claude Lévi-Strauss (1908-2009) have been two great thinkers and scholars of the last century. The former was an eminent psychiatrist and psychoanalyst, the first pupil of Sigmund Freud, then the founder of a new school of psychoanalytic thought called *analytical psychology*. The latter was, instead, an eminent anthropologist and an ethnologist, as well as one of the main leader of French structuralism, who also gave fundamental contributions to philosophy and psychology. A brief sketch of the main lines of their thought will be outlined in the next sections, whilst herein we wish to simply outline for what reasons, and to what purposes, we invoke them in this paper.

As we will see later, Jung first was one of the main connoisseurs and supporters of the Freudian thought, for many years having been one of the closest co-workers of Freud himself. Nevertheless, he believed that the whole Freudian framework was little opened toward other possible applicative perspectives as, for instance, those related to the anthropological and ethnological thought, in particular towards the mythological one, notwithstanding they have also played a fundamental role in the foundation of the Freudian thought itself. So, Jung decided to approach part of the Freudian thought giving a major load to these new perspectives, reaching to an original and appreciate thought's line having a notable interdisciplinary valence.

From this viewpoint, it is clear that possible common themes between psychoanalytic thought and the anthropological one, are more than likely. Moreover, the efficient results of Jungian psychotherapeutic praxis might be taken as an indirect prove of the validity of those anthropological ideas which have contributed in building up the Jungian theoretical framework itself, amongst which certain Lévi-Straussian ideas that will be herein briefly recalled. More than any other, the Jungian thought has played a very fundamental role in explaining the possible origins of consciousness.

Well, in this paper, we would like to retake the discussion about some aspects of the known critical comparison between the Jungian thought and the Lévi-Straussian one, trying to enlarge this comparative debate also thanks to elementary concepts of classical logic. In doing so, it will be also possible to shed light on some fundamental aspects of human conscious reasoning, in particular on its early origins. Precisely, as we will see, the Lévi-Straussian and Jungian systems of thought have many common theoretical backgrounds, like, for example, the Lévy-Bruhl work on primitive thought compared with the civilized one, which has been comprised into their theoretical systems. The current anthropological standpoints say that the only possible differences between these last two, should be searched in a different qualitative use of the primary logic rules rather than in quantitative modalities. According to our final considerations, it is just in the lacking of some of these basic logic rules that may be retraced the substantial differences between these two types of thought, confirming some assumptions made both by Lévi-Strauss and Jung on the origins of the conscious human thought, which we would to descry in the occurrence of the fundamental dialectic operation of separation of opposites.

2. Moments of the psychoanalysis history

In this section, we want to highlight only those aspects of the historical evolution of psychoanalysis which are in some relation with the arguments of this paper. The main intention of this section and of the next ones, is to outline the main aspects of this evolution which have led to the psychoanalytic anthropology, the main context within which this paper has been worked out. In pursuing this, we mainly follow one of the main references on the history of psychoanalysis, i.e. (Ellenberger 1970). This treatise, which was written by a professional neuropsychiatrist, lays out each great theoretical system into its proper social-politic-cultural-economic context, starting from the previous already existing metapsychic theories on shamanism, exorcism, hypnotism, spiritualism and magnetism which have constituted the first unavoidable background upon which it will be built up the subsequent scientific dynamical psychiatry framework, with the first theoretical systems of dynamical psychiatry by F. Mesmer, A.M.J. Puységur, J. Kerner, H.M. Bernheim and J.M. Charcot. At the same time, Ellenberger considers too the possible philosophical systems which have had a non-negligible influence on the early origins of dynamical psychiatry, amongst which those due to G. Fechner and J.J. Bachofen. Thereafter, on the basis of what already said, Ellenberger devotes single chapters to the great theoretical systems respectively due to Pierre Janet, Sigmund Freud, Alfred Adler and Carl Gustav Jung, also taking into account their possible applications. Together the Ellenberger's text, we also follow the biographical dictionary (Carotenuto 1991) in which a brief but organic recall of the main lines of the thought of each thinker are also exposed together to minimal biographical notes.

2.1 On Freudian thought

Pierre Janet, as a successor of J.M. Charcot at the Paris Salpêtrière Hospital, shifts his studies from hysteria to neurasthenia, elaborating a psychogenetic theory of neurosis in such a manner to throw, for the first time, a bridge between neurology and general psychology. These works will be retaken by Sigmund Freud, who also studied neurology with J. Breuer and Charcot himself. The theories on hysteria of the time greatly influenced Freud who published his first work, *Studies on Hysteria* (1894-95), just on these arguments, with the collaboration of his first teacher, the psychiatrist and neurophysiologist Joseph Breuer. Both adopted the hypnotic method for studying this disorder. In the next years, thanks to an epistolary correspondence with W. Fliess, gradually Freud accrues an original theory of mind, exposing part of his new ideas in an first draft entitled *The Project for a*

Scientific Psychology (1895), which nevertheless remained unpublished. It was at once followed by the publication of the celebrated *The Interpretation of Dreams* (1899), which officially marked the birth of psychoanalysis together with other two famous works, namely *Psychopathology of Everyday Life* (1901) and *Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality* (1905). In the first years of 1900, Freud began to acquire international fame, constituting the International Psychoanalytic Association in 1910; and amongst his closer co-workers, there were C.G. Jung, A. Adler, K. Abraham, O. Rank, E. Jones, S. Ferenczi and others. The first great internal schismatic divisions occurred in 1911 with Adler, then in 1914 with Jung.

The Freudian thought has evolved from a twenty years pre-psychoanalytic period of gestation, mainly characterized by a neurological and psychophysics viewpoint, towards a pure psychological model. By means of attempts to dynamically explain the neuroses, he reached to a first phase of his *metapsychological* theory centred around the notions of unconscious, repression, drives, free association method; while the second phase was characterized by the new notions of transference and counter-transference, and by the libido theory of infant sexuality, in turn centred on the Œdipus complex which will become the central pillar of his psychodynamics framework. In the years 1914-15, the Freudian theory undergoes a new reorganization, in his theoretical structure, first from the topographical standpoint, with the topography given first by the static constructs of unconscious, preconscious and conscious; hence, from the dynamical standpoint, with the various psychic conflicts, and, finally, from the economic standpoint, with the pleasure and reality principles. In 1920s, the theory undergoes another revision as concerns the theory of drives and their classifications, until reach to a second definitive topography including the Ego, Super-Ego and Id (or Es) agencies. His last work was the magnificent1938 *Abriß der Psychoanalyse* (see (Freud 1938)), where he axiomatically tried to sketch his definitive vision on human psychodynamics structure.

2.2 On Jungian thought, 1

Carl Gustav Jung started as a psychiatrist at the Zurich Burghölzli Hospital under the supervision of Eugene Bleuler around 1900s, then attending the Janet lessons at the Paris Salpêtrière Hospital until the pivotal meeting with Freud in 1906. Thenceforth, the close and deep relationships between Freud and Jung led to the Jung's appointment as first president of the International Psychoanalytic Association (IPA) in 1909. Nevertheless, the first significant disappointments between their ideas, started with the famous Jung's publication *Symbols of Transformation* of 1912, which underwent to successive revisions by Jung and that will constitute the central conceptual key of his analytical psychology. In 1914, Jung resigns his role of IPA president, retiring himself into a phase of personal deep inner reflexion which shall lead him to the knowledge of the polyhedral nature of human psyche with its multiple dimensions, and to this end he started to in-depth study alchemy, theology, mythology, history of religions and shamanism. Whence, the necessary encounter with the anthropological thought. The two main motivations which led Jung to turn away himself from the Freudian orthodoxy were: a) a criticism to the Freudian pansexualism, whose theory interprets each symbol only from the sexual individual standpoint; b) a Freudian conception of libido understood exclusively from a personalistic sexual viewpoint; c) the assumption according to which the neuroses dating back only to that phase of libidinal psychosexual evolution of human being which goes from the birth to about six-seven years old, ending with Œdipus complex.

The Jungian notion of libido is larger than the Freudian one: it denotes the general psychic energy, which is present in all that which is «tendency towards», *appetitus* (see (Laplanche & Pontalis 1973)). The neurosis is no longer relegated only to the infancy but rather it should be laid out within the wider and more complex dialectic relationship between the individual and the world; and this, because the former is always in continuous becoming along his life. According to Jung, the human

psychic evolution takes place through a particular dynamical process, called *individuation process*, which should be considered as a perennial psychic transformation of human being in the continuous relationships of herself or himself with her or his own unconscious, till to the realization of the own *Self*. The 1912 Jungian individuation process is a pivotal concept around which articulates the whole Jung thought and its approach to the psychic world. By means of such a basic process, the human psyche tries to dynamically realize its own Self, which should be meant as a totality comprising consciousness and unconsciousness, and that pushes for its self-realization in such a manner to determine a new centre 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 object[1]), starting to separate both from the Mother – this last being understood both from a personal and archetypical meaning – and from the collective. So Jung is forced to introduce a larger unconscious' epistemological construct than the Freudian one. He distinguishes between a *personal* (or *individual*) unconscious and a *collective* one, then introduces the notion of *archetype*. Collective unconscious and archetype are two Jungian notions closely related among them. The first one is the result of decennial previous studies made by Jung on mythology and archaic practices, from which Jung inferred that the above mentioned psychic processes were peculiar to any human being of every time, that is, they have a ahistorical and an atemporal structural nature. Such universal psychic processes are all potentially available in the collective unconscious, which become dynamically active during the psychic evolution of the human being. The structure of collective unconscious is given by archetypes, whereas its content will be given by the archetypical (or primordial) images, which have never individual character but always collective nature. They are like a kind of ''historical precipitate'' of the collective memory whose existence is suggested to us, inter alia, by the recurrent mythological themes which are likely common to every race and to all epochs. The archetypes express themselves by means of symbols or images. Later on, we will return again on these basic aspects of Jungian thought.

2.3 On Adlerian thought

Alfred Adler met Freud in 1902, joining the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society (precursor of the International Psychoanalytic Association – IPA) of which he was elected president in 1910. In 1907, Adler publishes the first works on the *organ inferiority*, prelude to his next *individual psychology* trend. In the next year, he introduces the notion of aggressive instinct, at first refused by Freud but later included in his theory of drives since the publication of his work *Beyond the Pleasure Principle* (1920). Adler gradually gives ever more load to his notion of *aggressive instinct* respect to the Freudian sexual drives, until the end of 1911, when Adler, with others, leaves the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society to found his own society later called Individual Psychology Society. Adler was the first great heretical of the Freudian orthodoxy, which will be followed by Jung in 1914.

According to Adler (and an analogous criticism will be also raised by Jung), Freud misunderstood the real symbolic and finalistic (or theleological) 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 major load is given to the individual with her or his neurotic conflicts arising from the basic opposition conscious-unconscious. According to Adler, the human being births with a connate *sense of inferiority* who tries to overcome through an aspiration to the personal success driven by a (Nietzschean) power will, in a continuous *compensation* between individual and social instances or requests, the latter re-

[1] This term must be meant in the wider psychoanalytic sense (see (Laplanche & Pontalis 1973)).

sulting from as many connate social feeling without which could not exist any human constructive agreement. So, with Adler, it emerges the basic role played by the social dimension as a fundamental structural component of human psyche, hence approaching the anthropological dimensions.

2.4 On Eriksonian thought

Erik H. Erikson made his first encounter with psychoanalysis when he was a teacher in a very special school of Vienna where both adult and children were under psychoanalytic treatment. After having achieved a psychoanalytic training at the Vienna Psychoanalytic Institute under the supervision of Anna Freud, he moves on United States where, amongst other things, makes fieldworks with Yurok and Sioux Indian natives in South Dakota. At the same time, he makes private psychoanalyst practice. His most famous work was the celebrated *Childhood and Society* (1950) in which were outlined the main cornerstones around which will revolve all his next thought system. He worked out a psychosocial development theory of human psyche which covers the whole life cycle, starting from the Freudian one until the old age, through a long series of eight stages by which the individual establishes her or his own continuous relationships with the environment. This last 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 of human being. From this standpoint, it follows that the anthropological dimension may influence the human personality, hence the psychoanalytic thought itself, whose theoretical frame couldn't avoid to consider such a basic perspective.

3. On analytical psychology, mainly C.G. Jung and E. Neumann

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

3.1 On Jungian thought, 2

Following (Carotenuto 1991, Chapter X), (Carotenuto 1994, Chapter VI) and (Samuels et al. 1986), before Freud and Jung, any psychopathological event was considered without any possible theoretical meaning; with them, instead, these apparently meaningless psychic events could acquire a proper meaning if one had introduced a certain epistemological construct called *unconscious*, which was nevertheless differently defined by these two authors. The main hypothesis of the Freudian framework is that of psychic *repression* according to which anxious object representations, linked to a given drive, are removed from consciousness field since contrasting with the internal or external needs; such anxious object representations however maintain the own energetic charge at a potential active state into the individual unconscious. Therefore, the repression is a fundamental psychic (defence) mechanism through which the consciousness field separates from the unconscious. This is one of the central statements of the Freudian thought.

From an epistemological and historical standpoint, the Freudian pattern has ever been the primary basis from which to start for laying the foundations of any other subsequent psychoanalytic model. And this has been the case of the Jungian theory which, starting from some Freudian ideas, reached to a wider construct of unconscious, distinguishing between a *personal* unconscious[2] and a *collective* one, the former being ontogenetically included in the latter which has a phylogenetic order.

[2] Which has many common points with the Freudian one, although them are different from each other.

Each of us, then, shall have her or his own manner to put herself or himself into relationship with the collective unconscious, in dependence on the forces of the own Ego: the stronger is the Ego, the wider it will be the opening towards the collective unconscious; in doing so, at the same time the personal unconscious will form. Later on, we will discuss, in a deeper manner, the Jungian notion of unconscious and its features.

Following (Laplanche & Pontalis 1973) and (Rycroft 1968), as well as briefly recalled above, the essence of Freudian doctrine revolves around two main topographies of human psyche. A first one, that identifies a conscious, a preconscious and an unconscious component. A second one, that 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 the social and normative instances; and the *Id* agency, that refers to the instinctual unconscious forces. The Ego agency acts (along the so-called *secondary process*) as an mediator between the strong Id claims, which would be uncompromising immediately satisfied (*pleasure principle*), and the Super-Ego normative forbiddances and rules, trying to find an intermediary resolution way of satisfaction (*principle of reality*). The neurosis takes place when the Ego fails into this its fundamental and primary role, notwithstanding it exists and is intact, that is to say, the basic test of reality is not compromised. Nevertheless, the main shortcoming of Freudian theory concerned with the lack of consideration of the psychoses, because it was built up, above all, upon clinical data provided by the analysis of neurotics whose Ego is, after all, intact.

Just due to this, Jung felt the need to fill up this lack, trying to extend the Freudian framework to include the psychosis case. In achieving this, Jung was facilitated by his valuable previous experience of psychiatrist at the Burghölzi Psychiatric Hospital of Zürich, that led him in direct touch with psychotics, differently by Freud[3] (who was a neurologist). From this valuable experience, Jung drawn fundamental inspiration to formulate his new theory of human psyche, following an epistemological paradigm quite similar to those of Kuhn's scientific revolutions. From all the material collected by the analysis of the deep psychotic suffering, Jung was led to widen the first Freudian framework. The basic assumptions of his theory are those of individuation process, of personal and collective unconscious, and of compensation principle. The personal unconscious is the place of the (Ego's) *complexes* which every human being experiences along her or his structuring infant relationships with collective unconscious. An *Ego complex* is defined as a set of (object) representations which refer to a given event having affective-emotive charge, that is to say, it is a set of images and ideas assembled around a central key[4], which are strongly joined together by an affective tonality. It autonomously acts within our personality and constitutes the basis of our own personal unconscious dimension. The complexes are the sources of dreams and symptoms of the personal history, which symbolically manifest themselves. They constitute autonomous parts of the human psyche which are variously activated in certain circumstance: for instance, when one establishes an interpersonal relationship, then it is activated a particular complex which manifests, or actives, an aspect of the personality that may be different or little coherent with the usual one, upon which it prevails. This is due just to the psychic partiality of it, strictly linked to the splitting attitudes of the human psyche (already identified by the Freudian work). Such a prevailing complex will possess the person. The analytic treatment is turned, by compensation (and then through the individuation process), towards the integration and assimilation of the various emerging complexes, through the own conscious Ego. The variegation of complexes, which are completely split in the primitive spiritual condition, is a phylogenetic characteristic both of primitive and differentiated (civilized) psy-

[3] Even if, Freud himself, in the last years of his life, tried to explain the psychosis by means of the *disavowal* mechanism. Such an epistemological need was however ever felt by Freud since his early works on psychoanalysis.

[4] Which roughly may correspond to the *cathexis object* of Freudian theory (see (Rycroft 1968)).

che, by means of the collective unconscious whose structural content is made by well determined psychic elementary structures called *archetypes*. On these last points, we shall return later.

As concerns the normal development of human psyche, the conscious Ego gradually acquires its autonomy (enlarging its consciousness field), just assimilating and integrating the various Ego complexes which take place in consequence of the life traumatic experiences that every human being experiences along her or his life (but with particular emphasis in the childhood epoch). Their structure is due to the *archetypical images* and *ideas* emerging from collective unconscious, which are the only ways with which the archetypes may manifest. They form the substantial (reified) content of the collective unconscious. This process of awareness of complexes is necessary to avoid the Ego fascination by the numinous power of (collective) unconscious, and this takes place just thanks to the *individuation process*, which has its apex in the range comprised approximately between the thirty and forty years old. Only through such a process, it will be possible reaching to a creative and constructive integral psychic personality, which is indivisible but quite differentiated from the collective conscious and unconscious psyche[5]. The main 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 herself or himself to propose to the world, a 'mask' with whom often one identified herself or himself), the *Animus* and the *Anima* (as reciprocal sexual unconscious counterparts), the *Puer* (i.e., the eternal possibility of the becoming from native state), the *Great Mother* (in both its good and terrific aspects – see next subsection 3.2). The Ego must compares itself with them, along the individuation process, to attain its autonomy. Such a primary process, by compensation, will try to integrate the different psychic parts into a total one called *Self*, beyond which the conflict between opposite tendencies is not eliminated but puts as creative structural datum of human psyche.

For Jung, the fundamental categories through which the psychic reality develops, are the *polarization* (i.e., the idea of an organization by opposites), the *compensation* and the *relation*, which are all elements that refers to the basic conflictual nature of personality (see (Samuels et al. 1986)). The dialectic of the opposites is connate with the human being, and embed its deep roots into the Shadow; in particular, Jung assigns a determinant role to the opposition Anima-Animus. The Self has then the fundamental task of mediation and synthesis between opposite tendencies, whose dualistic nature is a recurrent characteristic of archetypes. The symbolic function – as, for instance, that inherent the dreaming activity – is just of this type, casting a bridge between the conscious and unconscious dimensions which allow the approaching of opposites generating a third element – the transcendental function – which makes possible the passage from one to the other dimension. The reunification of opposites through this transcendental function (by *coniunctio oppositorum* or by *enantiodromia*), is properly called *mysterium coniunctionis*, a term drawing from Alchemy which has also played a fundamental role in formulating the Jungian thought. Following (Galimberti 2006), a basic principle of Analytical Psychology is that considering the psychic life as a self-regulating principle, by compensation, which can reach an equilibrium condition only by reconciliation of contraries either through coniunctio oppositorum or enantiodromia. At this point, it is now possible to continue with Neumann thought, which is a further mythological deepening of the Jungian thought.

3.2 On Erich Neumann thought

There have been many followers and pupils of Jung and of his thought: amongst them, Gerhard Adler, Luigi Aurigemma, Ernst Bernhard, Aldo Carotenuto, Hans Dieckmann, Gustav Dreifuss,

[5] The collective conscious psyche is related to the society and its collective representations. In that, it is clear the Lévy-Bruhl thought influence on the Jungian one.

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 Soliè, Sabrina Spielrein, Mario Trevi, Marie-Louise Von Franz, Joseph B. Wheelwrigt, Edward C. Whitmont and Hanna Wolff. Each of them has 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[6]. But, to our purposes, we are mainly interested to the thought of Erich Neumann, which herein we will briefly outline[7].

Following (Carotenuto 1991, Chapter XI), Neumann may be considered as one of the main authors of the analytical psychology, continuer of the Jungian *œuvre* where Jung himself had reached and stopped, as he had to say 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 (see (Neumann 1954)), together with the other his notable work, *The Great Mother*, first published in English in 1955, next in German in 1956 (see (Neumann 1955)). He has worked out his own genetic theory of 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 human psyche is, in a certain sense, intertwined with a recapitulation path of the phylogenetic course of the great mythologies. These transpersonal aspects transcend the personal ones had in the childhood. Their roots are deeply embedded into the Jungian collective unconscious. According to Neumann, it is reductive to consider only the personal events, as in the Freudian viewpoint; besides them, it should also be need to consider the transpersonal ones, according to a phylo-ontogenetic perspective.

Starting from Jungian work and taking into account the Egyptian, Hebraic and Greek mythologies, Neumann identifies a parallelism between some fundamental themes of such mythological constructions and the consciousness formation. As it has been said above, Jung considers the consciousness as a psychic entity or agency which starts from the unconscious by means of an integration and assimilation of the various Ego complexes understood as archetypical images emerging from the undifferentiated collective unconscious which everyone actives along own personal experience. Neumann in-depth studied such a primary psychic process, that he describes through a well-defined series of phases which 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 mythologems[8] of Egyptian, Hebraic and Greek tradition.

The first stage is the one in which the Ego is fully embedded into the unconscious: at the birth, the child lives into a totally undifferentiated state, called the *uroboric state*, where the individual is fully unconscious, the female and male are undistinguished, like in the condition of original universe in which all the cosmogonies were one. Such a 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 alchemical symbol, the ἓυ τό πᾶυ (that is, The One-All), representing the union of opposites, so that it is a symbol of the Jungian *coniunctio oppositiorum* as well as of the *enantiodromia law* (see also (Samuels et al. 1986), (Carotenuto 1990) and (Galimberti 2006)), the two main processes through which the 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 along the second stage, gradually the consciousness (paraphras-

[6] See (Tagliagambe & Malinconico 2011).

[7] On the other hand, the Erich Neumann work on the consciousness origins will deserve further attention.

[8] A *mythologem* is the basic and elementary recurrent theme, or key, of a myth (see (Keréney & Jung 1969)).

ing the Plato's *myth of the cave*) sheds light within this obscure world, from which starts to form an embryonic Ego.

In this second stage, such first gleams of consciousness strictly depend on the *Great Mother* archetype, which is present in many myths of antiquity. Such an archetype represents a first mythological evolution of the originary uroboros' archetype and will play a fundamental role in the psychic development of every human being. Such an archetype furthermore includes in itself both a destructive aspect and a protective and hospitable aspect. These aspects psychologically correspond respectively to a tendency to stay into a total regressive condition of psychic incorporation (*uroboric incest*) and to a propulsive and dynamic tendency towards differentiation. The uroboric incest is a symbolic coming back to the Mother, a prefiguration of the *hierós gámos*, that is to say, of the sacred marriage which reaches its definitive form with the next Hero phase. With such a primordial incest, we have a form of entrance into the Mother, hence it symbolically denotes the death, the dissolution of the son into the Mother. To acquire the first primordial status of an individual, it is indispensable to overcome this first uroboric incest. Once disengaged from this maternal incorporation, the individual gradually starts to determine the own Ego and Self agencies, through a vital process which will persist throughout the course of the life.

The psychic evolution phase dominated by the Great Mother archetype, plays either a constructive or a destructive fundamental role in the individual development and in its psychic formation. After the uroboric incest follows the orgiastic *matriarchal incest* which perpetuates the undifferentiated state and corresponds to the adolescence phase. It corresponds to a matriarchal castration, to the dissolution of an adolescent Ego that it is still not able coping the many strong forces symbolized by the Great Mother which still manifest herself through different personifications. To this point, according to the Neumannian perspective, the male psychic evolution is quite different from the female one, so that it is necessary to distinguish both cases. At first, we briefly sketch the male psychic development, then the female one.

3.2.1 The male psychic development

As regards boys, once overcame the uroboric incest, the opposition of the son against the Great Mother forces will slowly lead toward the so-called *centerversion* which should be meant as the tendency[9] towards a totality to create the (integrated) unity from its various parts (which are due to the fragmentation action of the Great Mother archetype). Through it, the Ego starts to acquire its own (Cartesian) autonomy respect to the unconscious, reaching to the centre of the consciousness which will constitute the central place of the Ego's complexes (according to Jung). In order to the Ego may sustain the hard comparison with the archetypical Great Mother, it autonomously must consolidate itself as a consciousness of himself, in such a manner to be so strong to separate the original undifferentiated situation into opposite pairs. To this end, it is necessary the action of another archetype, that of the *separation of world's parents*, which will be prodromal to the next phases concerning the fights respectively against the terrible *Drake* in its two archetypical faces of the Great Mother and of the Great Father. Thanks to this separation archetype, it takes place the fundamental separation of opposites, so incoming into the third phase[10], which will open the way to the Self.

As already said above, the first basic separation takes place between the conscious part of personality (with centre in the Ego) and the unconscious one. Along this phase, notwithstanding there are first primordial forms of identity, the strong ambiguity still present in the previous one (orgiastic

[9] The Neumannian centerversion is quite comparable with the Jungian compensation.

[10] This is a crucial phase for the development of consciousness because it begins to form the first nuclei of rational thought, as we will see later.

state of uroboros) will be overcame with the *matriarchal incest*, thanks to which the individual acquires the primordial Ego components. Once he has entered into this second phase, it will be possible to take place first forms of distinction between what is good from what is bad, this being possible thanks to the fundamental dualistic nature of the Great Mother archetype, the good one and the bad one. Just in this dual nature[11] lies 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 it always will try to emerge. The psychic phenomena which appear in this phase are particularly related to suffering and loneliness states and strong guilt feelings. With the disengagement from the uroboric state by means of the separation of opposites, the Ego is placed into a position which allows it to experience loneliness and separation, first basic elements towards the Ego self-emancipation. From this point onwards, the *Hero*[12] starts his autonomy path to configure himself as individual-man, freeing from the unconscious powers which ever try to overwhelm him. The Hero is the archetypical precursor of the man, to whose formation also contribute the various initiation rites typical of each culture.

Such a mythological figure, which transvalues the individual one, undergoes various mythological fights that the Hero must undertakes in order to attain his full autonomy and individuality. The first fight is against the Great Mother, that is to say, against the matriarchal incest, from which will emerge the first rudiments of his Ego, until adolescence with the occurred centerversion of this agency; at the end of this last process, the Ego will be put at the centre of the consciousness. This fight is also symbolically seen as a *fight against Drake* to conquer the *Princess* with her *Treasure*, that correspond 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* in order to determine an exact place in which locate the incoming *Self* which, at the end, will be the centre of the psyche; the bipolar axes Ego-Self will be then the directress of the own next personal life grow. Once defeats the Great Mother, the unconscious tries again to re-incorporate 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 seen, have two dualistic archetypical aspects, the good one and the bad one. During the adolescence phase, it implies a unique castration complex, the one consisting in disengaging from the matriarchal incest which helps to overcome this ambiguous and bipolar state due to the above mentioned archetypical duality. It will contrast other further forms of incest. Instead, the Great Father archetype has a unique aspect, that of the old law, but two forms of the castration complex: the *imprisonment* and the *possession*. The first one hinders the Ego to completely disengage 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 one, instead, tries to identify him with the divine father, or rather bringing him near the transcendental, ascetic and spiritual world. These two types of father castration are due to the twice parentage nature, both human and divine, of every Hero. Therefore, it is just thanks to this father castration that an individual may uprooting him from his ancestral instinctual nature to which the Great Mother terrifying aspects even tries to reduce him. However, the above transpersonal fights against the parents are required for the dawning of the personality and for the formation of its psychic agencies which will give autonomy to it. Lastly, according to Neumann, there exist three types of Heroes: the first is the extroverted one, inclines to the action for changing the world, hence mainly devoted to the external reality; the second is the introverted one, bearer of culture, hence mainly interested to the inner reality; and the third one is more oriented to-

[11] The Great Father archetype has another type of dualistic nature, as we will see later.

[12] That is to say, the individual in her/his transpersonal stance in this psychic configuration process.

wards a continuous and ever better modification of himself, independently from the collective dimension. Indeed, in both the first two types of Hero, the creative dimension is always at the centre of their attention to conquer the princess' 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 works aimed towards the humanity. The third one, instead, is only one turned towards himself and his inner path to an ever better contemplative perfection.

3.2.2 The female psychic development

Neumann has ever been greatly interested towards the female psychological dimension since, according to him, the female's Self plays a primary and irreplaceable role in the psychic development of any human being. Nevertheless, the female psychic development is quite different from the male one. Considerable deficiencies of maternal cares will imply strong guilt feelings which, in turn, will produce an inner emptiness whose consequent anxiety, for defensive purposes, will lead the individual toward narcissistic satisfactions and aggressive tendencies. This Neumann's interest led himself to in-depth study the creative dimension since he considers this as mainly connate with the femininity. This is a stance difficultly criticisable from a symbolical standpoint, seen the procreative nature of the female.

According to Neumann, only the uroboric stage is a common element to male and female psychic development. In this regards, as already seen, for male the second stage takes place with the decisive symbolic fight against the Great Mother, who basically he considers as a something of different and extraneous, respect to whom opposes himself to overcome the matriarchal incest. Instead, the female lives the mother as a something which is similar and familiar with herself, hence spontaneously and unconsciously identifying with her. Such a fusional identity allows to her, differently from the boy, to reach her own femininity thanks to the primary identification with the mother. All this may explain why the most females are more inclined (at least, at potential level) towards the relational dimension of life, just due to this primary identification. Conversely, the male is more driven towards those professions which require an objective vision of reality and problems, putting himself into a comparison position, rather than into an identification one, to better explore.

The second stage of female psychic evolution is named *self-conservation* phase and corresponds to the permanence of the woman into the female group (maternal clan), separating from the male. Often the female stays long within the Great Mother archetype, and this will mark the next relationships with the man. The more the female stays within the maternal clan, the more it will be the Shadow projections upon the man, with higher devaluation of him. Nevertheless, the above mentioned separation and alienation from the male world mostly will concur to the first formation of the sense of opposition in females. The persistence degree of the woman into the matriarchal clan will influence her relations with the man in dependence on the type to which she belong: if prevails the *horsewoman* type, then we have a sadomasochistic loving relation in which the woman uses the man only for her erotic and procreative aims; instead, if prevails the *puella-woman*[13] type, then she is fully subdued to the male power which nullify her individuality and her human dignity. Due to this basic duality, according to Neumann, this phase is characterizable respectively by the myth 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*).

[13] With the Latin terms *puer-puella* (boy-girl), the ancient Romans denoted the adolescent sons-daughters until eighteen years old, still living within the familiar nucleus (see (Janssens 1981, Part II, Chap. 1°, Section 2.b)), hence mainly devoid of the own individuality and autonomy.

Both for male and female, the human consciousness may develop and evolve only through the touch with the Other (the female with the male, and vice versa), to form the own Otherness. The female comparison with the male into the patriarchal uroboros, will be a determining moment for the development of the female consciousness. During this crucial comparison, it will be determinant what role will assume the *Animus* respect to her counterpart *Anima* within the female. The female will maintain her femininity only when she shall be able to avoid the strong plagiarism attempts by the Animus, in order that, in the next phase (said to be the *encounter phase*), she may refute the usual patriarchal values (polygamy of the man and marital fidelity by the woman), to keep up the matriarchal ones and not falling into a female psychic inertia of total male subjection. Only in this way, it will be possible a complete and normal female psychic development, dual to the male one. In order to it may take place a right and equilibrated reciprocally constructive meeting between female and male, each part must respect the other one, abdicating to the own exclusive authority upon the other, accepting and respecting the existence of this last. To this end, Neumann epitomizes this last stage with the myth of *Eros* and *Psyche*, thanks to which the female (Psyche) reaches to her own (female) individuation process, with the achievement of the highest consciousness maturity.

3.3 Further considerations

To our purposes, some points need to be highlighted from a comparison between Jungian and Neumannian thought as briefly exposed above. In particular, we are interested, above all, to those phases of the human psychic evolution in which takes place the so-called *separation of opposites*. The problem of pairs of opposites has played a primary role since the Freudian work (see (Laplanche & Pontalis 1973), (Samuels et al. 1986) and (Galimberti 2006)) where they are put at the basis of any psychic dialectic. Nevertheless, Freud did not give further details on their origins and development. Instead, Jung and Neumann put them at the basis 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 developments. The separation of opposites, which plays a very fundamental role in the consciousness formation, has already been a central point of Jungian thought, although he treated it not with the same mythological deepness made by his continuator Neumann, who has specified in which phases this takes place, in both female and male cases. Both authors however assign an archetypical origin to this fundamental psychic process, hence starting from the existence's assumption of a collective unconscious. A fundamental importance is also played by the dualistic nature of every archetype. Furthermore, from Neumannian viewpoint, this separation of opposites plays a primary role in the phases of first Ego formations, which, in turn, rely on the fundamental archetypical comparison female-male, that is to say, in the dualistic nature of archetype. From our standpoint, after having briefly discussed some points of Jungian and Neumann thought, we will compare them with other aspects of anthropological thought. At last, it is evident the anthropological motives which aimed the Neumann thought, above all on the mythological side. Therefore, at this point, it is necessary to briefly outline the main points of the psychoanalytic anthropology thought from a historical viewpoint.

4. The psychoanalytic anthropology: brief outlines

For our purposes, we herein give a very brief outline of the main ideas of psychoanalytic anthropology recalling its main protagonists. For a deeper analysis of this interesting chapter of anthropology, we refer to (Harris 2001, Chapter 16), (Fabietti 2001, Chapter 11), (Bourguignon 1979) and (Paul 1989) as well as (Fabietti & Remotti 1998). In some respects, we will follow too (Carotenuto 1992) in delineating a brief portrait of the main protagonists. For a modern sight on psychoanalytic an-

thropology and its applications, see the beautiful book (Obeyesekere 1990), on which we shall return in another place. In it, amongst other things, an interesting comparison between the old chapters of Western psychoanalytic anthropology, above all the Culture and Personality trend, and the Eastern culture (including Hinduism, Buddhism and other Asiatic cultures) is made. The symbolic dimension and the Œdipal problems, are the *leitmotiv* of the book, seen too the fact that the former is one of the main characteristic of almost every Asiatic culture, as Jung himself had well understood.

4.1 Sigmund Freud and the early origins of psychoanalytic anthropology

The psychoanalytic thought has entered into the anthropological field since Sigmund Freud work on psychocultural and social phenomena, opening the so-called *Culture and Personality* trend, nowadays included into the intersection area of the psychological anthropology, of the ethnopsychiatry and of the ethopsychoanalysis (see (Conti & Principe 1989)). According to (Bourguignon 1979, Chapters II and III), the dawning of psychoanalytic anthropology should be searched in the attempts in accounting the origins of human culture. In pursuing this, it was immediately realized that the psychological context wasn't possible to leave aside, above all the new Freudian ideas. The early 20th century American anthropology community was initially quite critical towards the Freudian attempts to psychoanalytically explain certain anthropological phenomena. This aversion however disappeared around 1930s and 1940s, when the psychoanalytic ideas exerted a dominant influence on the United States of America intellectual life, in particular deeply engraving into the cultural anthropology of the time. All this took place after the first celebrated American Congress on Psychoanalysis held at the Clark University in 1909, which marked the birth of psychoanalysis in the United States. In 1911, it was founded the American Psychoanalytic Association as a part of the International Psychoanalytic Association, and, thenceforth, the psychoanalytic ideas gradually pervaded other knowledge fields. Therefore, the history of Culture and Personality trend may be laid out as a kind of dialogue between cultural anthropology and psychoanalytic theory, and, since then, the relationships between these two disciplines were vicariously of each other.

One of the main encounter points between anthropology and psychoanalysis regarded the incest taboo, the exogamy and their role in the formation of social groups, starting from the study of primitive societies. This was, amongst others, one of the main research arguments carried on by Lévi-Strauss. Since the beginnings, however, the psychological dimension has ever been one of the main constitutive elements of the anthropological thought. The evolutionists L. Lévy-Bruhl, E.B. Tylor, W.H.R. Rivers and J.G. Frazer, put it 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 part of the contemporary anthropological literature. By the analysis of incest taboo, exogamy and totemism, a first theory on the origins and developments of culture was proposed by Freud, first in[14] *Totem and Taboo* (1913), then in *Civilization and Its Discontents* (1930), *Mass Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego* (1921), *The Future of an Illusion* (1927) and *Moses and Monotheism* (1939). According to Ernest Jones, Freud drawn up *Totem and Taboo* after having read Frazer's *The Golden Bough* (1890) and *Totemism and Exogamy* (1910) as well as the first series of the W. Robertson Smith's *Lectures on the Religions of the Semites* (1894), for answering two main anthropological questions of that time: What is the totemism? and What type of relationships do have totemism and exogamy? In the Freudian cultural studies, a great load had too the anthropological and evolutionary biology ideas of that time. His theory of culture is mainly based on the (Darwinian) *primordial horde* notion[15] on which relies the incipiency of the

[14] Where, inter alia, he also proposes a possible mythical origin of the incest taboo.
[15] See (Rycroft 1968).

Œdipus complex, the main pillar of his theoretical framework. From the tragic primordial horde event followed the exogamy and the totemism, hence the culture order. With *Totem and Taboo*, Freud wanted so give an anthropological basis to his psychoanalytic theory, whose ideas will play a fundamental role in the subsequent work of Jung and Lèvi-Strauss. In this paper, we want just to identify a central common point belonging to the complex thought systems of these last two authors, which turns out to be very useful to some speculations about the origins of rational thought.

4.2 Bronisław Malinowski

Under suggestion of his mentor C.G. Seligman, Malinowski read the above mentioned Freudian works just when he stayed in the Trobriand islands in 1910s for fieldworks. Thus, taking this opportunity, he wanted to examine the validity of certain psychoanalytic ideas, in particular the Œdipus complex, just within a cultural context quite different from the European one. His fieldwork observations led to the drawing up of the celebrated *Sex and Repression in Savage Society* (1927) in which he compares the patriarchal triadic structure of European monogamous family with the matriarchal one of the Trobriand monogamous family: the former mainly had a patrilineal descent pattern whereas the latter mainly 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 is meant to be as a kind of Œdipus complex but respectively referred to sister and maternal uncle instead to mother and father. So, with Malinowski work, the Freudian assumption of an universality of Œdipus complex was, for the first time, put into a dubious position, giving rise to criticisms by Ernest Jones towards the Malinowski thought, as well as to an ad hoc *avuncular complex* which was thought out just to conciliate the Freudian Œdipus complex with the Malinowski ideas. In any way, the Malinowski work has pointed out 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 has however exercised a non-negligible influence on the next social-anthropological thought: in this regards, see, for instance, (Bourguignon 1979, Chapter IV).

4.3 Géza Róheim and Georges Devereux

Róheim was in analysis under Sandor Ferenczi; afterwards, thanks to the Marie Bonaparte funding, he could made some interesting fieldworks amongst primitive peoples in Australia, New Guinea and North America. In this way, he had the opportunity to ascertain the validity or not of the Freudian psychosexual evolution with these primitive societies. His observations and conclusions roughly confirmed Freud's ideas.

He at first was a close follower of the Freudian ideas exposed in *Totem and Taboo*, exposing his psychoanalytic anthropology ideas in *The Riddle of the Sfinx* (1934) and in *The Origin and Function of the Culture* (1943), but he thereafter gradually showed his own conceptions quite far from the Freudian orthodoxy. He ontogenetically interpreted the 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''. The culture is thought as a structure built up to realize, in a translated forms mainly by means of sublimation processes, the fantasies of our infancy. He stated that «it seems that we grow up only to remain children». In Róheim work, the sublimation process plays a very fundamental role. For more information on Róheim work, who should be considered as one of the main leaders of the so-called *psychoanalytic reductionism*, see (Bourguignon 1979, Chapter III).

Devereux first studied physics, later human sciences. He is considered the founder of the ethnopsychiatry and of the ethnopsychoanalysis (see (Conti & Principe 1989) and (Bourguignon 1979, Chapter VIII).

4.4 John W. Layard

With Layard, the psychoanalytic anthropology moves its first steps from Freudian theory towards the Jungian one. Layard was a pupil of Rivers in the 1920s whose attention, in his last years, was oriented towards the *cultural diffusion* perspective (or *diffusionism*), against the prevailing one, the *functionalism*, whose two of the main exponents were A.R. Radcliffe-Brown and Malinowski; the former was besides an opponent of the so-called ''psychologizing anthropology'' (see (Bourguignon 1979)). All this wasn't useful to Layard career, explaining the little consideration that his work had, so remaining a marginal figure of the British anthropology of the time.

After his fieldworks at Malekula, Layard published *The Stone Men of Malekula* (1942), where the cultural diffusion hypotheses on the origins of local institutions, intertwined with the description of initiation rites, were the outcome of the twofold influence due to Rivers and Jung. Indeed, Layard was in analysis under Jung since the beginnings of 1940s. Through the Jungian thought, Layard tried to explain the *maki* rite, observed at Malekula, calling into question just the Jungian individuation process; as regards the Layard's work, see (MacClancy 1986). Nevertheless, still very few are the texts which quote Layard and his work, as well as very few were (also nowadays) the attempts to proceed towards a deeper comparison between aspects of the anthropological thought and some of the Jungian general ideas.

4.5 Further developments

As said 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 the anthropology to influence the psychoanalysis (as witnessed by the Freud and Jung work), while in the United States of America, vice versa, it was the psychoanalysis to have a considerable load in anthropology with the celebrated Personality and Culture trend. Between the 1930s and 1940s, this anthropological school had, as main protagonists, some notable Neo-Freudians, amongst whom Margaret Mead[16], Abraham 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, it prevailed the (synchronic) British functionalist perspective (*d'après* Radcliffe-Brown and Malinowski), whereas the psychoanalysis will go back to have its influencing load with the structural anthropology, whose predominant figure was that of Claude Lévi-Strauss. Finally, since the end of 1930s, Alfred I. Hallowell, under suggestion of the psychologist Bruno Klopfer, introduced and used the Rorschach projective tests in anthropology; also Cora A. Du Bois used these tools. Nevertheless, these studies were gradually abandoned, unjustly according to us.

5. Some moments of the history of anthropology

In this section, for a coherent historiographical completion of what has been said in the previous sections, we give a brief sketch of the main lines of the history of Western anthropology. The main intention of this section is to outline a brief synoptic framework of the history of anthropology in such a manner to coherently and organically reach till to the first elements of the Lévi-Strauss thought's system that may be easily compared with what has been said above in relation to Jung's and Neumann's thought's systems.

[16] She was the daughter of George Herbert Mead, one of the pioneers of the social psychology at the turn of the end of 19th century and the beginning of 20th century.

5.1 General outlines

Following (Fabietti 2001), (Harris 2001), (Barnard 2000) and (Mercier 1996), the first elements of a yet non-autonomous anthropological thought may be retraced in France, around the end of the 18th century, in that intersection area between the philosophy and the history, on the wake of the past Enlightenment. Only through the regular comparison with the emerging scientific method, the anthropological thought gradually acquired ever more autonomous features, starting to delineate its own borders as doctrine's field, with the coming of the celebrated contrast between *creationism* and *evolutionism* of the half of 19th century, with the well-known Darwin's work. The regular influences of geology, biology and archaeology led to the so-called *evolutionist anthropology* of the Victorian epoch. The Great Britain was the main centre of origin of the modern anthropology, with the studies of Edward B. Tylor, William R. Smith and James G. Frazer, who greatly influenced other foreign scholars, like Adolf Bastian and Johann J. Bachofen. Bastian observed a kind of recurrence of similar cultural phenomena in different cultural contexts, so elaborating the concepts of *elementary ideas* (*Elementargedanken*), mainly subconscious hence implicit, and *folk ideas* (*Völkergedanken*), from whose comparison it is possible to explicitate the former; through all these, it is possible to think existing certain ''germs of ideas'', or patterns of thought, common to all the men, but differently developed in dependence on the environment stimuli (see (Barnard 2012, Chapter 7)). Bachofen, instead, made important studies on kinship systems, in particular on matriarchate and patriarchate. Noteworthy works are also those made by John F. McLennan on marital relationships, coining the terms of *exogamy* and *endogamy*. All these studies will be retaken by the incoming American anthropological thought, above all by Lewis H. Morgan and Franz Boas[17], who can be considered the main founders of anthropology in United States of America. With Boas, a first criticism to the evolutionistic trend was raised, introducing the so-called *historical particularism* in anthropology, according to which, roughly, each culture should be seen as a singular event or phenomenon, opening the way to the next *diffusionism* and *Kulturkreislehre* (in German). Boas also put great attention to the social-psychological motivations underlying any singularly taken culture. Several his ideas will be developed by some of his many pupils, amongst whom Alfred L. Kroeber and Robert Lowie.

At the same time, the French anthropological thought was mainly oriented towards the sociological aspects rather than the ethnological ones, so that the French anthropological reflection on primitive societies hadn't significant developments till the end of 19th century. One of the main exponents of French sociological school of the time, was Émile Durkheim who also made notable studies on religious thought and its history, but from a social-anthropological perspective. Amongst those who originally developed some of Durkheim ideas from a more properly ethnological stance, we remember above all Lucien Lévy-Bruhl, who turned his attention to primitive societies of which he tried to explain the mentality by means of the so-called *collective representations* (*d'après* Durkheim) and the *participation mystique* law, criticizing the previous personal psychology methods followed by evolutionists. In applying sociological investigation methods to study primitive thought, he reached to identify possible explanations to their typical social-cultural aspects, where the evolutionistic tradition failed. Lévy-Bruhl, bringing to the extreme consequences the Durkheim thought, reached to the hypothesis according to which the collective representations influence the whole individual psychology. According to Lévy-Bruhl, the symbolic universe of primitives would be the result of a collective mystic participation having a foremost emotional character socially shared. Nevertheless, in contrast to what might seem at a first sight, the primitive thought is not

[17] It is interesting to remember that Boas had a very polyhedral academic formation, starting to study exact and natural sciences till to geography and history, then reaching to anthropology of which he can be rightly considered one of the founder fathers.

only mystical but also regulated by a certain type of logic which coordinates its mystic representations according to the above mentioned basic principle of *participation mystique*. In respect to that of civilized thought, the logic of primitive mentality is a *prelogic* which coordinates the various mystic representations of the latter. Following (Bonte et al. 1991), (Fabietti & Remotti 1998) and references therein, the primitive prelogic thought is insensible to contradictions as well as to the impossible. The primitive mystic prelogic must not be understood as lower than the civilized rational logic; with a great caution, they should be compared. The civilized logic thought is, according to Lévy-Bruhl, the result of a rebellious tendency of the individual mind to distinguish herself or himself from the collective mind. On the other hand, Lévy-Bruhl ideas had a great influence in the formulation of the later Jungian thought (see (Carotenuto 1994, Chap. VI)). On the other hand, almost all the studies on primitive thought (see (Fabietti & Remotti (1998)) have ascertained a great incidence of binary contraposition schema along the crucial passage from the primitive thought to the civilized one.

Then, the legacy of Durkheim and Lévy-Bruhl was received by Robert Hertz, Arnold Van Gennep and Marcel Mauss, founders of the new French ethnosociology. In particular, the work of Mauss on the *total social fact*, the *classification forms* and the *structural homology*, will be of a certain importance for the next work of Lévi-Strauss, together to the Lévy-Bruhl work. The next transition period between the end of 19th century and the World War I, marked a turning point for anthropology, with the decline of evolutionism and the development of the fieldwork through the ethnographic tools. This was of a certain interest above all for the British anthropology with the new ethnographers William H.R. Rivers and Bronisław Malinowski, until the psychoanalytical anthropology trend (briefly recalled in the previous section 4) and, above all, the constitution of the chief dispute between *diffusionism* and *functionalism*. The Durkheimian French school gradually made the great 'ethnological jump' also thanks to the remarkable Mauss work, with new scholars like Marcel Griaule, Maurice Leenhardt and Robert Montagne. At the same time, the American Culture and Personality trend (see above section 4), the *nomothetic* rebirth (following Harris) and the ethnoscience, as well as the British structural functionalism of Alfred R. Radcliffe-Brown and Edward E. Evans-Pritchard, earned their growing load amongst the anthropological thought. Thereafter, it makes its appearance Claude Lévi-Strauss with his masterful *structural anthropology*. Lévi-Strauss, with a Durkheimian and Maussian basic formation, as well as with a long fieldwork experience in Brazil, was considerably influenced, in his 1940s American period, by the structural linguistic of Roman Jakobson and others, which led him to formulate his new anthropological trend. The contemporary anthropological directions were then oriented towards a materialistic and Marxist critical ideology, as well as towards an interpretative trend, this last besides quite inclined to revaluate the psychoanalytic theories.

5.2 On Lévi-Strauss thought

Lévi-Strauss built up a complex, variegated and notable theoretical framework in which he laid out the fieldwork data achieved from his various and numerous research missions made above all in Brazil in 1930s, after having received a philosophical formation and having been into touch with some exponents of the Durkheimian French ethnosociological school of then. Afterwards, he stayed in United States in 1940s coming into touch both with scholars of the Boasian ethnological school (like Alfred L. Kroeber[18] and Leslie A. White) and with notable exponents of the American linguistic structuralism (like Roman Jakobson and Nikolai S. Troubetzkoy). All this was only a part of the complex set of disciplines which contributed to build his next valuable anthropological trend. In-

[18] Besides, the Kroeber's *unconscious patterns* have had a certain influence on the Lévi-Strauss' one, and vice versa (see (Remotti 1971, Chap. IV, Section 2)).

deed, above all psychoanalytic and philosophical disciplines strongly influenced his theoretical framework which however always started from the ethnographic data obtained from fieldworks amongst natives. His first works concerned with kinship's structures and their formal relations (see (Lévi-Strauss 1969)). On the basis of Freudian theories, he put at the basis of any further theoretical social system, the first and universal rule which allowed the passage from nature to culture, that is to say, the *incest prohibition*. This marked the origins of any further system of human rules. In developing this his notable theoretical framework, and taking into account the previous meaning that the term structure had in ethnology (above all, after Radcliffe-Brown), he reached to a new and more general notion of (anthropological) *structure*, taking into account some suggestions and ideas coming from some exponents both of the French Bourbakism (amongst whom André Weil[19] and Georges Théodore Guilbaud) and of the epistemological structuralism (amongst whom Jean Piaget); we will discuss the main points of Lévi-Strauss structural anthropology in the next section (see (Mercier 1966, Chapter IV, Section III)).

According to Lévi-Strauss, the social structures aren't observable and have no empirical referents because the latter are the models of social relations, constructed upon the former, which are the only ones to be observable. The social models make manifest the structures through relations[20]. The structures, in itself, are empirically undeterminable since 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 with the incest prohibition and lying at the basis of the passage from nature to culture, is also unconscious. On the basis of his structural perspective, Lévi-Strauss considers the totemism simply as the result of the human thought to classifies the natural phenomena through the usual binary logic of oppositions and relations. According to Lévi-Strauss, the totemism must not be understood as the result of a prelogic primitive thought, as made, for instance, by Durkheim, Lévy-Bruhl, Radcliffe-Brown, Malinowski and so on; instead, it should be simply considered as the natural tendency of primitive human thought to classify, to relationate, to structurate. The only difference between the 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 main characteristic of the human thought is the *classification* through an oppositional and binary logic operating amongst elementary (unconscious) structures which, through the principle of reciprocity, give rise to observable models of relations.

Therefore, the primitive thought and the (so-called) civilized one, shouldn't be put into a hierarchical position but rather they should be meant as two, in a certain sense, *parallel* and a-historical ways with which the human mind universally thinks the *real*. Because of this, both types of thought should be analyzed on the basis of similar or homologous formal principles, since they operate according to the same logic laws, even if oriented towards different objects (which produce the history). The totemism is therefore the result of a mental attitude which assumes the sensible experience data to build systems of relations and classifications, for giving rise to a symbolic *codex*. The various systems of classifications so determined, are put into reciprocal relationships amongst them by means of certain *transformation systems*[21] thanks to which it is possible to identify formal analogies and parallelisms amongst them. The Lévi-Straussian notion of transformation finds its highest expression in explaining the mythology that, together the totemism, represent the main symbolic activities of savage thought (which must not be understood in the mere literary sense of the term – in this regards, see (Fabietti & Remotti 1998) and (Bonte & Izard 1991)). Lévi-Strauss makes a formal

[19] Lévi-Strauss also quotes, in (Lévi-Strauss 1969), the mathematician John Von Neumann (see (Cipriani 1988, Chap. II, Section 2.1) and besides Weil. See also (Piaget 1968)).

[20] And in this, it is no possible does not see a parallel with the above mentioned Bastian's *elementary* and *folk ideas*.

[21] Which are just molded on the basis of mathematical transformation groups (*d'après* Weil).

linguistic analysis of the myth on the basis of structural linguistic pattern. According to Lévi-Strauss, a myth is structural made by great constitutive units called *mythemes* which formally correspond to the linguistic unites, like phonemes, morphemes, semantemes, etc. 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, the myth does not concern any classification of the external world but it is aimed by itself.

With the celebrated works *Les structures élémentaires de la parenté* (1947) (see (Lévi-Strauss 1969)) and *Mythologiques* (1964-71), Lévi-Strauss tried to give a scientific explanation of the structure and purposes of the general human thought, starting from his experience as ethnoanthropologist, retracing an inverse path respect to the one which goes from nature to culture. In doing so, he has discovered the unconscious structures which determine the choices of human beings and their cultures; he therefore has identified the so-called unconscious structures of the social-cultural institutions. On the other hand, with the other best-seller *Tristes Tropiques* (1955), Lévi-Strauss indulged to his deep affective-existentialistic philosophical vein, nostalgically recalling the contents of his individual memory which 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 the evidence of the loss of an happy relationship between them; motif today actual more than ever!

6. On Lévi-Strauss and Jung unconscious

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

6.1 On Lévi-Straussian unconscious

Following (Fabietti 2001, Chapter 18) and (Rossi 1978), the main ideas on structural anthropology were first exposed in the famous work *The Elementary Structures of Kinship* of 1949. In it, Lévi-Strauss puts the unconscious reciprocity principle, which explains the incest prohibition, at the basis of the passage from nature to culture. According to Lévi-Strauss, taking the structural linguistic as a main paradigm, every social model is the result of a symbolic process obtained from primary oppositions amongst structures which are unconscious elementary entities devoid of content. The passage from the nature to culture takes place thanks to the human attitudes to symbolically think the biological relationships in terms of systems of oppositions, which are the fundamental and immediate data of the social and mental reality, and where to recognize the crucial starting points of any further explanation attempt. In doing so, Lévi-Strauss was led to conceive a *structural unconscious*[22] as a universal basis for every human thought of any epoch and any civilization, in which relies the common laws of such a thought. It has been the structural linguistic to highlight the fundamental unconscious nature of the fundamental phenomena of life of the mind. The unconscious would be the intermediary between Self and the Others[23], making possible their integration as overcoming of the initial opposition. The binary and oppositional logic moulds the representations of social and

[22] Albeit some authors point out that such a term has never been 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 individual counterpart of the structural one, hence homologous, in many respects, to the Jungian personal unconscious.

[23] Amongst other things, the structural anthropology and linguistic ideas played a fundamental role in working out the thought's framework of Jacques Lacan.

natural reality into social models, following a pattern similar to that of ethnolinguistic. On it, the incest prohibition and the exogamy rely, both having the formal nature of a reciprocity principle, which fills an initial gap between two initially separated worlds, the nature world and the culture one. The reciprocity principle, as said, explains the incest prohibition by means of the dualistic organizations (see (Cressant 1970, Chap. II)). With *The Elementary Structures of Kinship*, Lévi-Strauss casts the basis for a *psycho-logic*, that is to say, the quest for the a-priori universal formal principles of the human mind, which concealable influence the concretely visible data and phenomena (see (Cipriani 1988, Chap. III, Section 3.1)). To pursuing this, he made continuous reference to mathematics[24].

According to (Comba 2000, Chap. IV, Section 1), since his fieldworks in Brazil, the relationships between social relation system and mental representations were always object of attention by Lévi-Strauss. To this end, he was forced to reach to a deeper human thought level respect to the conscious one. Lévi-Strauss, along the evolution of his thought, has reached to a notion of unconscious quite different from the Freudian one (but from which it started[25]), which allows us to may put, into reciprocal comparison, different cultural contexts otherwise incomparable. It will allow the communication, in every place and in every time, between us and the others, so attaining a well-defined conception of history. Through this notion of unconscious, its regularities and recurrences, as well as its common functional laws, Lévi-Strauss speaks of an *universal soul* or *mind* which, according to (Hénaff 1998, Chap. 4), allows us to states the finite number of possible logics with which it operates as well as to postulate a precedence of the logic rules respect to the functional ones. There is a sort of anteriority of the (common) logic relation systems which will structurate the unconscious level to give rise to the next symbolic thought and historical language. Following (Remotti 1971, Chap. IV, Section 2), the unconscious plays a very fundamental epistemological role in all the Lévi-Straussian anthropological system, which touches, at different times, Freud[26], Jung and Lacan ideas. Following (Nannini 1981, Chap. VII, Section 2), Lévi-Strauss considers the unconscious as the place of the *transindividual symbolic order* within which the communicating subjects – who are deceived to be protagonists of a game of free choices – recite roles implied by the dualistic combinatorial logic whose their same relationships give rise, and that dominate themselves. This binary logic is the essence of unconscious which is also the place of the inner human conflictuality that forces the Ego to have to do with the Other, for giving rise to the Otherness.

6.2 On Jungian unconscious

The Freudian unconscious relies on the basic repression mechanism which furnishes an essential individuality character to this entity. As said above, only in the old age, Freud turned his attention towards possible transpersonal and archaic unconscious influences on human psyche. Instead, it was Jung the first psychoanalyst who put great attention to these aspects, distinguishing between a personal (or individual) unconscious and a collective one.

Following (Carotenuto 1990), (Carotenuto 1991, Chap. X) and (Evans 1964), the Jungian *collective unconscious* is an entity which is understood to be dynamically structured, according to a phylogenetic order, by a set of primary, unobservable and irreducible elements called *archetypes*. Also the theory of archetypes has undergone a historical evolution that deprives it of a unique and definitive formulation, settling the notion of archetype between the psychological dimension and the somatic reality. Thus, since connected to the instinctual reality, the archetype is an innate predisposition devoid of certain psychological attitudes, whereas, since also related to the spiritual dimension,

[24] And on these last interesting points, we shall return later, in another place.
[25] Together to other notions of unconscious due to previous anthropologists (amongst whom Marcel Mauss).
[26] For a careful comparison between Freudian and Lévi-Straussian unconscious, see (Gould 1978).

it is an a-priori category of the knowledge, a transcendental dimension which, in turn, may be historically retraced in the Platonic ideas or in the Schopenhauer prototypes, or else 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 by the cultural and tradition context, giving rise to the personal unconscious. The collective unconscious, as meant by Jung, is an objective structural entity conceived as a universal sediment of past experiences[27]. To support this idea, Jung used the anthropological method of cultural parallelisms, observing as every ethnical group, respect to meaningful universal events like death, birth, love and so on, responds with quite similar behavioural and expressive modalities.

This is motivated by the comparison amongst the different mythologies, religious systems, 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 as the result of a human teleological adaptation, in turn due to a primary biological need in coping the anxieties of the live (see (Jacobi 1971, Chap. 3)). The Jung's interests towards the anthropology and ethnology constitutes, therefore, an indispensable premise to his theory of archetypes: for instance, the Lévy-Bruhl theories had a great load in building up the Jungian theoretical framework; and, vice versa, the Jungian theories had also a great influence on anthropological thought (see (Carotenuto 1994, Chap. VI)).

7. A first comparison between Jungian and Lévi-Straussian unconscious

Many studies have been conducted to compare the Lévi-Straussian unconscious with the Jungian collective unconscious, which discuss on many common points of these two theoretical constructs that nevertheless are not equal amongst them. Among these papers, we recall (Remotti 1971, Chap. IV, Section 2), (Staude 1976), (Gras 1981) and, above all, the very good paper of Richard M. Gray (see (Gray 1991) and references therein) which, amongst other things, put into comparison the various previous studies made about this question, trying to objectively prove that there exist many common points between these two constructs, contrarily to those who want instead see a net 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 to a primary binary and oppositional logic; as regards then the Jungian collective unconscious, this last aspect emerges from the study of mythological thought, as we will see later.

According to Gray, there exist strict parallelisms between them because both authors were observing the same entities from very similar perspectives. Both divide the unconscious into dual segments, one personal and one impersonal; they also see the deeper, impersonal level as providing a content-free infrastructures upon which content builds up. The next element of similarity is the pattern of oppositions and their resolution. Lévi-Strauss sees just such a dialectic as representing the underlying structure of unconscious. Again, Lévi-Strauss, in explaining the myth, states that «*the mythical thought always progresses from the awareness of oppositions towards their resolution* [...]. *We need only assume that two opposite terms with no intermediary always tend to be replaced by two equivalent terms which admit of a third one as a mediator; than one of the polar terms and the mediator become replaced by a new triad, and so on*». Patterns of opposing elements were central in the Jung's scheme. The principle of oppositions is pointed out by Jung as an essential characteristic of conscious thought. He notes that «*there is no consciousness without discrimination of opposites*». The following quote, drawn from *Aion*, reflects that in an oppositionally based dynamics Jung saw the heart of the psyche and although it reflects Jung's view of psychic organization, it is

[27] And in this a certain Lamarkism is identifiable.

nevertheless quite similar to Levi-Strauss' own dialectic. Precisely, 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*».

Jung has meant the archetype concept as having yes an aprioristic form, but not in a completely rigid manner; indeed, it is undergone to a continuous mutability also in the form, except its unavoidable dualistic and oppositional nature, according to a phylogenetic evolution. Instead, this last possibility is forbidden to Lévi-Straussian unconscious structure. The Jungian archetypes are neither representable nor visible, being fully unconscious, but they may appear only symbolically – for instance in dreams, in fantasies and in psychotic deliria – as primeval *archetypical images*, as said above. Just these last archetypical images give a substantial content to the Jungian archetypes. Therefore, a first common point between the Lévi-Straussian and Jungian unconscious is just due to their universal structural nature. Then, another their common point concerns the mythological thought which, in both authors, structurally takes place through processes by opposition, as recalled above.

Following a celebrated Paul Ricoeur remark (see, for instance (Renzi 1965)), the Lévi-Strauss unconscious is conceivable more as a Kantian type than as a Freudian type, that is to say, it is of categorical and combinatorial type but without thinking transcendental subject. This last aspect means that in place of the «I think» (Ego), there exists a well-determined a-historical and a-temporal formal organization understood as a sort of *facultas præformandi* (see (Carotenuto 1991, Chap. X) and (Carotenuto 1994, Chap. VI)) common both to ancient and modern individuals as well as to primitive and civilized persons, as proved by the study of symbolic function which is one of the main feature of the unconscious. This symbolic function is expressed through structures and forms meant as pure ontological modes of being of the human mind, foregoing every possible structurally organized content[28]. According to Lévi-Strauss, this (his) epistemological model of unconscious represents the main structure upon which grounding up the assumed Lévy-Straussian hypothesis of an universality and objectivity of every possible human thought, within a methodological unity of the knowledge, through which it is possible to reach to a sort of an equal levelling between the *Geisteswissenschaften* and the *Naturwissenschaften* in the Wilhelm Dilthey sense.

Moreover, in the Lévi-Strauss unconscious model (see (Galimberti 2006)), it takes place the crucial meeting between *subjective* and *objective* on the one hand, and between *model* and *structure* on the other hand. Therefore, it should be meant as a mediator among the various, otherwise irreconcilable, individual subjectivities, making so possible the intersubjective communication and cognition. This last is possible through the transposition of every individual towards a higher plane which does not transcend herself or himself in an alienating manner, but simply puts the individual into relationship with other common forms of knowledge which are together our and of others. Furthermore, again following Lévi-Straussian thought (see (Caldiron 1975)), the laws of unconscious activity remain always, on the one hand, out of the individual cognition (at most, being possible to take consciousness of them only as a historical object), whereas, on the other hand, it is 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, following Lévi-Strauss, to speak of the unconscious as of *the place of the science*, or else, of every form of rational knowledge (see (Rossi 1973)). The statement that sees the collective unconscious as the primary source of philosophy, science and mythology, which would originate by successive differentiations, is also expressed by classical scholar Francis M. Cornford as well as by the many other scholars like the

[28] In this regards, Lévi-Strauss picturesquely compares this «*with the empty stomach* [forms] *that assimilates the food* [contents]».

physicist Wolfgang Pauli, the historian Arnold J.Toynbee, and so on, who based their studies on Jungian collective unconscious hypothesis (see (Ellenberger 1970, Chap. 9)).

Only at the unconscious level (see (Grampa 1976)), as already said above, it takes place the meta-historical integration, otherwise unrealizable, between *subjective* and *objective*[29]. The unconscious operating modalities are the same for everyone in any time, because they represent the conditions of all the possible mental life of all the men of all the times, or else, the unconscious is the set of all the possible mental and psychic structures which regulate every human thought, both normal and pathological. In particular, in normal conditions, it takes place the (abstract) reification of certain symbolic forms (by means of archetypical images) whose structure leads just to the one provided by the Boolean algebra of the bivalent logic[30] (see (Piaget 1968)). The Lévi-Straussian unconscious, as metastructure categorized into pure free-content forms with a universal, a-temporal and formal character (see (Fabietti & Remotti 1998)), is above all aimed towards the explication of the unconscious-science (or knowledge) relationships, if one primarily considers it as an entity of all the possible absolute laws and of all the necessary relations (see (Moravia, 1969)). Finally, also according to the epistemological thought of Mario Ageno, which is derived from his work and philosophical meditations on biophysics (hence, by comparing the epistemological patterns of physics and biology), it follows a substantial unity of the nature as well as a communion of methods and foundations of all the sciences (see (Ageno 1962, Chap. 1, Section 1)).

As it has already been said, Jungian and Lévi-Straussian unconscious notions turn out to be, notwithstanding the most common aspects, yet different between them: amongst their main distinction points, we recall, above all, the diachronic (or historic) dynamicity of the structure of the former[31] against the utter synchronic (or a-historical) staticity of the structure of the latter[32]. Further, the archetypical structural forms of Jungian unconscious may undergo changes in dependence on the phylogenetic evolution of the related contents[33], and vice versa, that is to say, there is a certain and well-particular reciprocal relationship between forms and contents. Instead, the Lévi-Straussian unconscious is mainly characterized by the absolute and full predetermination of its structural forms which are completely independent from the various contents which will fill up them. Hence, there is a remarkable ontological insufficiency of contents in the Lévi-Strauss unconscious, unlike the Jungian one, because of the merely symbolic nature that the former must be. On the other hand, as already said, we would like again to stress on 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 that concerning 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 out through elementary and irreducible entities (the Lévi-Straussian structures and the Jungian archetypes) which relate amongst them through an oppositional binary logic. These are, in short, the main common points which we want to highlight for our purposes.

7. Some anthropological considerations on logic.

Following (Fabietti & Remotti 1998), the comparison between the logic of civilized thought with the logic of the primitive one, is a *vexata quæstio* still open. A deep study has been done by Chris-

[29] The seeing the unconscious as an intermediate term between subjective and objective will be, in a certain sense, suggested to Lévi-Strauss by the famous notion of *total social fact* due to Marcel Mauss (see (Renzi 1965)).
[30] To this purpose, see also (Iurato 2013).
[31] Mainly, as regard the (dualistic) forms of the archetypes.
[32] Whose (dualistic) forms are universal and determined once for all.
[33] Which, in turn, are strictly linked to the related social-cultural contexts.

topher R. Hallpike (see (Hallpike 1979)) and Jack Goody (see (Goody 1977)). Nowadays, the general notion of *primitive* is anthropologically discredited if one considers it in an opposition level respect to the modern one. In this regards, there was a semantic switch of the term 'primitive' which is nowadays understood as referring to the first original structural forms of logic thought. Therefore, the term primitive refers to a previous logic condition, namely to a logic anteriority, rather than a social-historic one (see (Bonte & Izard 1991)) and, hence, it is quite justified, from this last point of view, the elementary analysis carried out in this paper. Nevertheless, there is no full clarity about the passage from the primitive thought to the civilized one, whose borders seem to be quite vague[34].

The first valuable studies on primitive mentality were made by Lévy-Bruhl who identified a first core of a prelogic thought characterized by the lack of the elementary basic Aristotelian principles of *identity* and *non-contradiction* mainly due to the presence of the *mystic participation law*[35] that 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 when he or she had been individually considered, in a manner comparable with the civilized one. Nevertheless, it is just the social-cultural context, pervaded by this participation law and by the related collective representations, to hide these mental potentialities, giving rise to forms of syncretic reasoning. Later, Lévy-Bruhl will abandon the net contraposition between prelogic and logic thought, accepting the idea according to which these may coexist together but that then may manifest only one of them (at the expense of the remaining one) in dependence on the individual existential experiences and on the related invested affective charge. Thus, both of them are present in every society and in any human being but according to different ratios. In our case, we also point out a remark just due to Lévi-Strauss in *La penséè sauvage* (1962), according to which the logic of primitive societies is quite fragmented due to residuals of psychological and historical processes devoid of the notion of a priori necessity, which must discovered only a posteriori. According to him, the *classification* by *oppositions* and *binary relations* is one of the main a-temporal characteristic of the universal symbolic function, which explicates itself by means of the action of a binary principle on the basis of the structural linguistic pattern. It relies at the basis of the oppositional and relational binary logic which is the central pillar of the whole theoretical framework of the Lévi-Straussian work, but also of the Jungian system, as said above.

8. Final considerations

From what has been said above, notwithstanding their few dissimilarity as entities, it is now possible to make further disquisitions upon the above mentioned common theoretical points between the Jungian unconscious and the Lévi-Straussian one, which might turn out to be of a certain importance as regards the possible consciousness' origins. In the Lévi-Straussian conception, the unconscious is seen as the primary place of every possible psychic and mental structure, hence of each

[34] This crucial passage is similar to that concerning the passage from mythical to rational thought (with the dawning of philosophical thought of 6th century BC. We would be tempted to put forward the hypothesis according to which this type of crucial passages were strictly correlated with the occurrence of some process of separation of opposites.

[35] Which, on the other hand, will play a certain influence in 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 mainly differs from the civilized one – says Jung – because of the fact that the conscious mind is far less developed, in extent and intensity, in the former case than in the latter one. In the primitive mentality, basic functions such as thinking and willing are not yet differentiated; they are still preconscious. For Jung, the principle of participation is also applied to the internal development of the psyche itself, in which, he thought, the contents move out from the unconscious by a process of differentiation and are gradually freed from the condition of ''participation mystique'', that is, they move in the light of consciousness where can come under the direction and control of the Ego's dialectic, and are brought into the service of the whole Self.

form of thought and knowledge, whence, in particular, of every form of logic structure, including the bivalent Aristotelian one, this last being typical of the common rational thought (consciousness) but not the only possible one[36]. This is however the most elementary and primary one which relies at the basis of the first forms of the conscious reasoning. On the other hand, from what has been said about Jungian and Neumannian ideas, the separation of opposites play 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 logic arguments, that the logic deduction of any thinkable proposition and rational statement is possible, so reaching to clear prelogic forms of syncretic[37] reasoning.

Precisely, in that unconscious' realm given by the entity resulting from the common place of the non-void intersection between the Lévi-Straussian unconscious and the Jungian one, structurally made by elementary dualistic entities operating according to an oppositional binary logic, every possible proposition and statement is valid, or hold true, as it will follow from a Pseudo Scoto argument. In this, we refind one of the main characteristic theoretical aspects of the Lévi-Strauss unconscious concerning the presumed unifying relationships unconscious-science, precisely that according to which, as besides already said above, it is the unitary place of any science and every thought[38]. Therefore, only by means of the separation of opposites, in accordance with Jung and Neumann, it will be possible to get a rational thought respecting the usual basic Aristotelian bivalent logic rules and principles, amongst which the *principle of non-contradiction*[39] (also recalled by Jung himself in (Jung 1972)). On the other hand, Freud himself claimed that every human consciousness' act is basically the result of a dialectic process arising from a separation of opposites (see (Akhtar and O'Neil 2011)) by negation. Likewise, Imre Hermann (1989) points out what primary role plays the so-called *dual procedure*, basically founded on a separation of opposites by negation, in the formation of the elementary principles of Aristotelian logic.

The simple elementary logic argumentations which lead us to these conclusions, are as follows. Following (Beth 1959) and (Carruccio 1971, 1977), if a *rational theory* is, roughly, meant to be as a set of *premises* (i.e., primitive propositions or statements, axioms or postulates, aprioristically assumed to be true) and of *consequences* (logically deducted from the premises), then the well-known *Pseudo Scoto theorem*, dating back to Scholastics, states that, if, in a certain rational theory T, at least two contradictory propositions or statements at the same time subsist, say A and $\neg A$ (= *negation* of A), hence forming a *pair of opposites*[40], then it is possible to prove, within T, that every pos-

[36] For instance, the logic of psychotic patients is quite different from the Aristotelic one, as witnessed by the fundamental studies made by Ignacio Matte Blanco (see (Matte Blanco 1975) and (Iurato 2013) for a very brief recall).

[37] In this regards, the notion of *syncretism* should be meant in its wider sense, including the psychological one.

[38] On the other hand, also the structural principles of unconscious in the Freudian sense (albeit inherent to the individual one) provide for the possibility of having contradictions, this being further confirmed by Matte Blanco's studies (see (Matte Blanco 1975)). Moreover, the Matte Blanco *bi-logic* process might have many common points with Jungian notion of *compensation* (see (Galimberti 2006) and (Samuels et al. 1986)), in turn related to the Freudian notion of *ambivalence* (see (Laplanche & Pontalis 1973)).

[39] The *tertium non datur* principle is more general than the non-contradiction one, but implies this: indeed, this last principle puts a disjoint choice between one statement (A) and its negation ($\neg A$), that is to say, only and only one of these two is true; nevertheless, this does not exclude the case in which both may be false, hence with a third possibility (eventuality which is just that forbidden by the tertium non datur).

[40] Which is of *dialectic* type, when it leads to a some synthesis, or of *polar* type, when it is however maintained a certain tension's state which is at the basis of every psychic dynamism (see (Galimberti 2006) and (Samuels et al. 1986)). On the other hand, the notion of opposite pair, here taken from the Jungian psychoanalytic context (and, as said above, already present in the Freudian thought with the notions of *ambivalence* and *ambitendency*, that Freud himself set at the basis of every rational dialectical thought (see (Laplanche & Pontalis 1973) and (Akhtar & O'Neil 2011)), belongs to the wider class of *philosophical pairs* of the general dialectic thought. For a good exposition of the various relationships between dialectics and formal logic, see the interesting book (Malatesta 1982).

sible proposition or statement X is also true, clearly so reaching to forms of prelogic and (psychologically) syncretic reasoning (see (Malatesta 1982, Chapter IV, Section 5)), typical of the primary process and of the primitive thought (see what has been said above about Lévy-Bruhl in section 5.1). On the other hand, the simplest syllogistic inference, that is to say, the elementary logic *material implication* $A \rightarrow B$ (read: if A, then B) is just defined to be $\neg A \vee B$, where $\vee$ is the logic connective (*strong*) *disjunction* ($A \vee B$ means A holds true or – disjunctively – B holds true), that is to say, $\neg A \vee \neg (\neg B) = \neg A \vee \neg C$ if one sets $C = \neg B$. Therefore, the simplest form of elementary reasoning $A \rightarrow B$ (material implication) is equivalent to disjunctively choose (with $\vee$) one and only one element of a pair ($\neg A$, $\neg C$), that is to say, between two disjoint or separated alternatives $\neg A$ or $\neg C$. Therefore, the separation of opposites, through the *strong* disjunctive operator $\vee$, plays a very fundamental role in dawning of the primary forms of conscious rationality, by means of the disjunctive logic connective $\vee$ (in Latin, said to be *aut*[41]) and the separation of opposites. On the basis of the elementary principle according to which $\neg (\neg A) = A$, if $\neg C = A$, then we have $\neg C = \neg (\neg B) = A$, that is to say, $\neg B = \neg A$, that is to say $A = B$, so that the implication $A \rightarrow B$ is $A \rightarrow A$ which is *identity principle*; instead, if $\neg C = \neg A$, that is $C = A$, then we have $\neg B = A$ whence $\neg A \vee \neg (\neg B) = \neg A \vee \neg A$, which is the well-known *principle of non-contradiction*, in turn closely related to separation of opposites. So, we have re-obtained the elementary basic principles upon which relies the Archimedean logic, the first logic system to be historically outlined by the human being, both phylogenetically and ontogenetically. In few words, we have that such a primary form of reasoning $A \rightarrow B$, as well as the other basic non-contradiction and tertium non datur principles, all unavoidably rely on the primary psychological notion of separation of opposites. Without this basic process, the Pseudo Scoto theorem states that inevitably we fall back into the *undifferentiated's realm*. On the other hand, following (Sowa 1984, p. 386) and (Akhtar & 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 five these last operations can be derived only from two primitive ones, the conjunction and the negation, coherently with what just said above.

Thus, the origins of the fundamental bases of the bivalent classical (Aristotelian) reasoning, that is to say of the first forms of conscious rational thought (as emerging from the mythological one), should be traced just in this primary process of differentiation and separation from the above mentioned initial ouroboric undifferentiated state and from the subsequent various incest phases, in which prevail, at the same time, conditions of opposition and undifferentiation. Following (Samuels et al. 1986), the opposites are the indispensable and unavoidable precondition of every psychic life. Jung puts the opposition principle at the basis of his framework, as already made by his predecessors. The 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 become intolerable, then a solution must be found: the only possible one is placed into a higher level respect to those of 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 amongst them. The conscious mind does not know what will join together these two contrasting tendencies, until to it will appear the *symbol* which shall accomplish to such a difficult unifying task. It is the result above all of a *coniunctio oppositorum*, but, in some case, also of the *enantiodromia law*, which both will take place within the unconscious.

As it has already been said, the *opposites* play a fundamental role in Jungian theory which starts from the principle[42] (said to be *compensation principle*) according to which the psychic life is a self-

[41] Instead, the logical *weak* disjunctive connective *vel* is not completely disjunctive as the *aut* one, in the sense that, given two statements A and B, it is possible that both are contemporary true.

[42] In formulating this principle, Jung started from a careful historical recognition of the physical laws of general thermodynamics concerning the evolution of dynamical systems and related laws on energetic balance (see (Samuels et al.

regulating system which can attain to an equilibrium condition, between conscious and unconscious instances, only by means of an accommodation or mediation of opposites which just takes place through two main principles, the *enatiodromia law* and, above all, the *coniunctio oppositorum*. The first one is a psychological law first formulated by Heraclitus to denote the tendency of everything to transform into its opposite. According to Jung, the essence of the psychic dynamics is first the creation of pairs of opposites (from the primordial opposition conscious-unconscious), hence the *compensation* of their elements, so that it is just thanks to the enantiodromia law that the opposites take place. These then will be overcome thanks to the coniunctio oppositorum with the subsequent symbolic formation (see (Samuels et al. 1986) and (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' theoretical framework, which is but the essential core of the Aristotelian logic. According to Jung, the unconscious mind is undifferentiated, whereas the conscious mind is able to discriminate; the hallmark of consciousness is therefore the discrimination. If the consciousness wants to attain at the awareness of things, it must separate the opposites which are always inclined to merge (see (Samuels et al. 1986)). Once that the separation has taken place, the two distinct elements must yet keep into conscious relationship amongst them to avoid their nullifying fusion. Erich Neumann has therefore developed his own theory on the origins and developments of consciousness starting from this Jungian elements and following a phylo-ontogenetic stance in pursuing this. Ever taking into account the mythological perspective, he worked out a development of consciousness according to individual stages, phylogenetically isomorphic to the mythology development, pointing out on the centrality of the opposite separation theme. In conclusion, just thanks to very elementary basic logic arguments, it has been possible to ascertain as the consciousness of the human being can take place only from that non-void unconscious' realm given by the non-empty intersection between the Lévi-Strauss structural unconscious and the Jung collective unconscious, through those psychic processes explained by Jung and Neumann.

Finally, these last considerations, making use of very basic topics drew from elementary logic applied to psychological contexts, might undergo to impertinence objections if one accepts, in principle, a certain distinction between the mathematical logic and the psychological one, which we instead do not consider on the basis of what has been said by one of the major scholar of mathematical epistemology, Federigo Enriques (1871-1946), who considered, in a well-precise sense, the formal logic as a part of the psychology (see (Enriques 1985)). Therefore, the few considerations given above, should be considered within this Enriquesian epistemological framework.

References

Ageno, M. (1962), *Le radiazioni e i loro effetti*, Torino: Paolo Boringhieri Editore.

Akhtar, S. and O'Neil, M.K. (Eds) (2011), *On Freud's ''Negation''*, part of the collection *The International Psychoanalytic Association – Contemporary Freud: Turning Points & Critical Issues*, Editors-in-chief: Leticia Glocer Fiorini and Gennaro Saragnano, London: Karnac Books, Ltd.

Barnard, A. (2000), *History and Theory in Anthropology*, Cambridge (UK): Cambridge University Press (Italian Translation: (2002), *Storia del pensiero antropologico*, Bologna: Società editrice Il Mulino).

Barnard, A. (2012), *Genesis of Symbolic Thought*, Cambridge (UK): Cambridge University Press.

1986)). This is another argument which emphasizes what primary historical role has played the physics in the birth of psychoanalytic theories, since the Freudian work.

Beth, E.W. (1959), *The Foundations of Mathematics. A Study in the Philosophy of Science*, Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company, Inc. (Italian Translation: (1963), *I fondamenti logici della matematica*, Milano: Giangiacomo Feltrinelli Editore).

Bonte, P. and Izard, M. (1991), *Dictionnaire de l'ethnologie et de l'anthropologie*, Paris: Presses Universitaires de France – PUF (Italian Translation: (2009), *Dizionario di antropologia e etnologia*, a cura di Marco Aime, Torino: Giulio Einaudi editore).

Bourguignon, E. (1979), *Psychological Anthropology: An Introduction to Human Nature and Cultural Differences*, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc. (Italian Translation: (1983), *Antropologia psicologica*, Roma-Bari: Giuseppe Laterza & Figli).

Caldiron, O. (1975), *Claude Lévi-Strauss. I fondamenti teorici dell'antropologia culturale*, Pubblicazioni della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia, Università di Padova, Firenze: Leo S. Olschki Editore.

Carotenuto, A. (1990), *Senso e contenuto della psicologia analitica*, Torino: Bollati Boringhieri Editore.

Carotenuto, A. (1991), *Trattato di Psicologia della Personalità*, Milano: Raffaello Cortina Editore.

Carotenuto, A. (Ed.) (1992), *Dizionario Bompiani degli Psicologi Contemporanei*, Milano: Tascabili Bompiani.

Carotenuto, A. (1994), *Jung e la cultura del XX secolo*, Milano: Bompiani.

Carruccio, E. (1971), *Mondi della Logica*, Bologna: Zanichelli Editore.

Carruccio, E. (1977), *Appunti di Storia delle matematiche, della logica, della metamatematica*, Bologna: Pitagora Editrice.

Cipriani, R. (1988), *Lévi-Strauss. Una introduzione*, Roma: Armando Editore.

Comba, E. (2000), *Introduzione a Lévi-Strauss*, Bari: Editori Laterza.

Conti, L. and Principe, S. (1989), *Salute Mentale e Società. Fondamenti di Psichiatria Sociale*, Padova: Piccin Nuova Libraria.

Cressant, P. (1970), *Lévi Strauss*, Paris: Éditions Universitaires (Italian Translation: (1971), *Introduzione a Lévi Strauss*, Firenze: C/E Giunti – G. Barbera).

Ellenberger, H.F. (1970), *The Discovery of the Unconscious. The History and Evolution of Dynamic Psychiatry*, New York: Basic Book, Inc. (Italian Translation: (1972), *La scoperta dell'incosncio. Storia della psichiatria dinamica*, Torino: Editore Boringhieri).

Enriques, F. (1985), *Problemi della Scienza*, ristampa anastatica della seconda edizione del 1926, Bologna: Nicola Zanichelli Editore.

Evans, R.I. (Ed) (1964), *Conversations with Carl Jung and Reactions from Ernest Jones*, New York: Litton Educational Publishing, Inc. (Italian Translation: (1974), *Psicoanalisi o psicologia analitica*, Roma: Newton Compton editori).

Fabietti, U. and Remotti, F. (Eds) (1997), *Dizionario di Antropologia. Etologia, Antropologia Culturale, Antropologia Sociale*, Bologna: Zanichelli editore.

Fabietti, U. (2001), *Storia dell'antropologia*, seconda edizione, Bologna: Zanichelli editore.

Freud, S. (1938), *Abriß der Psychoanalyse*, Gesammelte Werke, Band XVII (English Translation: (1940), *An Outline of Psycho-Analysis*, London: The Hogarth Press, Ltd. – Italian Translation: (1999), *Compendio di psicoanalisi*, Torino: Bollati Boringhieri).

Galimberti, U. (2006), *Dizionario di Psicologia*, Torino: UTET Libreria.

Goody, J. (1977), *The Domestication of the Savage Mind*, Cambridge (UK): Cambridge University Press (Italian Translation: (1981), *L'addomesticamento del pensiero selvaggio*, Milano: Franco Angeli editore).

Gould, N. (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, G. (1976), *L'uomo e la storia nell'antropologia strutturale di Claude Lévi-Strauss*, in: Proverbio, G. (Ed) (1976), *Studi sullo strutturalismo*, Vol. I: *Natura e problemi dello strutturalismo*, Vol. II: *Proposte didattico-educative*, Torino: Società Editrice Internazionale – SEI.

Grass, V.W. (1981), Myth and the Reconciliation of the Opposites: Jung and Lévi-Strauss, *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 42 (3): 471-488.

Gray, R.M. (1991), Jung and Lévi-Strauss Revisited: An Analysis of Common Themes, *The Mankind Quarterly*, 31 (3): 207-226.

Hallpike, C.R. (1979), *The Foundation of Primitive Thought*, Oxford (UK): Oxford University Press (Italian Translation: (1984), *I fondamenti del pensiero primitivo*, Roma: Editori Riuniti).

Harris, M. (2001), *The Rise of Anthropological Thought: A History of Theories of Culture*, (updated edition of the 1968 original one published by Thomas Y. Crowell Company, New York), Walnut Creek (CA): Altamira Press, A Division of Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc. (Italian Translation of the 1968 Edition: (1970), *L'evoluzione del pensiero antropologico*, Bologna: Società editrice Il Mulino).

Hénaff, M. (1998), *Claude Lévi-Strauss and the Making of Structural Anthropology*, Minnesota (MN): University of Minnesota Press.

Hermann, I. (1989), *Psicoanalisi e logica*, Bari: Edizioni Dedalo.

Iurato, G. (2013), *Mathematical thought in the light of Matte Blanco work*, Philosophy of Mathematics Education Journal, 27.

Jacobi, J. (1971), *Complesso, archetipo, simbolo nella psicologia di C.G. Jung*, Torino: Editore Boringhieri.

Janssens, J. (1981), *Vita e morte del cristiano negli epitaffi di Roma anteriori al secolo VII*, Roma: Università Gregoriana Editrice.

Jung, C.G. (1969), *The Psychology of the Child Archetype*, in: Jung, C.G. and Kerényi, K. (1969), *Essays on a Science of Mythology*, Princeton (NJ): Princeton University Press, Chapter 2 (Italian Translation: (1972), *Psicologia dell'archetipo del fanciullo*, in: Jung, C.G. and Kerényi, K. (1972), *Prolegomeni allo studio scientifico della mitologia*, Torino: Paolo Boringhieri editore).

Jung, C.G. and Kerényi, K. (1969), *Essays on a Science of Mythology*, Princeton (NJ): Princeton University Press (Italian Translation: (1972), *Prolegomeni allo studio scientifico della mitologia*, Torino: Paolo Boringhieri editore).

Laplanche J. and Pontalis, J-B. (1973), *The Language of Psycho-Analysis*, London: The Hogarth Press, Ltd. and The Institute of Psycho-Analysis (Italian Edition: (1973), *Enciclopedia della psicoanalisi*, 2 voll., Bari: Editori Laterza).

Lévi-Strauss, C. (1967), *Les structures élémentaires de la parenté*, Paris: Presses Universitaires de France – PUF (Italian Translation: (1984), *Le strutture elementari della parentela*, a cura di Alberto M. Cirese, Edizioni Campi del sapere, Milano: Giangiacomo Feltrinelli editore).

Malatesta, M. (1982), *Dialettica e logica formale*, Napoli: Liguori Editore.

Matte Blanco, I. (1975), *The Unconscious as Infinite Sets. An Essay in Bi-Logic*, London: Gerald Duckworth & Company, Ltd. (Italian Translation: (1981), *L'inconscio come insiemi infiniti*. *Saggio sulla bi-logica*, Torino: Giulio Einaudi editore).

MacClancy, J. (1986), Unconventional character and disciplinary convention: John Layard, Jungian and anthropologist, in: Stocking, G.W. (Ed.) (1986), *Malinowski, Rivers, Benedict and Others*, Madison and London: The University of Wisconsin Press.

Mercier, P. (1966), *Histoire de l'anthropologie*, Paris: Presses Universitaires de France – PUF (Italian Translation: (1988), *Storia dell'antropologia*, seconda edizione, Bologna: Società editrice Il Mulino).

Moravia, S. (1969), *La Ragione Nascosta. Scienza e Filosofia nel pensiero di Claude Lévi-Strauss*, Firenze: Sansoni.

Nannini, S. (1981), *Il pensiero simbolico. Saggio su Lévi-Strauss*, Bologna: Società editrice Il Mulino.

Neumann, E. (1954), *The Origins and History of Consciousness*, Princeton (NJ): Princeton University Press (Italian Edition: (1978), *Storia delle origini della coscienza*, Roma: Casa Editrice Astrolabio-Ubaldini Editore).

Neumann, E. (1955), *The Great Mother. An Analysis of the Archetype*, Princeton (NJ): Princeton University Press (Italian Translation: (1981), *La grande madre. Fenomenologia delle configurazioni femminili dell'inconscio*, Roma: Casa Editrice Astrolabio-Ubaldini Editore).

Obeyesekere, G. (1990), *The Work of Culture. Symbolic Transformation in Psychoanalysis and Anthropology*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Paul, R.A. (1989), Psychoanalytic anthropology, *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 18: 177-202.

Piaget, J. (1968), *Le structuralisme*, Paris: Presses Universitaires de France – PUF (Italian Translation: (1968), *Lo strutturalismo*, Milano: Il Saggiatore di Alberto Mondadori Editore).

Remotti, F. (1971), *Lévi-Strauss. Struttura e Storia*, Torino: Giulio Einaudi Editore.

Renzi, E. (1965), Sulla nozione di inconscio in Lévi-Strauss, *Aut Aut*, 88: 55-61.

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

Rycroft, C. (1968), *A Critical Dictionary of Psychoanalysis*, London: Thomas Nelson & Sons, Ltd. (Italian Translation: (1970), *Dizionario critico di psicoanalisi*, Roma: Casa Editrice Astrolabio – Ubaldini Editore).

Samuels, A., Shorter, B. and Plaut, F. (1986), *A Critical Dictionary of Jungian Analysis*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul (Italian Translation: (1987), *Dizionario di Psicologia Analitica*, Milano: Raffaello Cortina Editore).

Sowa, J.F. (1984), *Conceptual Structures: Information Processing in Mind and Machine*, Reading (MA): Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc.

Staude, J.R. (1976), From depth psychology to depth sociology: Freud, Jung and Lévi-Strauss, *Theory and Society*, 3 (3): 303-338.

Tagliagambe, S. and Malinconico, A. (2011), *Pauli e Jung. Un confronto su materia e psiche*, Milano: Raffaello Cortina Editore.